

IUPUI Faculty Council Committee Annual Report 2016-2017

Committee Name: Academic Affairs

Chair: Mark W. McK. Bannatyne, Ph.D., prof. dr hab.

Members: Daniels Lee, Peggy (Business), Fu, Yao (PETM), Huffman, Max (Law), Magee, Paula (Education), Shieh, Carol (Nursing), Gavrin, Andrew (Science), Srinivasan, Mythily (Dentistry), Thedwall, Kate (Liberal Arts), Zimmers, Teresa (Medicine), Myers, Mary Beth (Registrar) (Ex-Officio), Malik, David (University College) (Administrative Liaison), Watt, Jeff X. (Science) (Executive Committee Liaison)

Action Items:

Action Item(s)	Status
<p>The committee was asked by the IFC Executive Committee to address how the policies shown below should be distributed Discussion was then directed toward the topic of the requirement to include specified campus policies in all course syllabi. The required policies related to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Disability Accommodations 2. Academic Integrity 3. Religious Holidays 4. Sexual Misconduct 5. Education and Title VI 	<p>The Committee responded to the IFC Executive Committee that while these policies were deemed as being extremely important, they should not be required as additions to course syllabi. Course syllabi were seen by the members of the Committee as already having too much required information that dealt with university policy and the syllabus of each course should concentrate more on course requirements and standards. The Committee recommended that the policies should be added automatically to each course Canvas site possibly by a hyperlink that would point the user directly to the posted policies.</p>
<p>The IFC Executive Committee asked that the Committee review the work being done on the “Academic Standing Policy: Probation, Dismissal, Reinstatement (PDR)”. Several meetings were dedicated to this discussion. Dr. Bannatyne sent a memo to Dr. Malik of the Student Affairs Committee which was working on the policy with suggestions offered by the AAC to make the wording more readable.</p>	<p>The recommendations of the AAC were presented to the IUPUI Faculty Council as a First and Second Reading at the IFC Meeting.</p>
<p>The Undergraduate Admissions Committee, overseen by the University College under the direction of Norman “Doug” Less, requested that a member of the AAC be appointed to act as a liaison between our two committees.</p>	<p>Kate Thedwall had volunteered to act as our committee’s liaison to the campus</p>

<p>The IFC Executive Committee requested that the members of the AAC review the issue of amendments proposed to the “Faculty Sponsorship of Student Admission as a Beginning Freshman”. (The amendments had previously to this meeting been forwarded to all committee members for their review in answer to an appeal by the Faculty Council Executive Committee that this committee consider the amendments suggested as soon as possible.) Two comments were received prior to this meeting by the Chair from those who could not attend the April 2017 meeting and read aloud before discussion was heard from those present.</p>	<p>Presented the AAC recommendations as First Reading at the May 2017 IFC Meeting. The Second Reading prior to any vote will be offered at the first IFC Meeting during the Fall 2017 semester.</p>
---	---

Action Items to be carried over to 2017-2018:

Action Item(s)	Status
<p>The issue of how the work of this committee has at times over the last several years been overtaken by university degrees and policies which are implemented without discussion by this committee was raised.</p>	<p>This was an issue should be discussed at future meetings.</p>
<p>The AAC heard extended discussion on the topic of how credits may be transferred from campuses within both the IU and Purdue systems, how credits outside of these systems are received by IUPUI, and how many credits must be taken at IUPUI before an undergraduate diploma may be granted at the IUPUI campus. It was determined that a survey as for responses to these questions should be sent to each school on the IUPUI campus. Further, Dr. Bannatyne discussed these questions with the Registrars of both parent campuses and reported back to the AAC in both written and verbal forms so all Committee members could obtain a clearer picture of how such issues are being handled across programs.</p>	<p>After hearing discussion at several meetings on these questions, it was the opinion of the entire committee that these issues required further in-depth discussion and investigation before any possible discussion of forming a policy could be reached. This matter was therefore, tabled for further consideration during the 2017-2018 academic year.</p>

Suggested new action items for 2017-2018:

Action Item(s)	Status
None at present.	

Please attach any completed documents, minutes, or recommendations made by your committee during this report year. One copy of this report and supporting documents will be sent to the IUPUI University Archives.

(Please see attachments of all AAC minutes as requested.)

