ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Agenda
Tuesday, March 5, 2019
10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
SCI III Room 100

1. CALL TO ORDER

2. ANNOUNCEMENTS AND INFORMATION
   • Trustee Romey Sabalius visits on April 23, 2019
   • President Zelezny Senate Report on April 4th 10:05 – 10:30
   • April 30 Executive Committee meeting from 11:30-12:30 to meet with President Zelezny

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   February 26, 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. Provost Update
      i. Sustainability position
      ii. Leadership Academy
      iii. Time Block Schedule Update
      iv. Financial Aid moved to BAS
      v. GRASP and AARC
   c. Searches
      i. Proposed members Search - AVP for Enrollment Management (see previous handout)
   d. BC/CSUB Partnership
   e. Financial and strategic planning transparency and faculty participation
   f. Academic Calendar: Scheduling Spring Break
   g. Starting new programs - possible referral to AAC
   h. 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
i. Hiring Procedures
j. Faculty Honorary Doctorate Committee process (possible FAC referral)

6. **NEW DISCUSSION ITEMS**
   a. Development of a Continuous Enrollment Course (see previous handout)
   b. Immediate Reinstatement After Academic Disqualification (see previous handout)
   c. GE Task Force Final Report (see previous handout 1-16 pages) (Pages 17-23 contains lists of members and references.)
   d. Faculty Marshals
   e. University Week
      i. Faculty Meeting
   f. Possible Referrals
      i. Distributed Learning Policies
      ii. Graduate Directors Term Limits and Review – Handbook Change

7. **AGENDA ITEMS FOR SENATE MEETING MARCH 7, 2019** (Time Certain 11:00 a.m.)
   Announcements
   Consent Agenda
   Potential change to Academic Calendar
   New Business
   Old Business
   RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change * Second Reading

8. **COMMENTS FROM THE FLOOR**
   * Changes to the University Handbook
**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>Complete</td>
<td>AAC, BPC The faculty stakeholder’s proposal was withdrawn 2/27/19.</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>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181903 Instructor Initiated Drop Policy</td>
<td>1/24/19</td>
<td>2/1/19</td>
<td>2/8/19</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>Viewing process flows</td>
<td>Viewing process flows of the annual vs. every two years, workload and implications</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>Processing</td>
<td>Recommendations made. Response received.</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>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</td>
<td>Pending others</td>
<td>Pending response to AS&amp;SS’ recommendations so they can finalze the issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support Animal Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/8/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 11 Textbook Ordering Process</td>
<td>Pending discussion</td>
<td>Pending discussion of the financial viability before the committee can make recommendations</td>
<td></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>Complete</td>
<td>AAC, BPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department Formation Proposal</td>
<td></td>
<td>The faculty stakeholder’s proposal was withdrawn 2/27/19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 09 University Hour</td>
<td>Pending others</td>
<td>BPC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pending classroom utilization data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 12 Academic Calendars</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>BPC</td>
<td>2/4/19</td>
<td>2/15/19</td>
<td>2/15/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RES 181907 Academic Calendars Summer 2019 through Summer 2020</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>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181902 Faculty on Sabbatical Serving on RTP Review Committee Second Reading 10/11/18</td>
<td>10/11/18</td>
<td>10/19/18</td>
<td>10/23/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 04 Ombudsperson</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181905 Role of Ombudsperson in Dispute Resolution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/13/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181909 Faculty Award Process – Handbook Change First Reading 2/21/19</td>
<td></td>
<td>03/01/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/2/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 06 Distributed Learning Committee</td>
<td>Processing</td>
<td>Referral moved from AS&amp;SS to FAC on 10/30/18. DLC is being codified and recommendations forthcoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/4/18</td>
<td>2018-2019 Referral 15_University Council Membership Addition-Library Representative – Handbook Change (105.3)</td>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>RES 181910 University Council – Addition Library Member</td>
<td>02/21/18</td>
<td>03/01/19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Debbie,

I am providing my tentative list of individuals for the AVP for Enrollment Mgmt. Search.

