

# HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY

## University Senate

**Tuesday, March 29, 2016, 3:00-5:00 pm, Goodwin Forum (NHE 102)**

1. Announcement of Proxies
2. Approval of and Adoption of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes from the Meeting of March 8, 2016
4. Reports, Announcements, and Communications of the Chair  
(Written Report)
5. Reports of Standing Committees, Statewide Senators, and Ex-officio Members  
(Written Reports)
6. Consent Calendar from the Integrated Curriculum Committee – no items at this time  
(ICC Instructions for Accessing Nolij)
7. TIME CERTAIN: 3:15-3:30 PM - Open Forum for the Campus Community  
(Open Forum Procedures)
8. Approval of the 2016/17 Senate Meeting Calendar
9. Resolution on University Degree Planning Policy (18-15/16-APC – March 29, 2016)  
Second Reading  
Resolution and Draft Policy with changes tracked  
Resolution and Draft Policy w/changes accepted  
Existing Milestone Policy
10. Resolution on Course Evaluations by Students (CEBs) Evaluation Period (22-15/16-FAC – March 29, 2016)  
First Reading
11. Resolution on Protocol for Conducting In-class Electronic Course Evaluations (23-15/16-FAC – March 29, 2016)  
First Reading

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**Senate Chair's Report**  
**Senate Meeting, March 29, 2016**

---

Dean Oberlander and I hosted a series of three World Café events (3/7, 3/8 and 3/11) to discuss the establishment of a Faculty Development Center on campus. We gathered much helpful feedback on our professional development needs. We will be posting a website shortly to present this information and to solicit input from an even broader audience across campus.

My next CSU Senate Chairs meeting will happen April 7th at San Francisco State. On the agenda are Executive Order 1064 (September 9, 2011, re: student internships), structural deficits and budgeting issues, Senate Chair membership on CSU Presidents' Cabinets, and "student demand for mini syllabi."

### **Appointments and Elections Committee:**

The 2<sup>nd</sup> spring call to faculty, seeking nominations for unfilled appointed/elected committee positions, has now closed. Elections took place from Monday 3/21 and closed Friday 3/25. Nominees will be notified the following week with results [available online](#) shortly after.

---

### **Constitution and Bylaws Committee:**

- I. Report from Fri Mar 11, 2016 – No meeting was called to order
  
- II. Report from Fri Mar 25, 2016
  - A. Meeting called to order at 9:00 in NHE 116 with Abell (Chair), Kyte, Locher and Shellhase. Abell served as proxy for Guzman.
  - B. CBC was asked by SenEx to consider a proposed modification to Appendix J Article VII.B.4.b. The article states: “These materials shall be retained by the IUPC and not forwarded to higher committees or administrators unless specifically requested.”
    1. “Materials” refers to supporting documents which are provided by the candidate for their Working Personnel Action File (WPAF). SenEx asked if this article could be deleted entirely since the WPAF is now kept online and thus there are no longer any hardcopy documents that the Initiating Unit Personnel Committee (IUPC) can “retain” after their initial review of the file.
    2. With the current procedure for handling WPAFs in Moodle, once the IUPC has completed its review, the Supporting Materials section is “hidden” so that higher committees and administrators can’t view them without a specific request for access. The CBC agreed unanimously that the current system under Moodle is consistent with the spirit of Article VII.B.4.b. There would be no need to delete this article simply because we are now using an online system.
    3. In Fall 2016, campus will migrate to Interfolio to manage WPAFs online. Interfolio will not have the capability of hiding specific sections of the WPAF. So supporting materials will be viewable by anyone who has access to the file. This system would seem to be inconsistent with article VII.B.4.b. However, higher committees and administrators never needed “permission” to view the supporting materials in the first place. The need for a “specific request” is a holdover from hardcopy WPAF days, when it was desirable to minimize the transfer of a large supplemental

binder which could contain a very large volume of supporting documents. In light of this, the CBC agreed unanimously that Article VII.B.4.b is not necessary in a system where WPAFs are managed online.

4. As such, CBC will draft an amendment to App J which deletes Article VII.B.4.b. This will be brought to Senate for consideration at its Apr 12 meeting. CBC notes, in accordance with Appendix J Article IX: Amendments, that the General Faculty must be notified of a proposed amendment to App J at least seven days prior to its discussion. Therefore, CBC plans to complete a draft by Fri Apr 1 in time for distribution via email to general faculty no later than Tues Apr 5.
- C. In our review of Appendix J Article IX: Amendments, the CBC noted that voting on any amendment to App J is currently restricted to General Faculty “in residence” (excluding non-tenure track faculty). Based on the revised definition of voting membership which passed the GF this semester, we want to delete the “in residence” clause from any subsection of Article IX. We’d like to incorporate those changes into the same resolution as item B. above. An issue this brings up is whether FERP faculty or administrators with retreat rights should be able to vote on App J changes. Input from Senate is welcome on this issue.
- D. CBC discussed language to amend Senate Constitution and Bylaws re: changing notification of Senate agenda from two days to three days. We will forward first reading resolutions for Senate consideration at the Apr 12 meeting. Resolutions will address:
  1. Senate Constitution amendment which will modify Section 6.11 to change notification of agenda to three days, move the three day deadline for materials notification from the Bylaws into the Constitution, and move section 2.91 from the Bylaws into the Constitution. We felt it was prudent to move items related to notification out of the Bylaws and into Constitution so that the various Senate electorates have some input on notification deadlines.
  2. Senate Bylaws amendment which will delete Sections 2.8 and 2.91. These sections are no longer necessary as they will be re-located into the Constitution.
- E. Meeting adjourned at 9:45.