Report due: June 30, 2017

Submit to: July 9, 2019 to Karen Lee
Office of the Faculty Council
klee2@iupui.edu

Academic Affairs Committee Minutes

September 8, 2016

1:00 – 2:30 p.m., UL 2115J

Members Present: Mark Bannatyne, Andrew Garvin, Max Huffman, David Malik, Paula Magee, Jeff X. Watt (Note: Mary Beth Myers had made arrangements to connect via Skype with Bannatyne to attend, but due to problems with the internet in UL 2115J this was not possible.)

1. Bannatyne called the meeting to order at 1:10 p.m. all members present introduce themselves briefly.
2. Bannatyne reviewed with all the committee's formal charge:

"This committee shall make recommendations to the Council on matters relating to general, not school specific, educational curriculum matters, establishing and revising academic calendars, degree formats, graduation requirements, the academic structure of IUPUI, and other related matters." (Bylaw III.B.1).
3. Discussion was then heard on trying to resolve the issue of establishing a meeting schedule for the Fall 2016 semester. Bannatyne had met with Mary Beth Myers and Carol Shieh prior to the meeting and discussed the scheduling issue with them. (Bannatyne will attempt to meet in-person before the next meeting with other members of the committee who were not able to be present on Sept. 8th to get to know them and resolve the issue of finding a time most agreeable to all members.

Prior to the Sept. 8th meeting a "Doodle" survey of open times was circulated to all members of the committee by Bannatyne. The best days at that time to meet appeared to be:

- a. Thursday 1:00 – 2:30 p.m.
- b. Thursday 3:00 – 4:30 p.m.
- c. Tuesday 2:00 – 3:30 p.m.

No morning hours were included in this survey and another offering more options will be sent before the next scheduled meeting to try and identify a better meeting schedule. Bannatyne will also survey meeting times for all members using Outlook and comparing days and times against their calendar events posted.

4. Bannatyne informed all present that the main request given to this committee by the Faculty Council Executive Committee (FCEC) for the present academic year was to review ideas on the use of transcribed credits being counted for award of both major and minor programs.

Bannatyne noted that the FCEC is not asking for a definitive policy to be written, but rather that the committee review what (if any) practices exist in regards to the distribution and acceptance of credits in regards to being counted for multiple degrees or certificates and offered their opinion on whether or not a standard policy be generated and applied across the campus.

In regards to this topic the following discussion was heard:

- a. This matter should initially concentrate at the BS level for the moment and be related primarily to areas of study and not to major programs. Discussion was then heard that areas such as General Education Core subjects should be reviewed, but not necessarily courses taken within a prescribed major. For example, classes offered within the major of both Education and Math allow “double dipping” (the application of credits earned) to satisfy both a major and minor within their programs.

Watt mentioned specifically that math majors can receive additional certificates or minors by taking courses within both math or computer science where these courses are used to not only substitute for required courses in the major plan of study, but also can count toward a certificate or minor. Magee and Bannatyne both mentioned that such practices happened within their programs also.

Some discussion was then heard on how the new practice of “Banded Tuition” might play into any application of credit distribution and it was the opinion of those present that we should look further into this area as this topic is discussed further at subsequent meetings.

Discussion was then heard on how applying credits might affect students seeking a double major. Watt gave a very detailed account of how this might Math and Physics majors as the courses required in both programs parallel each other so closely in several of their tracks. The programs in Physics are so dependent on math courses that it is an easy matter for those students who wish to do so to receive a degree in both areas by a careful selection of courses in either area that will satisfy both degrees. As this discussion went forward, Watt specifically noted that it should be understood that this practice applied to those pursuing dual majors and that it should be understood that within both Math and Physics students cannot use dual credit to receive a major and minor in the same program track.

This topic will be looked into further in subsequent meetings.

- b. Discussion was then directed toward the topic of the requirement to include specified campus policies in all course syllabi. The required policies related to:
 1. Disability Accommodations
 2. Academic Integrity
 3. Religious Holidays
 4. Sexual Misconduct
 5. Education and Title VI

(See: <https://iu.app.box.com/s/t22rlgiaat8ok3xykwjs3d49csmnyy8z>)

Views were heard as to the best way to ensure 100% compliance with such require statements on policies which included having all statements inserted into course pages on Canvas. Opinions were heard as to the desire by many to keep syllabi centered on the outline and needs of each course and the inclusion of such statements would be a duplication of these policies which are found in other student resources. It was also noted that there was a “Campus Policies” link in Oncourse where such statements could easily be accessed and perhaps a similar link could be embedded in Canvas. Further discussion will be heard on this topic at subsequent meetings.