Elected Faculty Member (FAC)
Provost Selected Faculty Member (FAC)
ASI Board Member (ASI)
Kathleen K. (EM)
Kris K. (IRPA)
Veronica B. (EM)

Vernon B. Harper Jr. Ph.D.
Interim Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
Office: (661) 654-2154

Go Runners!
MEMORANDUM

TO: Debbie Boschini
Chair of the Academic Senate

FROM: BJ Moore
Member, Graduate Directors

DATE: December 12, 2018

RE: Development of a Continuous Enrollment Course

C: Debra Jackson, Interim Dean, Graduate and Undergraduate Programs

I write at the request of the Graduate Program Directors. At a recent meeting one agenda topic focused on students that must maintain open enrollment to graduate once the thesis work starts and the process extends to when no other course work is involved. Extended University did establish a course for the MPA degree program and was charging the students an administrative fee. Other graduate programs expressed a need for the same type of course and it occurred that the doctoral program might also be interested. Attached please find a request for a single course ...CSUB 7000. Please consider referring this to the Academic Affairs Committee in regard to the Committee’s role as the University Curriculum Committee.

You will note that the number of units is blank. The Graduate Directors are open to the Committee’s recommendation on whether to attach one unit or to use an administrative fee. Thanks for your attention to this matter.
A. Proposed Course: Number and Title

HCA 7000 Continuous Enrollment

B. Catalog Course Description (If syllabus already developed, please attach)

This course is used by students that are not registered for courses but will be continuing to use library, e-mail, and other CSUB resources to complete thesis research, incompletes or are working on such during a leave of absence.

C. Course Objectives and Degree Program Learning Outcomes

NA

D. Course Topic Outline

NA

E. Required Texts and Other Learning Materials

NA

F. Rationale
   a) Present rationale for the course or course change. Describe how the discipline addresses the course material at other universities and complete a review of identical or similar courses offered on this campus.

   A similar course is listed for the MPA Program and may be needed for the Doctoral Program as well.
b) Place in the Program of Study (core, elective, etc.)
   NA

c) Describe the market for the course
   See B above

d) Prerequisites

   NA

e) Impact

   Does not impact Program resources. Is taken for 1 unit through Extended University

G. Faculty Resources Needed and Availability

   In Extended University
GENERAL EDUCATION TASK FORCE REPORT
Recommendations for GE Review and Reform

CONTEXT FOR GENERAL EDUCATION REVIEW

A robust General Education (GE) program is an invaluable component of a baccalaureate degree offered by the California State University (CSU) system. The CSU seeks to ensure undergraduate students succeed in meeting their academic goals by providing an environment where education writ large, lifelong learning, and civic engagement can flourish when the depth of each student’s chosen major is combined with the breadth of the GE program.

This is clearly articulated in a description of the General Education program at one particular campus, although others have similar statements:

“One of the principles on which a modern university rests is the assumption that there is an important difference between learning to make a living and building the foundation for a life. While the first goal is important, the second is fundamental.

In focusing on the students’ development as whole or “educated” people, a university distinguishes itself from a trade school. The goal of a university education is not simply the acquisition and application of knowledge, but the creation of people who firmly grasp the worth of clear thinking and know how to do it; who understand and appreciate the differences between peoples and cultures as well as their similarities; who have a sense of history and social forces; who can express thought clearly and have quantitative ability; who know something about the arts as well as how to enjoy them; who can talk and think intelligently about the physical and life sciences, the humanities, and literature; and, above all, who have the desire and capability for learning. This goal is why a university degree is so highly valued by individuals, employers, and the community at large.” (http://catalog.csus.edu/colleges/academic-affairs/general-education/)

BACKGROUND FOR GE REVIEW AND REFORM IN THE CSU

Arising from mounting concerns about the erosion of confidence in the value of higher education, higher costs of education borne increasingly by students, attenuated times to degree completion, and low persistence rates, many institutions and systems of higher education have taken on comprehensive reform of their GE programs. A unifying motive for such reform has been a conclusion that GE programs have stagnated while the diversity of students, education, workplace skills and needs, and technology have, by sharp contrast, changed dramatically.

Nationwide and in California, there is increasing pressure to reform GE. These pressures come from State legislators, community stakeholders, foundations and other non-profit groups, boards of trustees, university administrators, faculty and students. Although these
stakeholders have legitimate interests in general education, the review and reform (while collaborating with such stakeholders) must be led and implemented by faculty. Faculty are the experts in both disciplinary thinking and the pedagogical practices required for student learning to occur. Reform must be squarely situated in the enfranchisement of faculty to enact it.