### III. Fri Apr 1, 2016 – Agenda Items

- A. Draft first reading resolution re: App J changes referenced above
- B. Draft first reading resolution re: Senate Constitution changes referenced above
- C. Draft first reading resolution re: Senate Bylaws changes referenced above.

---

### **Integrated Curriculum Committee:**

The ICC continues working on:

- Curriculum Proposals

- Revisions to the PREP process and WASC Core Competency Assessment.

Lisa Castelino and the Academic Master Planning Subcommittee of the ICC have collaborated to revise the PREP annual Diversity/Enrollment/Student Success Questions and Process. The revised questions (and the preamble to the questions) are provided below. Note that:

1) We have committed to using these questions for at least three years so trends can be usefully tracked – and so programs will know what to expect from the PREP process.

2) Each question will have an accompanying Dashboard – a collection of charts and graphs showing the data to be discussed.

3) One of the goals is to develop a departmental process that will encourage all faculty to consider, discuss, analyze, and act on the data. Thus the questions are somewhat open-ended and will partially serve as documentation of the faculty discussion and any resulting action plans.

### **Annual PREP Diversity/Enrollment/Student Success Questions**

Preamble:

**Version A:** One guiding principle for Program Review is that it should not focus on completing a report to satisfy a campus obligation; rather, it should be part of ongoing program faculty discussion about fostering student success. PREP reports done in isolation by a busy chair or by a small subgroup of faculty can feel pointless. More importantly, they fail to capture the insights and discussions that occur during the entire academic year, whenever program faculty gather.

This template represents a different approach – one that captures those insights and discussions, making the process meaningful enough that we can commit to following it for the next four years.

Faculty talk frequently about how their students are doing, often informally or as sidebar conversations in meetings focused on other topics. These sessions can be very valuable, but they can also be difficult to translate into reflective review or plans for the future. Instead, consider convening your colleagues in a series of single-topic departmental meetings, or perhaps a retreat, for extended conversations about both the encouraging and the disappointing trends in student performance, and for exploration of promising solutions. To inform this activity, data will be easy to access via the Tableau dashboards that were introduced in Fall 2015. You can, of course, also consider additional kinds of data for your program. The open-ended questions we have provided below are intended to structure the programmatic conversations, but they are not meant to be their culmination.

The new process won't end with your submission of a report to the PREP website, although that part remains necessary as it contributes to the self-study report for periodic program review

and serves as a record of ongoing reflection. Instead, these focused Department level conversations that take place in September and October will lead to robust college-wide and ultimately campus-wide discussions among faculty, chairs, deans, provost and other stakeholders to describe and share what was learned.

**Questions:** (Each Question will be linked to specific data.)

1. Describe enrollment trends in your program, major(s), FTES, and retention/graduation rates. Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.
2. Describe trends in the composition of your majors (such as diversity, level of college preparedness, time to degree etc.). Please highlight any significant findings or unique outliers. Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.
3. Describe trends in overall course success rates for service courses as well as major courses. Please highlight any notable findings or opportunities for improvement you see in the coming year. If trends have been stable over time, to what do you attribute that stability? Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.
4. Describe how your program has influenced student success rates. What efforts have you made to improve or what opportunities are available to improve it? If trends have been stable over time, to what do you attribute that stability? Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.
5. Describe trends in inclusive student success for your program. What efforts have you made to improve or what opportunities are available to improve it? If trends have been stable over time, to what do you attribute that stability? Summarize the range of faculty opinions covered in the discussion of this data and/or describe the action plan that is a result of the discussion.
6. Summarize the actions that your program has taken in the past three to five years in response to Enrollment/Diversity/Student Success data. Based on the data, evaluate whether the changes have been effective.

For the 5-year program Review: What were your enrollment/diversity/student success goals from your previous Program Review MOU? Provide an update on those goals. Are they still

relevant? If so, what have you done? What progress has been made? What will the program continue to do? If the goals are no longer relevant, why has the situation changed? What would be appropriate alternative goals?