5. Old Business: No old business was brought forward for further discussion or action.

6. New Business

a. Bannatyne raised the topic that this committee may wish during this academic year to look at the issue of how degrees are awarded on diverse campuses, and even internationally*, by programs within the IU and Purdue systems and how they might affect programs on the IUPUI campus. This idea created discussion which included:

- 40% of students in the IU system are from outside Indiana (approximately 50% in the Purdue system) and bring credits from a wide diversity of other academic institution as transfer courses.
- There are also courses which are still quite specific to both IU and Purdue which students at IUPUI take to satisfy their degrees regardless of which school will grant their diploma.
- IU maintains a policy of transfer students having to take at least 32 credit hours at the campus which will grant their degree. Purdue allows for credits to be taken at any campus within its system, and the diploma to be granted at whichever campus the students chooses to complete their degree.
- How does offering similar courses on different campuses fit into the transfer policies of each university?

(*At present IU has not structure in place to grant off shore degrees for all programs and the issue of students receiving credit for taking online courses from foreign countries which could count toward graduation may become a more important issue in the future.)

b. Watt raised the issue of how the work of this committee has at times over the last several years been overtaken by university degrees and policies which are implemented without discussion by this committee. This was an issue that all present agree should be discussed at future meetings.

c. Bannatyne said he would look into having a Canvas site established for the use of this committee so that members can communicate with one another more easily and provide a venue for posting message and documents.

d. Bannatyne mentioned that he will include his full contact information in the minutes of this meeting so all members will be able to contact him. As Bannatyne has several international commitments this semester, he specifically noted that his "Skype Landline" number is a local Indianapolis telephone number which will call his computer anywhere in the world for no cost.

Mark W. McK. Bannatyne, Ph.D., prof. dr. hab.

Dept. of Computer Information & Graphics Technology (CIGT)

Purdue School of Engineering and Technology, IUPUI campus

799 W. Michigan Street, ET 309C

Indianapolis, IN 46202-5160

Tel.: +317.278.8196 (W) +317.438.5611 (H) +317.345-5958 (C)

SKYPE: Video calls SKYPE to SKYPE: tula1231

SKYPE Landline: +317.353.3231 (Calls from any telephone to SKYPE worldwide toll free)

Fax: +317.274.0565 (Attn. Dr. Bannatyne)

Adjournment

Academic Affairs Committee Minutes

October 13, 2016

3:00 – 4:30 p.m., UL 1126

Members Present: Mark Bannatyne, Andrew Garvin, Max Huffman, Paula Magee, Jeff X. Watt, Carol Shieh, Mythily Srinivasan

Matt Rust, Director, Campus Career and Advising Services, joined the meeting to clarify issues and answer questions associated with the “Probation, Dismissal and Reinstatement (PDR)” policies of the campus.

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair (Bannatyne) at 3:05 p.m. who also welcomed all present.
2. The minutes of the Sept. 8, 2016 meeting were approved without any additions or corrections.
3. Agenda items discussed:
 - a. Further discussion in regards to the inclusion of required statements and policies in all course syllabi was again heard. Opinions included:
 - That a defined icon or action button should be included on every Canvas course page which would immediately take students to a page(s) where university policies could be found. Discussion was also heard on what possible problems this might cause in Canvas (if any).
 - Policies which may be singular to certain courses should be included in the course syllabus when deemed appropriate by the instructor or department.
 - Support should be given to adjunct instructors to stay up-to-date in university, course, department, and school policies with emphasis on ensuring they know how to direct students in their sections to such policies.
 - That it should be remembered that all students are bound by university policies and that there is a need to ensure they are made aware of them in an effective manner.

Action: The committee approved the motion that university policies would best be addressed on all Canvas course sites by the inclusion of an icon or link which would take the student to a page(s) where they could read such policies for themselves. Therefore, this recommendation will be forwarded back to the Faculty Council for review and consideration.
 - b. The Chair (Bannatyne) informed the Committee that had visited briefly with the Registrar of the West Lafayette campus (Jerry Ross) at the Purdue Summit which was

held recently at IPFW. They have agreed to meet on Monday, Nov. 7, 2016 on the West Lafayette campus to discuss in detail how Purdue University approaches transcribed credits being counted for both major and minor programs. The Chair will report back to the Committee on his findings at the Dec. 1, 2016 meeting.