Regardless of any external pressures to review and reform GE, it is time for the CSU to engage in its own review of the system’s GE requirements. The most recent effort to revise GE occurred in 2008 (“Give Students a Compass”), resulting in the requirements that GE be both assessed as a program in and of itself and developed in a manner consistent with the American Association of Colleges and University’s Liberal Education for America’s Promise, or LEAP outcomes. However, the basic structure of CSU GE requirements has remained largely unmodified for several decades. Society, the demographics of our students, pedagogy, content and curriculum in many disciplinary fields, all have changed; therefore, it is incumbent on the faculty to lead efforts to revise general education in the CSU system.

The CSU also has been subject to mandates affecting graduation requirements beyond GE instituted by the CSU Board of Trustees in Title 5 education code (e.g., the American Institutions/American History requirement, and the upper-division writing assessment requirement, or GWAR). In addition, individual CSU campuses have implemented campus-based requirements to graduate above and beyond the CSU-wide GE, statutory and Board requirements. Taken together, such graduation requirements situated as extramural to the GE program create the perception that non-major degree requirements are piecemeal rather than integrated, and undermine the ability to assess them all holistically consistent with the LEAP outcomes.

Aside from the foregoing imperatives suggesting the need for review and reform, Graduation Initiative 2025, with its core intent to eliminate administrative and academic barriers to student success and to eliminate equity gaps, has provided additional incentive to undertake a comprehensive review of the CSU’s GE and related requirements.

THE ACADEMIC SENATE CSU TASK FORCE

The Academic Senate of the CSU (ASCSU), with the concurrence of the CSU Chancellor’s Office, established a GE Task Force, which held its first meeting in March 2017. The Task Force was comprised of several members of the CSU faculty, two CSU students, a staff member from the CSU Office of the Chancellor, and one faculty representative from each of our sister institutions, the University of California and the California Community Colleges. Two members of the Board of Trustees also participated on the Task Force because of their interest in the subject matter, however they did not officially represent the Board.
GE TASK FORCE GUIDING PRINCIPLES

One of the first aims of the Task Force was to establish principles to underpin its review of the GE program in the CSU. These principles were used to evaluate the status quo as well as to form the basis for recommendations for change. Throughout the work, each member tried always to keep students at the forefront of any discussion featuring one overarching goal: educating students with the skills, abilities and dispositions needed for success. Accordingly, the Task Force agreed on the following principles underpinning a recommended GE program:

1. The GE program must indeed be a CSU systemwide program, with internal coherence and consistency, and with its goals and relationship to other aspects of higher education understandable to students, faculty, and external stakeholders alike (e.g., legislators, taxpayers, and employers).

2. The GE program must align readily with the curricula offered by the California Community Colleges and, when possible, the University of California, so that transfer among these sister institutions is in no way impeded and, ideally, enhanced.

3. The GE program should meet all three goals of higher education, i.e., familiarization with “ways of knowing,” proficiency with fundamental skills, and enhancement of the dispositions of an engaged citizenry.

4. The GE program should contain clear learning outcomes and be reviewable and subject to assessment and alteration where and as needed.

5. The GE program, in particular, campus course offerings, should allow for appropriate campus autonomy within the systemwide GE program to express the uniqueness and strengths of each campus without hampering student transfer.

6. The GE program should be coherent, easy to navigate, and consistently provide high quality learning experiences for all CSU students.

7. The GE program should lead to persistence to degree completion and increased confidence in the students’ ability to succeed in college.

8. The GE program should be delivered in a context relevant to students (e.g., by encouraging campus-driven “themes” and “pathways” that link and provide multiple angles of view on a topic of significance).

9. The GE program and related graduation requirements should be properly proportionate to the number of required units for the entire undergraduate curriculum.
10. The GE program should consist of the highest-quality educational experiences and high-impact practices: encouraging multi-disciplinary efforts, establishing student-student and student-faculty interaction, amplifying the creativity and energy of faculty, instilling curiosity in students, and enhancing their joy of learning.

