April 4, 2001

ACADEMIC STANDARD COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF APRIL 3, 2001 MEETING

Attendance: Richard Benfield (Geography), Ross Baiera (Arts and Sciences), Brian Sommers - Chair (Geography), Louise Williams (History), Ray DeCormier (Marketing), Sharon Braverman (School of Business), David Smith (Mathematics), Jane Higgans (Student Affairs), Mary Pat Hager (Education), Laura Haverwas (Special Education), John Mitrano (Sociology), Zdzislaw B. Kremens (School of Technology), Mary Cutler, (Finance);

The meeting was held in Marcus White Living Room on April 3, 2001 at 3:30pm and was chaired by Brian Sommers.

1. Minutes from Feb 6, 2001 were approved.

2. Announcements: Elections need to be conducted in various schools before the next meeting. New officers will be elected at the next monthly meeting.

3. Discussion ensued concerning the Policy on Good Standing. Afterwards, Chairperson Sommers assigned a committee consisting of Ross Barera, Carol Jones and Brian Sommers to rewrite the Policy on Good Standing taking into consideration both policy and process. It is expected that further discussion will occur next time and this rewrite may be forwarded to the Faculty Senate for further discussion.

4. Next meeting in Marcus White Lounge at 3:30 on May 1, 2001

5. Meet was adjourned at 4:40pm

Respectfully Submitted

Ray A. DeCormier
Secretary pro tempore
Goals for the Revision of the Good Standing Policy

1) To raise the academic expectations among students and faculty
2) To identify 'at risk' students earlier in their academic careers
3) To develop a stronger system of academic support for all students

Proposed New Policy

All students are expected to maintain a cumulative GPA of 2.0 or higher to be in Good Standing.

All students who fall below a 2.0 will receive notification from the Registrar’s Office.

Those students who fall below a 2.0 but within the Academic Warning range appropriate to their accumulated credit hours will be REQUIRED to meet with a faculty representative of their dean’s office to determine an appropriate course of action. Students failing to meet this requirement or who fail to pursue the recommended strategies over the course of the next regular semester may be subject to a probation hearing or academic dismissal.

Students who fall below the Academic Warning range appropriate to their accumulated credit hours will receive notice of pending dismissal. These students may petition for academic probation by contacting the office of their academic dean. Students who fail to apply for probation or who are denied probation will be dismissed. Following dismissal, a student must normally wait at least one semester before being considered for reinstatement.

Students with fewer than 19 credits hours will not receiving a pending dismissal notice, regardless of their grade point average. However, these students will be notified of Academic Warning and will follow the procedures for students in this category as described above.

From 70 credit hours onward failure to maintain a GPA of 2.00 or above will result in a dismissal notice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Credit Hours</th>
<th>Probation/Dismissal Hearing</th>
<th>Notice of Academic Warning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-18 credits</td>
<td>below 1.60 GPA</td>
<td>Below 2.00 GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-36 credits</td>
<td>below 1.80 GPA</td>
<td>1.60 to 1.99 GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37-53 credits</td>
<td>below 1.90 GPA</td>
<td>1.80 to 1.99 GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54-69 credits</td>
<td>below 2.00 GPA</td>
<td>1.90 to 1.99 GPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+ credits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>