

IUPUI Policy for Undergraduate Probation, Dismissal, and Reinstatement

Circular 2017-08.1

FULL POLICY CONTENTS

[Scope](#)
[Policy Statement](#)
[Sanctions](#)
[Reason for Policy](#)

Effective: *April 4, 2017*
Last Updated: *April 4, 2017*

Faculty Council Committee:
Academic Affairs Committee

ADDITIONAL DETAILS

[Related Information](#)
[History](#)

Scope

1. This policy affects undergraduate students only.
2. Academic units may establish policies for probation, dismissal and reinstatement that are more restrictive than provisions outlined by this policy.
3. Academic units are encouraged to clearly explain their probation, dismissal, and reinstatement policies in programmatic materials.
4. The academic requirements for probation, dismissal and reinstatement detailed by this policy take precedence over qualification for student financial aid and/or maintaining student visa status.
5. To ensure equity between intercampus transfer students (ICT) and transfer students from outside the IU system, academic units may review ICT students initially selected for probation/dismissal status for possible exception based on IUPUI enrollment. Units should allow students to complete a minimum of 12 IUPUI credit hours prior to consideration for probation/dismissal.
6. By signing the reinstatement petition, the student agrees to meet with an academic advisor and meet all requirements stipulated by the school.
7. Academic units are encouraged to recommend steps to enhance the students' chances of readmission, such as attending reinstatement workshops, removing grades of incomplete, undertaking assessment of their academic problems, and providing evidence of their ability to do successful academic work upon their reinstatement to IUPUI.
8. Readmission after a second dismissal is extremely rare.
9. Probation, dismissal, and reinstatement status must be reported into the Student

Information System each major semester (fall/spring). This allows all academic units, advisors, and other student support staff to carefully monitor student progress.

Policy Statement

Probation

1. Students whose Indiana University cumulative grade point average (GPA) falls below a 2.0 will be placed on probation. Students will be informed of the probationary status by letter.
2. Students may be continued on probation when the semester GPA is at least a 2.0 but the Indiana University cumulative GPA is below a 2.0.
3. Students will be removed from probationary status once the Indiana University cumulative GPA is at least 2.0.

Dismissal

1. Students on probation at IUPUI will be dismissed if they fail to attain a semester GPA of at least 2.0 in any two consecutive semesters (fall and spring) and the Indiana University cumulative GPA is below 2.0.
2. Students who are dismissed for the first time cannot enroll until one regular (fall or spring) semester has elapsed since dismissal and must petition by the established deadlines to be reinstated.
3. Students dismissed two or more times must remain out of school for the next two consecutive regular (fall and spring) semesters and petition by the established deadlines to be reinstated.

Reinstatement

1. Reinstatement will be the decision of the academic unit to which the students are petitioning.
2. Students who are reinstated will be classified as probationary students until the Indiana University cumulative GPA is at least 2.0. During the first regularly enrolled term on probation, the student must achieve a semester GPA of at least 2.3. In each subsequent semester on probation, the student must achieve a semester GPA of at least 2.0. Failure to meet the semester GPA requirement while on probation will result in dismissal.

Sanctions

Students may be academically released from a particular program if they do not make consistent and appropriate academic progress relevant to their fields of study. The decision to release is left to the discretion of the appropriate officer in the school.

Dismissal is a campus-level action and may be invoked only by the standards noted in the policy statement. Students not meeting the requirements specified will generally be released by their schools, but not dismissed by the campus.

Reason for Policy

Document Authors: Matthew Rust, Director of Campus Career and Advising Services
Kim Lewis, Associate Registrar

The authors met with the Undergraduate Affairs Committee who endorsed the following issues and solutions for consideration by the IFC Executive Committee:

1. Students with identical degree objectives, identical course enrollments and identical grades can be treated differently—in terms of their academic standing with IUPUI—simply because their academic homes differ (e.g., University College pre-biology major vs. School of Science biology major).
2. A student whom one school has put on probation can miss important academic support intervention if he/she changes majors to a school with a less rigorous academic standing policy. This also happens when students change into a school which only applies standing policies to those students who began the semester in that school.
3. A student whom one school has dismissed from their program can be reinstated by changing their major and thereby re-entering through University College or another school.
4. Students who graduate from IUPUI with roughly the same academic history and apply to the same graduate or professional school (or licensure process) might report very different academic standing histories based solely on the differing policies and practices in place in the different IUPUI schools from which they graduated.
5. Though we have a campuswide policy on Probation, Dismissal, and Reinstatement (PDR), schools are inconsistent in applying it. Some schools do not always apply academic standing at the end of each term; these schools are in effect more lenient than the policy allows.
6. Also problematic, the campus-wide PDR policy—as written—is based on “IUPUI GPA hours” and “IUPUI grades” neither of which is a recorded field within the student information systems. This means schools would have to hand-calculate hours and GPAs in order to correctly apply the policy as written.

Proposed Solutions:

1. The Undergraduate Affairs Committee has recommended that the Academic Affairs Committee of IFC consider editing the campus-wide PDR policy changing the “IUPUI GPA hours” and “IUPUI grades” language to “IU GPA hours” and “IU grades.” The latter are in fact fields in SIS and are criteria by which students can be efficiently and consistently evaluated. See Appendix A for current version of the PDR policy along with these suggested edits.
2. If the action above is taken, 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 troubleshooting support provided by the registrar’s office.
3. Transition of academic unit ownership over this process allows each school to have the necessary flexibility to run, review, and update this information more quickly in the SIS system. Additional benefits to schools include consistent tracking of academic standing,

not dependent upon consistent staffing in schools, ensuring that students in need of academic interventions (probation) are identified and coded as early as possible so interventions can occur in first four weeks of next semester, and ensuring that students in need of a time away (dismissal) are identified and dismissed as early as possible so as to avoid having them accumulate more debt and take up seats that could be utilized by students in a better position to succeed.

- a. Implement procedures to facilitate school-by-school compliance with the existing campuswide 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. This centralized process would benefit schools initially by ensuring that the data being extracted at the end of the term would be using the minimum criteria in alignment with campus policy.
 - ii. Registrar's office would make this report available to the schools through their normal department shares folders.
 - iii. Schools would have a reasonable amount of days to review and make edits for errors, for grade changes, or for more restrictive policies that exist in the schools (more restrictive policies are specifically allowed within the campus-wide PDR policy).
 - iv. Registrar's office will then batch upload the standing codes and work with the academic units to apply the negative service indicators.
 - v. Schools would continue to their current practices with regard to appeals of academic standing, and with reinstatement procedures.
 - vi. Schools would be reminded that they will continue to have access to edit student academic standing even after the batch upload process has run.
 - vii. Additionally, because there is no IFC policy on Deans List, schools would be encouraged to adopt their own process for adding this academic standing to the student record.
 - viii. The procedures explained above have been discussed and affirmed by the Campus Advising Council.
4. Ask the EVC to reiterate to the deans that it would be unethical to have PDR policies more lenient than the campus standard for the sole purpose of maintaining headcount. The PDR policies exist to identify students who need early intervention and to encourage students to step away from the university before digging too deep of an academic and fiscal hole.

History

Former Policy:

Academic Affairs Committee	March 9, 2005
IFC First Read	April 5, 2005
IFC Second Read	September 6, 2005
IFC Third Read	November 1, 2005
Undergraduate Affairs Committee	September 2016
IFC Revisions	October 2016
Updated	February 2017; March 2017
Approved	April 4, 2017