

Academic Policies Committee

Meeting: Tuesday, October 24, 2023 at 4 pm

Attending: Dan Thorp, Keith Goyne, Keith Thompson, Susan Sumner, Michel Pleimling, Jen Pike

Absent: Kim Smith

Revision of policy 6305 section 2.1- charge from CUSP

Section 2.1 was formerly known as Policy 91

During CUSP discussion on Oct. 23, 2023

- CUSP has agreed that the university progress toward degree requirements should no longer be related to general education
 - Pathways won't be used as a benchmark
- 2.1.1 “Any college or department may develop, adopt, publish and adhere to the policies that are in addition to this policy with the approval of the Commission on Undergraduate Studies & Policies.”
 - Michel would like this committee to consider framework for 2.1.1
 - Many students that get a policy 91 notification are not dismissed based on the criteria.
 - Despite complexity, departments are using them properly as intervention measures to keep students on track.
 - Keith G. shared peer universities' criteria
 - NC State: very complicated
 - Others: 2.0 GPA – what VT uses to determine probation and suspension
 - “Satisfactory Academic Progress” is a federal requirement that is associated with financial aid
 - Must have a satisfactory academic progress policy
 - VT is convoluted and appears out of alignment with other institutes
 - It was suggested that staff and faculty should not have to spend a lot of time micromanaging departmental progress requirements
- What would it mean to simplify 2.1. for a restricted major?
 - It would have an impact in Engineering and Business
 - The check sheets don't talk about what you need to enter the major.
 - However for restricted majors, the criteria for continuing in the major are the same as getting into the major.
 - This is something to keep in mind when overhauling this policy.

- “Students who have not met conditions in 2, 3a, 3b and 4 for eligibility for continued enrollment will be declared by their academic dean to be ineligible to register or return at the end of any academic semester for a specified period of time to be determined by the academic dean. Students who have not met condition 3c may be declared by their academic dean to be ineligible to register or return at the end of any academic semester for a specified period of time to be determined by the academic dean.”
 - Michel suggested removing this part of the policy
 - Criteria 3b is useful for some departments/majors to get students to enroll in a degree-granting program
 - One could consider enhancing this part of the policy with something around a probationary term, that, if a student is in violation, they have a semester to recover.
 - This part of the policy is ambiguous and a more meaningful approach may be a suspension from a degree program as opposed to suspension from the university.
 - It was noted that this statement conflicts with 2.3—not coordinated language

- Michel asked the committee to agree to walk through the criteria (1, 2, 3a, 3b, 3c and 4) and determine how to modify it.
 - Criteria 3
 - 3b has meaning
 - The committee agreed that somewhere between 72 or 75 credits is a meaningful checkpoint for progress.
 - Criteria 4
 - Should there be an in-major GPA requirement as part of continuing enrollment?
 - If in-major GPA requirement is meaningful we need to define “in-major GPA”—everyone measured the same way
 - If we define in-major requirements here we need to make sure that it all coordinates with graduation requirements
 - In-major GPA is used in so many places that we can’t just define it.
 - Is it worth having a check at the 96 hour mark?
 - Susan isn’t convinced that this helps us retain or help students do better.
 - In her area, a number of graduates have the 2.5 in-major GPA requirement waived if they are above the 2.0 university requirement.
 - Don’t know where 96 credits comes from? Why 96?
 - It was suggested that in-major criteria could be under section 2.1.1 instead of being part of the general policy
 - Michel noted that would leave only 3B in the general policy

- Should there be a data requirement to show that a minimum grade supports students to be successful? The Registrar supports this.