Humboldt State University  
University Senate  
Meeting Calendar for AY 2016/2017

**2016 Fall Semester**

<b>Executive Committee (3-5 pm, NHE 106)</b>	<b>University Senate (3-5pm, NHE 102)</b>
August 30, 2016	September 6, 2016
September 13, 2016	September 20, 2016
September 27, 2016	October 4, 2016
October 11, 2016	October 18, 2016
October 25, 2016	November 1, 2016
November 8, 2016	November 15, 2016
<i>Fall Break, November 21-25</i>	
November 29, 2016	December 6, 2016
December 13, 2016 <i>(if needed)</i>	
<i>Finals, December 12-16</i>	

**2017 Spring Semester**

<b>Executive Committee (3-5 pm, NHE 106)</b>	<b>University Senate (3-5pm, NHE 102)</b>
January 17, 2017	January 24, 2017
January 31, 2017	February 7, 2017
February 14, 2017	February 21, 2017
February 28, 2017	March 7, 2017
<i>Spring Break, March 13-17</i>	
March 21, 2017	March 28, 2017
April 4, 2017	April 11, 2017
April 18, 2017	April 25, 2017
May 2, 2017 <i>(if needed)</i>	May 9, 2017 <i>(if needed)</i>
<i>Finals, May 8-12</i>	



HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY  
University Senate

Resolution on ~~Adoption of Campus~~University Degree Planning ~~Software~~Policy

18-15/16-APC—March 29th, 2016—Second Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the Humboldt State University Senate recommends to the Provost that the ~~Campus-University~~ Degree Planning ~~Software~~ Policy and associated recommendations be accepted as submitted; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Senate recommends to the Provost the creation of a new Degree Planning Oversight Group that will be responsible for coordinating and overseeing the development and implementation of the degree planning software, tracking the implementation of policy recommendations across campus, and developing consequences for not meeting milestones; and be it further to replace the Degree Planning Software Working Group, and coordinate and oversee the development and implementation of the software; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Degree Planning Oversight Group operate under the direction of the Provost, inform the University Senate periodically of implementation progress, and provide recommendation for policy through the APC for approval by the University Senate; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate extend its gratitude and thanks to the Degree Planning Software Working Group for its work.

**RATIONALE:** *The Degree Planning Software Working Group has completed its work and provided a series of policies and recommendations necessary to implement the use of degree planning software at HSU. Use of degree planning software in conjunction with major academic plans is a best practice for increasing student success. By providing students with a defined pathway to graduation, it reduces the time required for routine advising, allowing advisors to use their time effectively. In addition to helping students see their pathway to graduation, it will help administrative units identify and plan for course demand. Effective implementation of degree planning software will require coordinated effort on the part of many individuals and units. The implementation, policy and process document represents a practical and achievable blueprint for bringing degree planning software onto our campus to provide an effective planning tool for advisors and students in order to better ensure their success. The use of degree planning software will also allow for the implementation of prioritizing student registration appointment dates in accordance with their progress to degree, rather than by the current total*

number of units earned. It is the recommendation of the Working group that this be implemented as it will motivate and reward students who are pursuing the fastest path to graduation, thus helping to increase graduation rates and lower time to graduation. Furthermore, it is recommended that existing milestones (Golden 4 -GE Area A and Area B: Mathematical Concepts by 60 units) have consequences for non-compliance and that two new milestones be developed by each program, also with consequences for non-compliance. It was felt that consequences were necessary for the milestones to be meaningful in encouraging student behaviors (such as learning to write) that would increase their chances of success in the degree. Data indicate that the Golden 4 milestone has not been observed, with approximately 600 juniors and seniors, who matriculated as freshmen to HSU, missing at least one of the Golden 4 courses from their transcripts. The additional milestones could be specific courses, or one of a list of courses, along with a specific grade and time to complete. The idea of a milestone is that we set standards for expected academic progress that students will encounter at an early point in their degree. The standards indicate where the students need to be in terms of academic performance to be successful in their major. If students are unable to meet these standards at that time, they will be required to work with an advisor to make a plan. This might mean developing better study habits, getting a tutor, spending more time on homework, or it might mean switching to another major. Coming to this challenge point early on will result in a greater chance of success, or at the very least, spare them from further years in a major that they do not have the momentum to complete. Recommendations for the consequences for not meeting milestones will be developed by the Degree Planning Oversight Committee with wide consultation. They will then be sent to the Academic Policy Committee for further development and guidance through the University Senate policy approval process. It is recommended that the consequences be consistent across the campus for clarity for students, many of whom move between programs, and to make administration of the process realistically enforceable. Milestones will be set by each program after the consequences have been determined. With this sequence, programs will be able to decide on the appropriate difficulty of the milestone with full knowledge of the consequences of non-compliance.

# University ~~Policy on Use of~~ Degree Planning ~~Software~~ Policy

Degree planning software facilitates a timely path to graduation by providing roadmaps or Major Academic Plans (MAPs) for every program of study. These roadmaps link curricula, course offerings, program requirements, pre-requisites, and course sequencing into semester-by-semester plans. It also provides aggregate data to assist departments with appropriate course planning. The Degree Planning Software Working Group developed a series of policies and recommendations to effectively implement the degree planning software. The recommendations build on existing policies, structures, and expectations whenever possible to streamline practices and minimize the need to create more policies to implement the software (i.e. enforce current policies rather than create new ones).

In the following document, ~~we list~~ six policies are listed, followed by ~~and~~ recommendations of the Degree Planning Software Working Group to guide their implementation.

## Policy 1. Registration priority will be based upon % of degree requirements completed rather than number of units accrued.

Registration priority will be set using completed units in GE and Major classes that directly lead to meeting graduation requirements first and equally, followed by elective classes that help with getting to 120 units but are not part of either GE or Major requirements.