The Chair will also be contacting the Registrar at the IU Bloomington campus to secure further information as to Indiana University's policies in regards to this matter.

- c. Discussion concerning the memo from the Undergraduate Affairs Committee regarding "Academic Standing Policy: Probation, Dismissal, Reinstatement (PDR)" was heard. As this memo did not come directly from the Faculty Council, The Chair discussed the inclusion of this item on the agenda with Karen Lee, Director of Academic Affairs and Strategic Initiatives, who asked that it be included so this committee's recommendation could be returned to the Undergraduate Affairs Committee.

The following opinions were offered:

1. The Chair informed the Committee that this memo was received for its review and recommendation at this time, and not as an action or voting item. Discussion heard was top center on any improvements or concerns we could forward back to the Student Affairs Committee for their information.
2. It was the opinion of those present that some consideration should be given to the professional schools/programs in regards to raise the minimum GPA. This could be due to accreditation requirements which supersede present university standards.
3. While it was particularly noted in the memo that students who have been placed on probation receive an official letter through the US postal service that it might also be appropriate to recommend that they also receive an e-mail from the university informing them of this action. As so many students move and do not update their demographics information with the campus, it would ne likely that a letter may not be received by the students due to a change of residence. (It was noted that e-mail sent by the campus is stipulated as an official form of university communication and students are bound by the contents of all such messages.)
4. Considerable discussion was heard on the Section 2, sub. I, 1 and 2 as shown below, with the recommendation that this portion of the policy be reviewed further for clarity and additional explanation:

ACADEMIC STANDING POLICY: PROBATION, DISMISSAL, REINSTATEMENT (PDR)

2. If you take the action above, then the policy will more closely align with the academic records being maintained in the Student Information System (SIS). Therefore, the following procedures could be adopted by the Registrar's Office as a temporary solution while the campus moves to better enact the

academic standing policy. In the long term, schools would be encouraged to take ownership of the process listed below, perhaps with trouble-shooting support provided by the Registrar's Office.

- a. Implement procedures to facilitate school-by-school compliance with the existing campus-wide PDR policy (which was originally approved by IFC in 2005 and reported to ICHE in 2013, and which we hope will be updated to address the issues noted above):
<http://www.iupui.edu/~fcouncil/documents/probation-dismissal-reinstatement.htm>
- i. Registrar's office runs report of students who meet the definitions for Good Standing, Probation, and Dismissal at end of each term
 1. Phase 1 would be to enforce the probation piece alone (this could occur as soon as December 2016 assuming IFC clarifies the PDR policy).
 2. Phase 2 would be to enforce the probation AND Dismissal components (this could occur as soon as May 2017, assuming IFC clarifies the PDR policy)
5. Further discussion by this committee strongly supported consideration being given to including the IU GPA and IU Grades (hours earned) in any decision made to place students on probation, or being dismissed.
6. The Chair will draft a memo and circulate it to the members of this committee for their review before sending it to the Chair of the Undergraduate Affairs Committee (David Malik).
3. Old Business: None brought forward
4. New Business
 - a. The next meeting of this committee will be held on Thursday, December 1, 2016. The Chair will arrange for the room and send out an official notification to all Committee members.

Adjournment

Academic Affairs Committee Minutes

December 1, 2016

3:00 – 4:30 p.m., UL 2115J

Members Present: Mark Bannatyne, Peggy Daniel Lee, Max Huffman, Watt, Carol Shieh, Mythily Srinivasan

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair (Bannatyne) at 3:05 p.m. who welcomed all present.
2. The minutes of the Oct. 13, 2016 meeting were approved without any additions or corrections.
3. Agenda items discussed:
 - a. Bannatyne informed those present that he had sent the memo to Dr. Malik of the Student Affairs committee which contained our suggestions on the work that committee was doing in regards to reviewing the “Academic Standing Policy: Probation, Dismissal and Reinstatement (PDR)”. As Bannatyne had not heard back from the committee regarding this committee’s suggestions, Lee (who is also a member of that committee) volunteered to report back to us on any response the Undergraduate Affairs Committee may have for us.
 - b. Bannatyne distributed to those present a one page chart of the responses he recorded while visiting with the Registrar’s of both the IU Bloomington and Purdue West Lafayette campuses regarding credit transfer and residency requirements for graduation. (This chart will also be included in these minutes for distribution to committee members who were unable to attend the meeting.)