With these principles in mind, the Task Force has developed the following conceptual framework/model for general education in the CSU, proposed a structure for unit allocation, and provided examples of what the model might look like when operationalized on a campus.
A Conceptual Framework for General Education in the CSU

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of the conceptual framework (model) is to describe how the General Education (GE) curriculum can provide meaningful, impactful learning experiences as students move through their academic programs in the CSU. The GE curriculum at each CSU campus should engage students in the practices and habits of mind which exist across multiple disciplines using high-impact, learner-centered pedagogies that scaffold the knowledge and skills students are expected to demonstrate. The curriculum also should provide students with opportunities to develop stewardship/leadership/advocacy around the values that distinguish each CSU campus. Learning outcomes for GE programs should articulate these multiple dimensions accordingly.

A visualization of the conceptual framework for General Education in the CSU, illustrating the multidimensionality and integrative intentionality of the GE program. At the core are the Essential (foundational) Skills that are taught, then reinforced and scaffolded throughout the GE curriculum. Surrounding the core are Disciplinary Perspectives (ways of knowing), Cross-cutting Values (institutional priorities), and Integrative Experiences (learner-centered, multidimensional experiences which contextualize the GE program), all of which tie together and make coherent the courses students take to complete their GE programs.
THE FRAMEWORK

**Essential Skills** make up the nucleus of GE and serve as the foundation of a college education and lifelong learning. Traditionally considered the “Golden Four” of basic skills requirements as described in EO 1100-Revised and part of the WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC) core competencies, these skills must be learned, practiced, bolstered, and threaded throughout the curriculum. Information literacy, another WSCUC core competency not listed here as a stand-alone requirement, should also be integrated throughout GE and the major. The Essential Skills include:

- Quantitative Reasoning
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking

**Disciplinary Perspectives** include the core concepts, habits of mind, methods of inquiry, and ways of understanding that are specific to each distinct discipline. Considered the “breadth of knowledge” areas, these courses provide students with insight into the traditions of a discipline, while also providing robust opportunities to practice and to develop further the Essential Skills using the traditions of a discipline. Campuses may choose to thematically link or infuse a Cross-cutting Value with a Disciplinary Perspective within a GE pathway or minor. The Disciplinary Perspectives include:

- Arts
- Humanities
- Life Science
- Physical Science
- Social Science

**Cross-cutting Values** are broad, multifaceted dimensions that reflect the mission/priorities of the CSU and the distinctive institutional values of each campus. The term “cross-cutting” reflects the ways in which the issues and concepts inherent within these values overlap with each other, transcend lock-step categorization, and may be addressed from multiple viewpoints and disciplinary perspectives. The broad grouping of Cross-cutting Values is intended to challenge campuses to identify/define the dimensions and develop GE pathways/minors and associated learning outcomes that encompass their institutional values. The Cross-cutting Values include three broad categories:
• Diversity and Social Justice, which may include cultural competency, equity, equality, human rights, and issues of diversity in all of its forms (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, age, ability, etc.).
• Democracy in the U.S., which may include American and California government and history.
• Global Awareness and Civic Engagement, which may include global issues of environmental, social, political, cultural, economic, and ethical importance, as well as the ways in which students may act as advocates, stewards, and activists to effect change and solve problems at the local, state, regional, national or global levels.

**Integrative Experiences.** These are the pedagogical strategies, evidence-based practices, and learner-centered experiences that are embedded within and connect the Essential Skills, Disciplinary Perspectives, and Cross-cutting Values throughout the GE program. These experiences serve as the means of scaffolding learning in GE as students progress from lower- to upper-division coursework and may be centered on a specific problem or theme. These experiences help to contextualize and provide coherence/intentionality to the GE program. These upper-division courses may involve or be a part of learning communities, research experiences, service learning, collaborative learning, problem- or theme-based learning, hands-on learning, study abroad, capstone courses, and/or signature experiences that reflect the identity of each campus.

**GE LEARNING OUTCOMES**

It is not appropriate for the CSU to dictate what the specific learning outcomes should be for each Essential Skill, Disciplinary Perspective, Cross-cutting Value, and Integrative Experience. However, all GE learning outcomes should draw extensively on the Essential Skills, as these are the skills that students use to demonstrate their learning. Learning outcomes (specific indicators of learning) for each dimension should be articulated by campuses and speak to the unique priorities and demographics of the campus. The explicit articulation of GE learning outcomes is needed for programmatic assessment of GE and for the clear communication of the purpose, goals, and expectations of GE to the students and campus community.
## Proposed Structure and Unit Allocation