Formatted: Normal

### Recommendations:

- We recommend that % of degree requirements completed be calculated by weighting degree completion components. The implementation and development of an equitable and workable process will be the responsibility of the Oversight Group.
- Testing various models for point assignments against hypothetical students in a set of our majors is recommended prior to implementation to assure that the calculation performs as intended and does not create unfair conditions.
- This will include GEAR requirements. Units completed that do not go towards GEAR or major requirements, i.e. free electives will only be counted for registration priority if the major they have selected has free electives and they help the student reach 120 units.
- If a student switches to a major with fewer free electives, or none, these courses may no longer contribute towards completing a degree, thus this change of major may result in a reduced registration priority.
- Recommendations for specific cases:
  - o Double Major
    - o Calculate scores using the %'s of major that gives a student the highest priority (but not using both majors).
  - o Undeclared Majors
    - o Will calculate utilizing the "undeclared" major degree code in the u.achieve/DARS system
  - o Units that count in multiple areas

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

- o Units that count in multiple categories (e.g. GE and Major) will be added to the calculation of % in each area.

## Policy 2. Policy recommendation on Expected Academic progress:

Each academic program will develop two milestones in addition to the current milestone of completing basic subjects by 60 units. The Degree Planning Oversight Group will ~~establish and implement~~ develop recommendations for consequences for non-compliance with the milestones with wide consultation. ~~The recommendations will be further developed by the Academic Policies Committee and brought before the University Senate for approval as new policy. by the Spring 2018 registration period.~~ The current policy: Academic Progress Milestones for Undergraduate Programs will be revised to reflect these changes.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Calibri, Not Italic, Font color: Black

### Recommendations:

- ~~It is recommended that the specific consequences for missing milestones be developed by Spring 2017, and the individual program milestones by developed by Fall 2017, so that both will be in place for the Spring 2018 registration period. This sequence is suggested so that programs can develop milestones that are appropriate to the consequences.~~
- It is recommended that departments consult with Institutional Research when picking milestone courses. Certain courses and course grades may have greater predictive value for future success in a given major and thus would make better milestone courses.
- ~~The specific consequences for students not meeting the milestones will be developed by the Degree Planning Oversight Group with wide consultation.~~
- Consequences for non-compliance with milestones will be standard across the university, while the milestones themselves be designated by departments.
- Programs will provide support and a clear set of steps for students not meeting milestones. Other student support services should also be involved with this transition.
- Milestone timelines will be set according to units attempted rather than semesters, so as to not disadvantage part-time students.

Formatted: Normal

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.25"

## Policy 3. Use of degree planning software by students will be mandatory

### Recommendations:

- A registration hold will be lifted when the plans are completed and reviewed by the appropriate advisor. This would be an appropriate time for advisors to discuss progress to degree and relevant milestones. The students will still have full freedom to register for the courses they desire to take, that fit in their schedule, or that still have spaces when their registration time comes up. The plan will need to be updated each semester to reflect adjustments. (Some provision/distinction will need to be made so that freshmen are using the system for their first year but probably not be required to fill out a four year plan until they meet with their advisor in either their first or second semester.)

- Mandatory use of degree planning software should begin in spring of 2018. This will allow departments the time to develop maps in spring and fall 2016 with a soft roll out of the product beginning in spring 2017 and to develop and provide degree planning software training to advisors and students. We envision this roll out to be an open invitation to all students to use the planning tools as maps are finalized with mandatory use of the system in spring 2018.
- Ensure that the structure of mandatory use and any consequences for lack of compliance be based upon student actions and not be a result of structural or policy oversights. The overarching philosophy of degree planning software should be that it is a planning and advising tool that helps our students achieve their goal of graduation in as short a time as is possible.

#### Notes:

As the maps and software implementation are being developed, the following policy/procedure issues will need to be addressed and finalized:

- Faculty/Student training for using the tool.
- Map update procedures and approvals.
- Map development deadlines and enforcement.
- Phase in for requiring four year map completion including undeclared majors and freshmen/transfers.
- Types and number of holds (Administrative/Advising, one set for semester and plan updates or separate holds?).
- Consider issues specific to impacted programs.

#### **Policy 4. Graduation workflows and Major Academic Plans will be standardized in format across all programs**

##### Recommendations:

- Major Academic Plans will be written by each program accounting for co- and pre-requisites, students taking two semesters of English Composition instead of one, and/or needing additional math courses to prepare for the GE math requirement, and students transferring to HSU.
- All departments will use a common template for presenting MAPs to students.
- The standard template would replace all existing versions of roadmaps and be made available in a centralized, easily accessible site.
- Undeclared MAPs will also be developed utilizing standard templates.
- Each program will develop both a visual flowchart MAP and a curriculum listing.
- MAPs should show accurate and realistic paths that include 5th year courses if necessary.
- Utilize Spring/Fall of 2016 to develop and finalize maps.
- Develop appropriate web sites and links to facilitate the distribution and access to Maps.

- Office of Academic Affairs will develop ongoing maintenance plan including roles and responsibilities for updates to flowcharts and Course lists.
- Associate Deans will work with departments to review and manage development of the templates.

### Policy 5. Advisors, Department Chairs and the Registrar will use degree planning software to enter and approve course substitutions.