Considerable discussion was heard from all present in regards to the chart’s notes. It was noted that several practices used by both campuses paralleled each other, but that some differences existed:

- While Purdue WL has a minimum residency requirement for graduation of 32 credit hours which is campus wide, IUB allows each school to set its own residency requirements which are reviewed and approved by the Campus Curriculum Committee (CCC). No set number of require credits is offered at IUB as a guideline as each program may establish its own requirement level due to accreditation, professional needs, etc. Once a school has established its requirements they are then submitted for consideration to the CCC and adoption.

Further discussion was then heard on the topic of what constituted “residency” as so many courses, and even degrees, are now or offered online at IUPUI. Opinions were heard as to different applications which had been used by diverse schools and programs at IUPUI and how new technology might affect residency in the future. All those present felt that with the move by this campus to attract more students who will live in

university sponsored housing, and the increase in numbers of students desiring to take classes online, this matter requires further investigation so that a clear understanding of the effects of technology and course scheduling may become part of the discussion at future meetings.

The following suggestions were heard:

- That this committee might poll the schools on the IUPUI campus to get an overview of how each program is handling the delivery of instruction to students both on and off the campus electronically
- The opinion of each school as to what constitutes residency
- The our peer institutions be polled also as to their practices and policies regarding residency

This committee will continue to address this topic in the next semester.

4. Old Business: No old business was brought forward for further discussion or action.
5. New Business: No new business was proposed.

Adjournment until the Spring 2017 semester.

***** PLEASE SEE ATTACHMENT TO THESE MINUTES ON THE FOLLOWING PAGE. *****

**Indiana University and Purdue University Policies and Practices
On Credit Distribution and Residency**

Question	Response from IUB	Response from Purdue WL
Do all credits transfer from statewide campuses and other institutions to the main campus?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, but only in terms of credit hours and according to transfer rules already in place which restrict remedial courses, completed courses which bear an “S” (and several other standard practices). - Credits may not necessarily transfer in terms of application toward degree programs. Each school and program determines which courses they will accept to count toward graduation. - If a course is not accepted as part of the program requirements, it may count toward free or other electives. 	
Is there a general university policy which governs the total number of credits that can be transferred?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, but transferred courses which are accepted by a school or program to count toward graduation in any capacity must be either a “shared” course from another campus which bears the same name and number; OR be an equivalent course which has been approved to count in place of the required course; OR reviewed and found to be equivalent in content. Courses not accepted to count toward graduation may still be listed on the student’s transcript and used in other programs. 	
Can credits used in one degree program also be counted for application toward a minor or certificate?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes generally, but each school or program also has the right to specify if that is acceptable for their own graduations requirements. For example, if the major degree, and the minor or certificate, both come from the same department or program it can be denied. 	
Does the campus have specific residency requirements in regards to how many credits must be taken on the campus which grants the diploma?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No, each program or school sets the number of residency credits required for graduation. However, in all cases, standards set for the acceptance of credits, required resident hours, etc. are reviewed and approved by the Campus Curriculum Committee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes, students are required, regardless of the program they are in, to take a minimum of 32 credit hours at the campus where their diploma will be granted. Programs or schools may however also require more than the 32 credit hours set by the campus.
If a person takes a course online, and they are not living in Indiana, are the credits generated still counted toward residency?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We are not sure as of this time as that is being considered and debated due to the fact there are so many different circumstances to take into consideration, i.e. are they on active duty in the military, are they on a university sponsored program in another country temporarily, etc. 	