**CSU GE Breadth Requirements = 42 Semester Units**

### Essential Skills (12 semester units), 3 semester units in each of the following subareas:
- Written Communication
- Oral Communication
- Critical Thinking
- Quantitative Reasoning

### Disciplinary Perspectives (15 semester units), 3 semester units in each of the following subareas:
- Arts
- Humanities
- Life Science
- Physical Science
- Social Science

### Cross-cutting Values (9 semester units), 3 semester units in each of the following subareas:
- Diversity and Social Justice
- Democracy in the U.S.
- Global Awareness and Civic Engagement

### Integrative Experiences (6 semester units), only at the upper-division level

These courses should be anchored to lower-division GE; optimally within a specific pathway, GE minor, or GE certificate program; and cannot be double counted with the major.
GOALS AND RATIONALE FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGES IN GE REQUIREMENTS

**PRIMARY GOALS**

In adherence to its guiding principles, the Task Force operated under the following assumptions and goals regarding the subject area distributions and unit totals outlined above.

1. **Decrease the total number of units** devoted to GE in the undergraduate degree program to 42 semester units. Reducing the total number of units required in GE will align the CSU with several other institutions of higher learning, offer high-unit major programs some “breathing room,” facilitate additional Associate’s Degree for Transfer (ADT) pathways, and encourage persistence, graduation, and closure of equity gaps.

2. **Eliminate the practice of “double counting”** of courses, which complicates students’ ability to navigate GE curricula. In addition to being highly dependent on reliable advising, double- and triple-counting, particularly with courses in the major, cuts against the conceptual logic of general education sought by the Task Force. In other words, when students simply take a class because it fulfills multiple requirements, GE becomes a box-checking exercise rather than an intentional, coherent experience.

3. **Minimize the number of non-major requirements outside of GE** by incorporating them into the GE program. These include requirements such as American Institutions and diversity/cultural competency. Other campus-based graduation requirements such as coursework in languages other than English also can—and should—be accommodated within the GE program. The Task Force believes these worthwhile requirements deserve explicit inclusion in GE curricula. Moreover, because they are completely consistent with the tenets of the conceptual model of general education offered by the Task Force, their inclusion makes the model even more compelling. It has been our abiding goal to bring coherence, logic and intentionality to the set of non-major requirements which constitute a baccalaureate education, so we consider extra graduation requirements to be antithetical to that goal.

4. **Leverage upper-division GE** as the way in which students synthesize their learning and demonstrate mastery of the skills, disciplinary knowledge, and values embedded throughout the program; as the way in which the intentionality, coherence, and objectives of the GE program are realized; and as the way in which a campus may emphasize its signature values. Upper-division GE offers more complex and integrative learning, which is easily made available through the integrated packages of GE pathways, minors, certificates, capstones, and signature coursework. The majority of Task Force members consider integrated upper-division GE courses to be vital to the integrity of the proposed GE program.

**RATIONALE**

The following rationale underpins each of the categories in the conceptual model offered by the Task Force.
The **Essential Skills** serve as the anchor to which all other GE courses are attached. These are the skills that are drawn upon to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes and should therefore be reinforced in every GE course.

Consistent with (a) recommendations made in the Quantitative Reasoning Task Force Report, (b) campus feedback offered to the Chancellor’s Office on possible changes to EO 1100, and (c) a request by the Chancellor’s Office to consider relocating the current Area B4 (Quantitative Reasoning) requirement to an area featuring other foundational requirements (currently Areas A1, A2 and A3), the model situates Quantitative Reasoning with the other Essential Skills of Oral and Written Communication and Critical Thinking, bringing the total number to 12 semester units.

The **Disciplinary Perspectives** of Arts, Humanities, Life Science, Physical Science, and Social Science are highlighted in the proposed structure. These disciplinary contexts offer exploration into unique ways of knowing in each discipline, and preserve the hallmark of breadth in the GE program. Each Disciplinary Perspective is allocated 3 units at the lower-division level, bringing the total number of semester units to 15 for this area in the proposed model, although those considering these recommendations should resolve the issue of assigning laboratory units in Life Science and/or Physical Science.

The **Cross-cutting Values** area of the conceptual model affords the opportunity for campuses to highlight their institutional values and the CSU’s commitment to them. Collectively, these values are made visible through GE and serve as curricular anchor points for other GE areas, thereby lending credence to the overall logic of the GE program. Each Cross-cutting Value is allocated 3 units at the lower-division level, bringing the total number of semester units to 9 in the proposed model.