#### Recommendations:

- Degree planning software will show the substituted courses, and the names and dates of approved substitutions. The procedure will be an electronic version of our current process, facilitated by degree planning software.
- We recommend the following workflow for course substitutions using degree planning software:
  - [Advisor](#) enters substitution in degree planning software, routes to **Department Chair** who approves and routes to **Registrar** for official entry in DARS (u.achieve).
  - [Substitutions made during a semester will appear in DARS prior to enrollment the following semester.](#)
  - [An audit trail will be implemented on the degree plan so that students and advisors can see the status of the substitution approval process.](#)

#### Note:

This is essentially the policy we have now but uses electronic means rather than paper for entry. It is in the best interest of students and advisors to have substitutions officially entered in DARS as soon as possible. An electronic process consisting of using degree planning software alone may not in and of itself be efficient enough to facilitate faster processing and so the substitution process must be reviewed in order to promote a faster turnaround in the Registrar's Office without unduly burdening Registrar personnel.

### Policy 6. These recommendations, when implemented and taken as a whole, will replace the current major contract system.

#### Recommendations:

- ~~The current Degree Planning Oversight Group Software Working group or a successor (possibly the newly reconstituted Enrollment Management Group)~~ should be assigned the task of developing, vetting and implementing degree planning software and the required policy and process components as outlined in this document.
- [The Degree Planning Oversight Group should have wide representation from faculty staff and administrators from the different colleges, and solicit student input, whether that be membership on the Group, presentations to the Associated Students or inclusion of students in beta-testing of degree planning software.](#)

- The committee ~~would~~ should report to the Provost, inform the Senate of progress and consult with the Academic Policies Committee regarding any changes to policy that might require Senate approval.

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**University Senate**

**Resolution on University Degree Planning Policy**

18-15/16-APC—March 29th, 2016—Second Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the Humboldt State University Senate recommends to the Provost that the University Degree Planning Policy and associated recommendations be accepted as submitted; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the Senate recommends to the Provost the creation of a new Degree Planning Oversight Group that will be responsible for coordinating and overseeing the development and implementation of the degree planning software, tracking the implementation of policy recommendations across campus, and developing consequences for not meeting milestones; and be it further,

**RESOLVED:** That the Degree Planning Oversight Group operate under the direction of the Provost, inform the University Senate periodically of implementation progress, and provide recommendation for policy through the APC for approval by the University Senate; and be it further

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate extend its gratitude and thanks to the Degree Planning Software Working Group for its work.

**RATIONALE:** *The Degree Planning Software Working Group has completed its work and provided a series of policies and recommendations necessary to implement the use of degree planning software at HSU. Use of degree planning software in conjunction with major academic plans is a best practice for increasing student success. By providing students with a defined pathway to graduation, it reduces the time required for routine advising, allowing advisors to use their time effectively. In addition to helping students see their pathway to graduation, it will help administrative units identify and plan for course demand. Effective implementation of degree planning software will require coordinated effort on the part of many individuals and units. The implementation, policy and process document represents a practical and achievable blueprint for bringing degree planning software onto our campus to provide an effective planning tool for advisors and students in order to better ensure their success. The use of degree planning software will also allow for the implementation of prioritizing student registration appointment dates in accordance with their progress to degree, rather than by the current total number of units earned. It is the recommendation of the Working group that this be implemented as it will motivate and reward students who are pursuing the fastest path to*



graduation, thus helping to increase graduation rates and lower time to graduation. Furthermore, it is recommended that existing milestones (Golden 4 -GE Area A and Area B: Mathematical Concepts by 60 units) have consequences for non-compliance and that two new milestones be developed by each program, also with consequences for non-compliance. It was felt that consequences were necessary for the milestones to be meaningful in encouraging student behaviors (such as learning to write) that would increase their chances of success in the degree. Data indicate that the Golden 4 milestone has not been observed, with approximately 600 juniors and seniors, who matriculated as freshmen to HSU, missing at least one of the Golden 4 courses from their transcripts. The additional milestones could be specific courses, or one of a list of courses, along with a specific grade and time to complete. The idea of a milestone is that we set standards for expected academic progress that students will encounter at an early point in their degree. The standards indicate where the students need to be in terms of academic performance to be successful in their major. If students are unable to meet these standards at that time, they will be required to work with an advisor to make a plan. This might mean developing better study habits, getting a tutor, spending more time on homework, or it might mean switching to another major. Coming to this challenge point early on will result in a greater chance of success, or at the very least, spare them from further years in a major that they do not have the momentum to complete. Recommendations for the consequences for not meeting milestones will be developed by the Degree Planning Oversight Committee with wide consultation. They will then be sent to the Academic Policy Committee for further development and guidance through the University Senate policy approval process. It is recommended that the consequences be consistent across the campus for clarity for students, many of whom move between programs, and to make administration of the process realistically enforceable. Milestones will be set by each program after the consequences have been determined. With this sequence, programs will be able to decide on the appropriate difficulty of the milestone with full knowledge of the consequences of non-compliance.