Academic Affairs Committee Minutes

March 2, 2017

2:30 – 3:30 p.m., Ashby Browsing Room (UL)

Members Present: Mark Bannatyne, Andrew Gavrin, Max Huffman, Carol Shieh, Mythily Srinivasan, Kate Thedwall, Jeff Watt

Guests: Kimberly Lewis, Office of the Registrar
Jay Gladden, AVC Undergraduate Education and Dean of University College

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair (Bannatyne) at 2:35 p.m. who welcomed all present.
2. Agenda items discussed:
 - a. The issue of “Academic Standing Policy: Probation, Dismissal and Reinstatement (PDR)” was heard with a brief presentation made by Kimberly Lewis. Ms. Lewis’s remarks included a review of the wording changes, and an explanation as to why the Undergraduate Affairs Committee (UAC) and the Office of the Registrar had again visited this policy. The following remarks were heard:
 - Changes were implemented to the document to help make policies outlined more easily understood in the face of ongoing staffing turnovers. It was hoped that some clarification to the wording would assist new hires who would be responsible for using the policies more quickly understand practices.
 - Consideration of dismissals had previously been based solely on the student’s IUPUI GPA. It was determined that consideration in all dismissals should take into account the IU GPA so that all courses taken would be considered in such an action.
 - Noting the status of a student should be included in the Student Information System record
 - No dismissal should be taken before a student has completed at least 12 credit hours

The question as to whether a student who was dismissed from one program due to unacceptable academic performance could then enter another program at IUPUI. Responses heard included the following remarks:

- Yes, it is possible at present for students to be dismissed from a program in one college and then immediately accepted into a different program that is located within another college. This can happen if the GPA dismissal standards are not the same in both colleges. It was further noted in this regard that the document in question is not to be considered as “one campus” policy, but rather set a minimum standard for schools to follow. It was noted that each school or program had the right to exceed the standard being suggested in an effort to protect their program from what they considered a lack academic strength or credibility. In regards to the rigor of certain programs, it was further noted that schools like Engineering and Technology (ENGT) often have students who often fall below the standards outlined

in this document. In such cases, schools should have the latitude to retain students when programs feel that such standards can be overcome by the students in subsequent courses. The opinion was heard that schools may also have a standard which they implement which would tie to the intent of this document where students might be dismissed should they be seen to not be making “progress toward completion” in a satisfactory manner due to adding and dropping courses in an effort to circumvent the campus policies.

Other comments were heard on the expulsions which were due to behavior issues and that some offenses require a student to only sit out one semester. This topic may be heard again in future meetings should the need to revisit this issue arise.

Several comments were heard in regards to clarifying slight wording changes so that everyone present was clear on the amendments made to the document and how they might be implemented.

A motion was heard by Gavrin to accept the document as stipulated and seconded by Thedwall. The vote by the quorum present was unanimous. Bannatyne will take the vote to accept the document to the IUPUI Faculty Council meeting on March 7, 2017 and present it for first reading.

- b. Discussion was heard from all present in regards to the responses received from schools on the matter of the acceptance of credits earned from other IU and Purdue campuses and institutions. It was noted that only 5 of the IUPUI had responded to the questionnaire sent out to all Deans. Concern was expressed by many present that several of the larger schools like Liberal Arts and Business had not responded. It was felt that the opinions of these schools was vitally important if this committee was to get a true picture of practices being used at present in regards to the acceptance of credits toward graduation, and residency requirements for graduation.

All agreed that Bannatyne should again send out the questionnaire to the schools that did not respond, and ask for an immediate reply so that this issue may be addressed in the April meeting of this committee. It was hoped that further responses would be received so that the committee could yet make a recommendation on action and policy to the IFC before the end of this academic year. This committee will continue to address this topic in its next meeting.

4. Old Business: No old business was brought forward for further discussion or action.
5. New Business: No new business was proposed.

Adjournment until April, 2017.

Academic Affairs Committee Minutes

April 26, 2017

11:30 a.m. – 12:45 p.m., UL 2115E

Members Present: Mark Bannatyne, Peggy Daniels Lee, Andrew Garvin, Carol Shieh, and Mary Beth Myers (Several members sent requests to be officially excused due to teaching responsibilities or illness)

1. The meeting was called to order by the Chair (Bannatyne) at 11:35 a.m. who welcomed all present.
2. The minutes of the March 2, 2017 meeting were not presented for approval due to the time the Chair wished to use for discussion of the agenda items. The minutes will be presented for consideration and approval at the first meeting in the Fall 2017 semester.
3. Agenda items discussed:
 - a. Bannatyne informed those present that Kate Thedwall had volunteered to act as our committee's liaison to the campus Undergraduate Admissions committee which is overseen by the University College under the direction of Norman "Doug" Less who is Chair this year.
 - b. Bannatyne updated those present that he had offered a motion for the Second Reading of the "Academic Standing Policy: Probation, Dismissal, Reinstatement (PDR)" at the March 7, 2017 Faculty Council meeting, and that the members of the Council voted to pass the amendments in the policy as stipulated.
 - c. Considerable discussion was then heard on the issue of amendments proposed to the "Faculty Sponsorship of Student Admission as a Beginning Freshman". The amendments had previously to this meeting been forwarded to all committee members for their review in answer to an appeal by the Faculty Council Executive Committee that this committee consider the amendments suggested as soon as possible. Comments by Kate Thedwall and Andrew Garvin were received prior to this meeting by the Chair and read aloud before discussion was heard from those present.

