Minutes for the February 28, 2006 Meeting

Meeting called to order: 2:35

Members Present:

M. Warshauer, Chair, (History), S. Tomczyk (Accounting) R. Roth (A&S Dean), J. Mulrooney (Biomolecular Science), S. Braverman (Business), , M. Hager (Education), C. Doyle (English), K. Czynik (Finance), M. Mahoney (History), C. Waveris (Math), S. Petrosino (Registrar),A. Paviz (SEPS Dean), P. Osei (Biology)

Guests: K. Oliva (Acad Ctr-Student Athletes), M. Mitchell (management)

1. Minutes of the last meeting, November 29, 2005 (Mulrooney/Czynik)(approved)

2. Motion to discuss proposal from School of Business outlining changes to the admission requirements for majors in the school of business (Mulrooney/Hager). Proposal was discussed as presented. Amendments were made (see attached) (approved).

3. Motion to discuss proposal from Daniel Miller (management) – Dealing with “No Show” students- A resolution submitted to the Faculty Assembly of the School of Business. (Tomczyk/Roth). Proposal was discussed. Logistics appear to be a major issue in resolving this problem. No resolution on the proposal. Motion to have M. Warshauer respond by email (attached) to D. Miller
concerning the issues with resolving this proposal (Waveris/Petrosino) (approved)

Motion for adjournment (Mulrooney)

Meeting Adjourned 3:42

Respectfully Submitted

James Mulrooney

Secretary, Academic Standards Committee.

NEXT MEETING:  March 28th 2:30 in the Blue and White Room, Student Center
School of Business Proposal (Item 2 above)

Date: 2/23/06

To: Academic Standards Committee

From: Chris Galligan, acting Dean, School of Business

RE: School of Business GPA Proposal

Overview

The faculty of the School of Business, on November 30, 2005, approved to increase the GPA requirement for the School of Business from the present 2.0 to 2.5. The rationale for this decision is to improve both the overall quality in the classroom and the educational experience of two of the School's primary stakeholders; faculty and students.

The School of Business would appreciate both the guidance and the support of the Academic Standards Committee.

Proposal

Admission to the School of Business and the Business Major (2005-2007 Undergraduate Catalog, Page 71)

Business Major Status will only be granted to students who have:

1. achieved junior or senior standing,
2. completed the Pre-Major requirements (AC 211, 212; ECON 200, 201; ENG 110; MATH 123 or 125; STAT 200, 201) with a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.5,
3. attained a grade of C- or better in each of the Pre-Major Requirements courses, and
4. earned a minimum cumulative grade point average of 2.5 in all coursework. Students accepted into Business Program status must maintain a
minimum 2.5 cumulative grade point average in business coursework and in the university grade point average. A student whose grade point average falls below the required minimum 2.5 cumulative grade point average will be subject to dismissal from the School of Business.

**Business Degree Minimum Grade and Cumulative Grade Point Average Requirements (2005-2007 Undergraduate Catalog, Page 72)**

Students must complete:

1. the Common Business Core (AC 211, 212; FIN 295; LAW 250; MC 207; MGT 295, 480; MIS 201; MKT 295) with a minimum cumulative grade point average of **2.5** (students must also receive a grade of C- or better in each of the common business core courses);
2. the Business Major requirements (30 credits) with a minimum cumulative grade point average of **2.5** (students must also receive a grade of C- or better in each business major course taken); and
3. the entire business degree program requirements (122 credits) with a minimum cumulative grade point average of **2.5** in all coursework at CCSU.

**Transfer Students**

Transfer students must meet the same course requirements, application procedures, and cumulative grade point averages as CCSU students. Transfer credit for pre-major requirements courses, common business core courses, and chosen major courses will not be granted by the School of Business unless such courses were completed with grades of C- or better.

---

**EMAIL FROM M. Warshauer to D. Miller (Item 3 above)**

Dan,

The Academic Standards Committee had a long discussion yesterday about your proposal for a policy concerning no show students. Whereas we agreed that there existed a problem, we were unable to determine a
feasible solution to it. And trust me, we batted it around for quite some time. Rick Roth, the associate dean of Arts & Sciences, also noted that this was discussed at a recent chairs meeting. They ran into the same issue we did: logistics. The problem is in actually implementing a policy that would solve the problem without raising half a dozen additional problems. For example, how should faculty go about notifying the registrar and what will be the mechanism for handling the issue. A seemingly easy issue, it is not. IT would have to create web links and we are told that they are already understaffed and would have difficulty doing it. More problematic is the issue of actually opening up the seats for prospective students after other students were dismissed from a course. If the dismissals occur at the end of the first week, there really isn’t enough time for other students to utilize add drop. One could argue that we just extend add drop, but this raises other issues and the registrar already believes that add drop is too long and thus causes course shopping. There is also the problem of courses that meet just once a week. Should a student be dropped for missing only one course? We also have to consider the effect on students who are carrying the minimum 12 hours in a semester. If they are summarily dropped from a course they may lose financial aid and it could effect their medical insurance. There is also the question of eligibility for student athletes. Whereas one might argue this is a matter of responsibility for the student – and we did discuss this point in some detail – many faculty members were uncomfortable with the problems that a dismissal policy might create. All of this combined caused us to drop the matter. We simply could not agree on the best way to move forward. Rick Roth did suggest that departments could look at their enrollment data and determine the number of students who normally drop a course and subsequently allow about that number to over-enroll in the course and hope that all things even out. This, of course, could raise different problems for some departments.

Sorry we couldn’t make this work, but do understand that many of the faculty on the committee commiserated with your concerns.

Matt Warshauer

RESPONSE from D. Miller:

Thanks for all your work. I talked to both Rick Roth and Paul Altieri and we recognize all the logistical problems with implementation.

As a business, "semi-free-market" kind of guy, there is a simple solution
that requires an enormous SYSTEMATIC change. When I was an undergrad (many years ago), my university charged tuition on a per-credit basis. Many universities do this now. (The initial implementation of this would be revenue neutral.) I realize that there would be tremendous resistance to this change. Second, we make the refund policy for tuition much more strict: 100% during the first week, 50% the second week and nothing after that.

For students on financial aid (who are not price sensitive) this will have little short-term effect, until they realize the long-term consequences of paying for classes they did not take. It will change the behavior of others.

Everything else would remain the same.

I realize that a system-wide change of this magnitude is beyond the scope of your committee. (This is an issue that the Trustees would have to consider.)

Thanks again for your thorough examination of the problem.

Dan Miller