With regard to the first broad category featured in the model as a Cross-cutting Value, “Diversity and Social Justice,” the Task Force discovered during its work that all 23 campuses in the CSU have some requirement focused on diversity/cultural competency and/or social justice. Some campuses include the requirement in GE, while others identify it as a graduation requirement outside of the GE program. The Task Force was clear and unanimous in its conclusion that coursework featuring cultural
awareness and social justice should be articulated as a core, Cross-cutting Value in the CSU, and included within GE.

Another area made visible by the proposed structure is “Democracy in the U.S.” The Task Force acknowledges the Trustees’ requirement to ensure that all CSU graduates “acquire knowledge and skills that will help them to comprehend the workings of American democracy and of the society in which they live to enable them to contribute to that society as responsible and constructive citizens” (Title 5, section 40404). This requirement is called ‘American Institutions,’ and Title 5 is silent on the number of units to be devoted to this endeavor. Currently, most campuses require 6 semester units in the area, and some campuses include these units within their GE program, while others do not. In addition, campuses variously “double count” such coursework. The Task Force deemed it appropriate that this Cross-cutting Value be integrated into the GE program as a 3-unit core value that contributes to the intentionality and coherence of the GE package rather than a stand-alone, supervenient graduation requirement.

Finally, the Task Force acknowledged the importance of “Global Awareness and Civic Engagement” by situating it as a Cross-cutting Value in the CSU. This area highlights the imperative to expose students to issues occurring in the world around them. As borders between nations become less distinct and ecosystems are increasingly threatened, the CSU must prepare students for our international, multicultural society and encourage them to be stewards of change, working to find solutions to global problems. As a Cross-cutting Value, this area asks students to consider, across a broad range of subjects, how their engagement in local, regional, statewide, national and/or international affairs impacts society and the environment.

The Integrative Experiences area of the proposed model is envisioned to promote the main objectives of providing breadth, depth, intentionality, and campus autonomy to the GE program. It transforms the current requirement of 9 semester of upper-division GE (UDGE) disbursed evenly across breadth Areas B, C, and D into a proposed 6 semester units of UDGE, which are not necessarily tied to a specific discipline but are deeply connected to and built upon GE work in the Essential Skills, Disciplinary Perspectives, and Cross-cutting Values. The Task Force believes that Integrative Experiences courses should be the realization of the intentionality and coherence of the GE program for each campus.

With regard to breadth, the majority of Task Force members consider an UDGE requirement in the CSU compelling as a “best practice” and a signature feature of sound GE pedagogy, but two issues gave us pause. The first is whether 9 semester units is a “magic number” which should be preserved, and the second is the distribution of those units solely in Areas B, C and D. While on the face of it, distribution in those three areas seems to promote breadth, isolation of those three areas, to the exclusion of the other two as possibilities, creates
an artificial and limiting standard. The Task Force reasoned that breadth could be achieved by letting campuses determine disbursement, as long as these units were not situated in a student’s major, and as long as they do not “double count” with other GE or graduation requirements. Breadth is implicated in these two issues because of the student’s exposure to upper-division coursework outside of the major, and because of the dedicated objective that these units serve, which is to foster the synthesis of learning experiences across the broad swath of courses included in a GE pathway or minor.

With regard to depth and intentionality, most members of the Task Force were enthusiastic about the prospect that these units can be strategically deployed as the culmination of a graduated, scaffolded, and coherent set of integrative learning experiences while promoting deeper inquiry beyond a student’s major. Furthermore, the more complex and sophisticated integrative learning that UDGE offers is best made available through the integrated packages of pathways, certificates, GE minors, capstones, and signature courses.

The potential for interdisciplinary pathway minors, certificates, badges, capstones or other means of showcasing the ways in which the students’ General Education experience promotes Integrative Experiences is exciting. Thus, the Task Force recommends providing maximum latitude to campuses within the confines of a system policy which defines the goals of Integrative Experiences but does not prescribe how to achieve them. Such decisions are properly the province of campus faculty, in consideration of institutional goals and autonomy. Therefore, the Task Force intentionally offers no recommendations on issues such as course sequencing, course content, student learning outcomes, and other operational strategies or approaches. Instead, the model simply features the means to pursue such pedagogical opportunities, using evidence-based practices and learner-centered approaches.