# University Degree Planning Policy

Degree planning software facilitates a timely path to graduation by providing roadmaps or Major Academic Plans (MAPs) for every program of study. These roadmaps link curricula, course offerings, program requirements, pre-requisites, and course sequencing into semester-by-semester plans. It also provides aggregate data to assist departments with appropriate course planning. The Degree Planning Software Working Group developed a series of policies and recommendations to effectively implement the degree planning software. The recommendations build on existing policies, structures, and expectations whenever possible to streamline practices and minimize the need to create more policies to implement the software (i.e. enforce current policies rather than create new ones).

In the following document, six policies are listed, followed by recommendations of the Degree Planning Software Working Group to guide their implementation.

## **Policy 1. Registration priority will be based upon % of degree requirements completed rather than number of units accrued.**

Registration priority will be set using completed units in GE and Major classes that directly lead to meeting graduation requirements first and equally, followed by elective classes that help with getting to 120 units but are not part of either GE or Major requirements.

### **Recommendations:**

- We recommend that % of degree requirements completed be calculated by weighting degree completion components. The implementation and development of an equitable and workable process will be the responsibility of the Oversight Group.
- Testing various models for point assignments against hypothetical students in a set of our majors is recommended prior to implementation to assure that the calculation performs as intended and does not create unfair conditions.
- This will include GEAR requirements. Units completed that do not go towards GEAR or major requirements, i.e. free electives will only be counted for registration priority if the major they have selected has free electives and they help the student reach 120 units.
- If a student switches to a major with fewer free electives, or none, these courses may no longer contribute towards completing a degree, thus this change of major may result in a reduced registration priority.
- Recommendations for specific cases:
  - Double Major
    - Calculate scores using the major that gives a student the highest priority (but not using both majors).
  - Undeclared Majors
    - Will calculate utilizing the “undeclared” major degree code in the u.achieve/DARS system
  - Units that count in multiple areas
    - Units that count in multiple categories (e.g. GE and Major) will be added to the calculation of % in each area.

## **Policy 2. Policy recommendation on Expected Academic progress:**

Each academic program will develop two milestones in addition to the current milestone of completing basic subjects by 60 units. The Degree Planning Oversight Group will develop recommendations for consequences for non-compliance with the milestones with wide consultation. The recommendations will be further developed by the Academic Policies Committee and brought before the University Senate for approval as new policy. The current policy: Academic Progress Milestones for Undergraduate Programs will be revised to reflect these changes.

### **Recommendations:**

- It is recommended that the specific consequences for missing milestones be developed by Spring 2017, and the individual program milestones be developed by Fall 2017, so that both will be in place for the Spring 2018 registration period. This sequence is suggested so that programs can develop milestones that are appropriate to the consequences.
- It is recommended that departments consult with Institutional Research when picking milestone courses. Certain courses and course grades may have greater predictive value for future success in a given major and thus would make better milestone courses. Consequences for non-compliance with milestones will be standard across the university, while the milestones themselves be designated by departments.
- Programs will provide support and a clear set of steps for students not meeting milestones. Other student support services should also be involved with this transition. Milestone timelines will be set according to units attempted rather than semesters, so as to not disadvantage part-time students.

## **Policy 3. Use of degree planning software by students will be mandatory**

### **Recommendations:**

- A registration hold will be lifted when the plans are completed and reviewed by the appropriate advisor. This would be an appropriate time for advisors to discuss progress to degree and relevant milestones. The students will still have full freedom to register for the courses they desire to take, that fit in their schedule, or that still have spaces when their registration time comes up. The plan will need to be updated each semester to reflect adjustments. (Some provision/distinction will need to be made so that freshmen are using the system for their first year but probably not be required to fill out a four year plan until they meet with their advisor in either their first or second semester.)
- Mandatory use of degree planning software should begin in spring of 2018. This will allow departments the time to develop maps in spring and fall 2016 with a soft roll out of the product beginning in spring 2017 and to develop and provide degree planning software training to advisors and students. We envision this roll out to be an open invitation to all students to use the planning tools as maps are finalized with mandatory use of the system in spring 2018.
- Ensure that the structure of mandatory use and any consequences for lack of compliance be based upon student actions and not be a result of structural or policy

oversights. The overarching philosophy of degree planning software should be that it is a planning and advising tool that helps our students achieve their goal of graduation in as short a time as is possible.

#### Notes:

As the maps and software implementation are being developed, the following policy/procedure issues will need to be addressed and finalized:

- o Faculty/Student training for using the tool.
- o Map update procedures and approvals.
- o Map development deadlines and enforcement.
- o Phase in for requiring four year map completion including undeclared majors and freshmen/transfers.
- o Types and number of holds (Administrative/Advising, one set for semester and plan updates or separate holds?).
- o Consider issues specific to impacted programs.

#### **Policy 4. Graduation workflows and Major Academic Plans will be standardized in format across all programs**

##### Recommendations:

- Major Academic Plans will be written by each program accounting for co- and pre-requisites, students taking two semesters of English Composition instead of one, and/or needing additional math courses to prepare for the GE math requirement, and students transferring to HSU.
- All departments will use a common template for presenting MAPs to students.
- The standard template would replace all existing versions of roadmaps and be made available in a centralized, easily accessible site.
- Undeclared MAPs will also be developed utilizing standard templates.
- Each program will develop both a visual flowchart MAP and a curriculum listing.
- MAPs should show accurate and realistic paths that include 5th year courses if necessary.
- Utilize Spring/Fall of 2016 to develop and finalize maps.
- Develop appropriate web sites and links to facilitate the distribution and access to Maps.
- Office of Academic Affairs will develop ongoing maintenance plan including roles and responsibilities for updates to flowcharts and Course lists.
- Associate Deans will work with departments to review and manage development of the templates.