Several issues were heard in reference to the amendments proposed which ranged from a recommendation to dismiss the policy in its entirety, to the clarification of some of the wording. Information on actual cases where the policy had been seen as effective in past implementation were also heard. The following remarks follow the flow of the discussion heard:

- This policy has been used many years among diverse programs across the campus, and there arose a comment as to whether it may have been implemented for the wrong reasons by specific programs on the campus. Mary Beth Myers provided additional information that there is no evidence that the "Faculty Sponsorship" option has been

abused consistently in the past, and that, in fact its use is (appropriately) very infrequent. Only a handful of cases of the policy being implemented each year is typical.

- Information was then offered which cited individual cases where this policy had been used for the benefit of the students involved, and examples of how faculty members identified students who fell under the guidelines of the policy
- Significant time was spent in discussion which centered on clarifying several portions of the Policy amendments:
 - o It was suggested by Andrew Garvin that bullet point #2 be arranged for clarity into sub-bullet points.
 - o Bullet point #3 which dealt with enrollment limits heard the most comment. It was suggested that a recommendation be returned to the Executive Committee that this point be edited further for clarity. The members of the Academic Affairs Committee strongly recommended that students being sponsored by this policy should enroll in only 12 credits hours during their first semester, with a limit of no more than 15 credit hours being allowed under unusual circumstances. It was further heard that while students may wish to enroll in 15 hours due to the advantage it offers them in the cost of tuition, that 12 hours of study was viewed as being a safeguard to the students from being overwhelmed in their first semester. The registration of 12 credit hours also allows students to be considered for financial aid as a full time enrollment.
- Discussion was then heard on the policy's requirement that only "full time tenure track faculty" were eligible to sponsor students. It was agreed that while this issue was not included in the amendments proposed for consideration, that the Academic Affairs Committee may wish to revisit this portion of the policy during the Fall 2017 Semester for further review.
- The issue of what exactly was meant in the policy by the phrase "conditionally admitted student" was discussed in some detail. Mary Beth Myers volunteered to research this for members and send out her findings. (An e-mail to the Chair dated April 27, 2017 was received with further clarification on this phrase as shown below.)

A "conditionally admitted student" is determined to fall under the following stipulations when registering and attending:

"If the student successfully completes the stipulations listed above [see policy in full for listed stipulations], the student can enroll in the subsequent semester. The student will continue to be required to schedule regular meetings with the personal success coach and meet with the faculty sponsor on a monthly basis. If the student completes those

requirements and achieves an overall IU cumulative GPA of 2.0 or above after the second term, all conditional requirements will be lifted. Failure to comply with any of these requirements at any time within the first two consecutive semesters will result in the student being dismissed. The Director of Admissions will specify the stipulations for readmission.”

The Chair then heard a motion to approve the amendments as stipulated with the suggestions for some wordsmithing as detailed in these minutes above. The motion passed unanimously and will be presented by the Chair at the May 2, 2017 of the IUPUI Faculty Council for adoption.

4. The Chair offered a few comments on the issue before this committee related to the acceptance and applications of transfer credits, and issues dealing with residency. It was proposed that as this matter was not a matter of any urgency, and that it was proposed by the committee rather than requested for attention by the Executive Committee, that it be tabled until the Fall 2017 semester for more complete discussion. Comments were heard by those present that this matter is seen as being more complex than first anticipated and more time was needed for the members to review the responses from the individual schools on the campus before a detailed discussion could be heard on the subject. All agreed to table the discussion of this matter until the Fall 2017 semester as suggested.
5. Old Business: No old business was brought forward for further discussion or action.
6. New Business: The Chair indicated that he was in the process of writing our Annual Report which is due in May to the Executive Council which he will also distribute to all members of this committee for their consideration.

The Committee then adjourned until the Fall 2017 semester.