The Task Force wishes to emphasize the importance of Integrative Experiences in programmatic assessment of GE. Just as is required of programs in each major, the GE program itself must be assessed holistically. Moreover, the assessment of GE programs must provide evidence of the development of learning in all the elements of the GE program. It is difficult to provide that evidence without a robust and full upper-division element, which is why a majority of the Task Force members recommends 6 semester units at the upper-division level. Mastery of the more complex, synthesizing content in two upper-division Integrative Experiences courses can be assessed by way of signature assignments designed to exhibit that mastery.

The Task Force also notes that reciprocity of upper-division GE must be preserved. In other words, matriculated students who complete upper-division GE units at one CSU campus and then transfer to another cannot be required to repeat upper-division GE units at their receiving campus. However, because of the purpose, importance, and uniqueness of UDGE Integrative Experiences courses in a student’s GE program, the Task Force discourages the practice of allowing additional UDGE units to satisfy lower-division GE requirements.
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

In sum, the unit totals and subject area distributions discussed above afford the opportunity for students to see why they are doing what they are doing as they proceed through their GE program. Student perceptions of the purpose and value of their GE courses hopefully will shift from a checklist of disparate categories of courses needed for the diploma to a meaningful learning journey that empowers them to become independent thinkers and educated citizens of the global community, able to transform their learning into meaningful action. Not only does the proposed model offer an overall logic to GE requirements, but it also offers milestones, which will help students mark their progress. For instance, a student member of the Task Force expressed that it was motivational to be able to say, “I’ve learned my Essential Skills, now I’m ready to use these skills in my Disciplinary Perspectives and other GE courses.” This sense of logic and coherence to the GE program is a driving force behind the recommendations of the Task Force.

As another consideration, it should be noted that the unit total and distribution recommendations described herein do not change GE certification for transfer students. In other words, a transfer student would be “GE certified” with 36 units in Essential Skills, Cross-cutting Values, and Disciplinary Perspectives coursework just as occurs now, and when they transfer to a CSU campus, they still would need to complete 6 additional semester units in upper-division GE. The unit distributions and unit totals are consistent with IGETC, with Title 5, and with SB 1440 (the Star Act).

A third consideration relates to what might be colloquially called “carve outs” in the proposed model to capture graduation requirements such as American Institutions, diversity/equity/race/ethnicity (e.g., Ethnic Studies courses), second English composition, and languages other than English requirements. Since these requirements are entirely consistent with the aims of general education, and since articulating them within the conceptual model embeds them even more intentionally in the student’s experience, the Task Force encourages that specific attention be paid to the ways in which such courses are integrated into the GE program.

With regard to Integrative Experiences, a fourth consideration is whether upper division courses should be included at all in the CSU general education program. While the majority of Task Force members strongly supported them as vital to the integrity of the GE program because they synthesize and make transparent what it seeks to accomplish, the minority view should be acknowledged: the Task Force could not identify another higher education institution with this requirement; it adds units to the general education program; it was established at a time when we had fewer transfer students; and finally, upper-division GE has been in place for decades, and yet these courses do not appear to have accomplished what the conceptual model asks of them, i.e., the intentional scaffolding of learning from introduction to development to mastery. On balance, the majority deems upper-division GE critical to
assessing the development of learning in the GE program, and to demonstrating the seriousness with which the CSU views GE learning, as well as the importance it has in a student’s undergraduate career.

A fifth consideration regarding the proposed model is that it neither requires nor prevents a course or series of courses dedicated to a First-Year Experience. As with many facets of its recommendations, the Task Force considered such an approach to be in the purview of a specific campus and its faculty. However, the Task Force noted that such courses may be included in the GE program via lower-division GE requirements, such as in the Essential Skills, Disciplinary Perspectives, or Cross-cutting Values areas. The majority of Task Force members support a First-Year Experience program as a high-impact practice that holds particular value and meaning for student populations in the CSU.