## Policy 5. Advisors, Department Chairs and the Registrar will use degree planning software to enter and approve course substitutions.

### Recommendations:

- Degree planning software will show the substituted courses, and the names and dates of approved substitutions. The procedure will be an electronic version of our current process, facilitated by degree planning software.
- We recommend the following workflow for course substitutions using degree planning software:
  - **Advisor** enters substitution in degree planning software, routes to **Department Chair** who approves and routes to **Registrar** for official entry in DARS (u.achieve).
  - Substitutions made during a semester will appear in DARS prior to enrollment the following semester.
  - An audit trail will be implemented on the degree plan so that students and advisors can see the status of the substitution approval process.

### Note:

This is essentially the policy we have now but uses electronic means rather than paper for entry. It is in the best interest of students and advisors to have substitutions officially entered in DARS as soon as possible. An electronic process consisting of using degree planning software alone may not in and of itself be efficient enough to facilitate faster processing and so the substitution process must be reviewed in order to promote a faster turnaround in the Registrar's Office without unduly burdening Registrar personnel.

## Policy 6. These recommendations, when implemented and taken as a whole, will replace the current major contract system.

### Recommendations:

- The Degree Planning Oversight Group should be assigned the task of developing, vetting and implementing degree planning software and the required policy and process components as outlined in this document.
- The Degree Planning Oversight Group should have wide representation from faculty staff and administrators from the different colleges, and solicit student input, whether that be membership on the Group, presentations to the Associated Students or inclusion of students in beta-testing of degree planning software.
- The committee should report to the Provost, inform the Senate of progress and consult with the Academic Policies Committee regarding any changes to policy that might require Senate approval.

## Humboldt State University

**Academic Progress Milestones for Undergraduate Programs**

The purpose of this policy is to allow departments to establish milestones for identifying at risk students who are not making sufficient progress in their undergraduate academic programs for the purposes of intervention. Students so identified will be required to meet with academic advisors to develop a plan that will lead to successful completion of the existing program. If it is determined that successful completion of the current academic program is not achievable, then the student will be dismissed from that program and guided to a more appropriate program.

**I. ESTABLISHING MILESTONES**

Milestones must contain the following:

- A. Clear indicators of whether a student is making academic progress. The milestones must be consistent with minimum graduation requirements and university policy. Academic progress milestones may include but are **not limited to** the following types of criteria:
  - 1. Passing grades in specified required courses;
  - 2. Semester GPAs above 2.0 (or higher for pre-majors if the impacted major has a heightened GPA criteria);
  - 3. GPA in the major and upper division GPA in the major above 2.0;
  - 4. Numbers of repeats or withdrawals.
  - 5. Completion of specific courses.
  - 6. Timelines that identify how and by when the milestones must be met (end of one academic year, one calendar year, by 30 units, by 60 units, by 90 units, etc.). Such timelines will include adjustments as necessary for students requiring developmental work and transfer students.
- B. A detailed description of the intervention that will follow a missed milestone. The intervention must include:
  - 1. Mandatory academic advising to provide the student with guidance to meet the missed milestone the following semester.
  - 2. Clearly articulated timelines for dismissal from the academic program (e.g., when students have missed a milestone for two successive semesters), and
    - a. A description of the process by which students dismissed from the academic program will be notified, advised, and guided into new academic programs.
    - b. The process by which resulting changes to student academic program objectives will be communicated to the Registrar's Office in a timely manner.

**II. APPROVAL PROCESS**

Academic progress milestones that potentially dismiss students from the major must first be approved through the regular curricular approval process (Integrated Curriculum Committee), then be placed on the Senate's consent calendar, and then be submitted to the Provost's Office. All milestones must be approved by the Provost's Office

before they are implemented to assure that they adhere to university and state educational policies. Milestones must be published in the university catalog and included in all advising materials. Departments or colleges may revise milestones, subject to approval by the Provost's Office. The impact of a department's milestones will be reviewed as part of the Program Review, Evaluation and Planning (PREP) process.

### **III. APPEAL OF DISMISSAL FROM THE ACADEMIC PROGRAM**

Students who are dismissed from an academic program have the right to appeal that dismissal to the office of the Dean of the College, and if not satisfied they may file an appeal with the Provost or designee.

### **IV. DECLARATION OF AN ACADEMIC PROGRAM**

Continuing students may be denied a request to declare an academic program if the student's academic record already demonstrates a lack of success based on that program's approved milestones. These students should be referred to the Advising Center.

### **V. UNIVERSITY-WIDE ACADEMIC PROGRESS RULES**

Students who have missed an academic progress milestone or who have GPAs below 2.5 may not add additional degree objectives, minors, or certificates unless approved by the advisor for their current primary academic program. Students who have missed a milestone or have GPAs below 2.5 may change primary academic programs to facilitate timely progress toward their degree.