Finally, the Task Force discussed on several occasions that the present funding model might encourage departments to offer GE courses in an effort to generate FTES and the resulting resources that extend from student enrollment. In addition to noting that campuses should be “held harmless” during a transition period while any changes in the GE program take place, the Task Force briefly discussed the prospect that the CSU might fund GE courses at the university level, which would be particularly beneficial for courses in the Integrative Experiences area. Removing financial incentives based on student enrollment numbers might result in a greater focus on the best pedagogical strategies and curriculum design to maximize student learning rather than on how to maximize student enrollment in a particular course.

POTENTIAL CATEGORIES OF GE PATHWAYS

The Task Force recognizes the CSU campuses that have already made great strides in providing students a coherent and intentional GE program under the existing Executive Orders (e.g., Chico State’s Pathways in General Education). The Task Force has been inspired by these efforts as well as other GE reforms across the nation (e.g., Virginia Tech’s Pathways to General Education). The following illustrates how the proposed CSU GE model may be packaged into three broad categories of pathway options for students. A shared theme, problem, or issue, relevant to a Cross-cutting Value, links GE courses within these pathways.

I. GE Minor Pathway

- Best option for students beginning their programs as first-time freshmen.
- Includes a minimum of 18 semester units (6 courses):
  - one Essential Skills course (3 units), e.g., in the Critical Thinking category
  - one Disciplinary Perspectives course (3 units), e.g., social and economic sustainability, art and social justice
  - two Cross-cutting Values courses (6 units), and
  - two Interdisciplinary Experiences courses (6 units), one of which serves as a capstone experience.
- Facilitates the creation of freshman learning communities or First-Year Experience programs organized around a problem/issue highlighted by a Cross-cutting Value.
- Examples provided below illustrate the subareas from which courses may be selected to fulfill the 18-unit (6 course) GE minor; students would still complete courses in all other GE areas to meet the 42-unit requirement.

**Example 1. GE Minor in Sustainability for a STEM major**

**Example 2. GE Minor in Social Justice for a social science major**

---

### II. GE Certificate or Special Programs Pathway

- Best option for transfer students or students opting into a pathway after completing most to all of their lower-division GE coursework, particularly in the Essential Skills and Disciplinary Perspectives areas.
- Includes a minimum of 9 semester units from at least one Cross-cutting Values course (3 units) and two Integrative Experiences courses (6 units), with one Integrative course serving as a capstone.
- Facilitates learning communities/cohorts, including student equity support organizations established for transfer students of color (e.g., CSU East Bay’s Sankofa Scholars, GANAS, and TAPASS).

### III. Traditional GE Program—the traditional distribution model

- Students select from all available GE courses that fulfill each GE area.
NEXT STEPS

THIS IS JUST THE BEGINNING

This report is the culmination of nearly two years of dedicated work by the General Education Task Force. The document seeks to provide a solid starting point for discussion and reflection and is offered up for wide dissemination, discussion, and ultimately, shared governance-based recommendations to further enhance all CSU students’ baccalaureate education. It is vital that students learn within a robust, dynamic general education environment in programs centered on coherent, intentional student learning. The liberal education provided by GE is a liberating education.

Curriculum planning, development and revision are led by the faculty; therefore, the ASCSU is the appropriate body to lead the next phase of GE reform, consonant with the principles and practices of shared governance. Wide, full consultation and consideration of this report is now needed, so the ASCSU is strongly urged to champion and lead the next phase of this important process. Initially, Task Force members anticipated they could help marshal those efforts and, after casting a wide consultative net, make changes to these recommendations prior to encouraging their implementation. However, in the wake of the most recent revisions to Executive Order 1100, the work of the Task Force intentionally slowed, in order to take stock of how those revisions affected both campus programs and systemwide conversations. In the wake of this report, important conversations will be many, varied, and appropriately situated in shared governance contexts both on campuses and systemwide.

The Task Force suggests that among groups the ASCSU consult with are the following: standing committees of the ASCSU; the Chancellor’s General Education Advisory Committee (GEAC); campus senates; campus GE committee chairs and/or directors of GE programs; other interest groups relevant to GE; the Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges and the University of California; and the California State Students Association.

Task Force members have appreciated the opportunity to consider the ways in which the California State University system can craft a GE program that best serves the needs of students on each campus. Naturally, members of the Task Force are willing to answer any clarifying questions that come to the ASCSU as the work continues, and wish the ASCSU well as the process moves forward.

Respectfully submitted,

Members of the General Education Task Force
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 and 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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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.
Academic Intervention Program – Proposal

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 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

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.