Academic Policies Committee: April 2012

University Senate: Passed, 05/01./12 (Resolution #39-11/12-APC)

President Richmond: Approved 05/03/12

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**University Senate**

**Resolution on Course Evaluations by Students (CEBs) Evaluation Period**

22-15/16-FAC—March 29, 2016—First Reading

**RESOLVED:** The University Senate designates the last two weeks of instruction plus the weekend following (ending at 11:59pm on the Sunday before the Monday of exam week) as the period that on-line course evaluations by students (CEBs) shall be open. This policy applies to semester-long courses during the regular academic semester. For courses that meet for shorter periods than a semester or courses conducted during the summer session, the course evaluation period shall be determined by the appropriate Dean or Associate Vice President.

**RATIONALE:** Senate Resolution 13-13/14 regarding the on-line administration of teaching evaluations states that the “administration of the on-line teaching evaluations is the responsibility of the dean of each college”. The resolution states that “the administration of online teaching evaluations should begin no sooner than the first day of week 14; research suggests that exam week solicitations of evaluations contributes to lower scores”. The current close date for the CEBs survey is 11:59pm on Friday of the last week of instruction. In Fall semester, 2015, in order to increase response rates on course evaluations, college office staff opened CEBs Monday, 11/16/15, a full week before Thanksgiving break. The concern of many faculty is that date is far too early for students to be able to evaluate the structure, materials and pedagogy of a semester-long course. College staff responsible for administering CEBs asked Faculty Affairs Committee for guidance regarding standard open/close dates.

Results from a google search of standard on-line course evaluation periods (completed March 15, 2016), show that colleges and universities vary widely regarding the period in which on-line course evaluations remain open (See Appendix A). The last two weeks of instruction are typically very busy for students; to accommodate students who are not able to complete evaluations or forget to fill out evaluations before the last day of classes, we recommend that the course evaluations remain open through the weekend before exam week begins.

Appendix A: Selected examples of on-line course evaluation periods

Note that data for most CSU’s were not available because 1) most CSU’s have not migrated to fully on-line evaluations (for example, CSU-Chico and CSU-Long Beach remain fully paper-based) and 2) some campuses, like CSU-Stanislaus, publish the on-line evaluation period information each semester and the current semester information was not yet posted.

Boston College

Open two weeks before the end of the final examination period and close the day after the last final exam



CSU-Sacramento

Open Last three weeks of the semester

CSU-San Marcos

Open last two weeks of instruction (excluding exam week)

San Diego State

Open no later than one week prior to the last day of instruction and run through the last day of the semester (when grades are due)

San Francisco State

Open last two weeks of instruction + plus two days (closes at 11:59pm the night before the first day of exams)

Georgia State University

Open last two weeks before classes end until 5 days after grades become available

SMU (Southern Methodist University)

Open during a three-week window (last week of classes, exam week, week after exams),

St. Louis University

Open 11 days before final exams begin through final exam week

MIT

Open for a two week period ending at 9:00am on the first day of exam week

UCLA

Open last two weeks of instruction (excluding exam week)

University of South Florida

Open 7 days ending 11:59pm on the last day of instruction.

**HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY**  
**University Senate**

**Resolution on Protocol for Conducting In-class Electronic Course Evaluations**

23-15/16--FAC March 29, 2016—First Reading

**RESOLVED:** That the University Senate recommends the following protocol for instructors (Unit 3 employees) to administer in-class electronic course evaluations.

1. Instructors should notify students least one class period in advance that evaluations will be performed in-class on a specified date. As part of the notification, instructors should ask students to bring some kind of portable electronic device (smartphone, laptop, tablet) to class on the designated day (HSU Library may have laptops for check-out).
2. To ensure maximum participation, instructors should arrange for the evaluation to be completed at the beginning of class and should allow ten to fifteen minutes for the evaluation. The instructor should indicate the course name, instructor name and course CRN (for example by writing them on the board) so that students are clear about the correct course evaluation link to access in their HSU email.
3. in accordance with Appendix J, section VII.A.2.a (1), instructors must leave the room while the evaluation is being conducted. Instructors may enlist a proctor (departmental staff, if available, or designated student) to potentially improve participation and quality of responses.
4. The proctor should notify the instructor when course evaluations have been completed so that the instructor may re-enter the classroom to resume instruction.
5. The instructor should remind students who were not able to complete the evaluation in class on the designated evaluation day that they may complete the evaluation outside of class until the course evaluations period close date.

**RATIONALE:** Faculty have expressed concern that the response rates on their course evaluations have dropped precipitously since the permanent adoption of on-line evaluation processes, which could be affecting the reliability of course evaluation data used in personnel review processes. Prior to the adoption of on-line only evaluations, response rates for all classes averaged between 70% and 80%. A preliminary Institutional Research and Planning analysis of Fall 2015 response rates indicates that the electronic-only response rate average for all classes is approximately 47% ,and rates among the same course number but different sections of a class can vary widely (for example, BIOL 105 rates range 25 to 58%). The most immediate way for many faculty to increase their course evaluation response rate is to designate class time for students to complete course evaluations.