

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

11-14-2017

Revised Academic Standing Policy

Kelly Sullivan/Academic Standards Committee
Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>

 Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Sullivan/Academic Standards Committee, Kelly, "Revised Academic Standing Policy" (2017). *Faculty Senate Index*. 628.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/628>

This motion request is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

Approved by the Senate: 11/27/2017

Approved by the President: 11/29/2017

Revised Academic Standing Policy

Submitted by: Kelly Sullivan/Academic Standards Committee

ksullivan@georgiasouthern.edu

478-7902

11/14/2017

Motion:

The Academic Standards Committee recommends that the University adopt a revised Academic Standing Policy. The SEC moves to accept the recommendation of the revised Academic Standing Policy.

Rationale:

OWG 6-6 recommend that the new Institution: (1) create a task force to review the current Academic Standing Policies of Georgia Southern University and Armstrong State University in order to create a new Academic Standing Policy. (2) create a new Academic Standing Policy within an abbreviated timeframe to facilitate full implementation in Fall 2018. (3) develop an Academic Standing Policy that holds students accountable without imposing excessively punitive requirements for continued enrollment at the institution. (4) create an Academic Standing policy that rewards students who are making on-going progress, each term, towards good academic standing. The Academic Standards Committee along with our counterparts from Armstrong was charged with drafting these policies for the new Georgia Southern. The attached policy drafts have been co-created with our colleagues and passed by at least a majority voted by both voting bodies as policy drafts to move forward to our respective Faculty Senate.

Response:

Minutes 11/27/2017

d. Revised Academic Standing Policy Attachments: Academic Standing Policy Visual Academic Standing Policy

“The Academic Standards Committee recommends that the University adopt a revised Academic Standing Policy.” Moderator Pirro then read the rationale: “OWG 6-6 recommend that the new Institution:

- (1) create a task force to review the current Academic Standing Policies of Georgia Southern University and Armstrong State University in order to create a new Academic Standing Policy;
- (2) create a new Academic Standing Policy within an abbreviated timeframe to facilitate full implementation in Fall 2018;
- (3) develop an Academic Standing Policy that holds students accountable without imposing excessively punitive requirements for continued enrollment at the institution;
- (4) create an Academic Standing policy that rewards students who are making on-going progress, each term, towards good academic standing.” Moderator Pirro said it seemed the motion was not about changing anything right now, but putting in motion the processes that will lead to a revised academic standing policy.

Mark Edwards (COSM) seemed to confirm that. Most elements would be the same as current policy, for example re: warnings and what leads to and constitutes probation one and probation two and so forth. The big difference would be the GPA students would need to achieve if their grades after the next semester don't put them at 2.0; they have to make a 2.25 (confirmed by Christine Ludowise) in order to go another semester.

Janice Steirn (CLASS) was unclear whether we would be voting to approve these elements or to establish a task force to study the proposal. Edwards clarified that the senate would be voting on a revision of our current policy of warnings, probations, and reinstatement.

[The recording is not clear at this point. Several people were confused about what this “task force” was that had been mentioned.]

Christine Ludowise (Provost's office) said the Academic Standing Committee and the Student Success Committee at Armstrong were the Task Force.

Moderator Pirro then confirmed that this vote would be on a change in policy.

Ted Brimeyer (CLASS) said this seemed like another policy to keep students around to take their money. If students get over a 2.25 they can stay, but for students who have done really badly in one semester, that 2.25 likely will never get them over the 2.0 threshold to graduate.

Ludowise responded that COSM and CLASS have data that demonstrates that students who earn at least a 2.25 over consecutive semesters do bring their GPA up. Our current policy excluded students whether making progress or not, so if a student had a bad first semester, they could still be excluded at a 1.98 two semesters later. Most of those students did not come

back. 25% of Georgia Southern students end up on some kind of academic warning or probation at some point in their career here. The committee was trying to make sure that students who are making progress had incentive to continue making that progress via a little bit of a soft landing net. Steirn asked if there was a limit on how many semesters students can take to raise their GPA; a 2.25 could not raise a very low GPA in, say, two semesters. Ludowise said there was no time limit.

Scott Beck from the College of Education had done some calculations that showed a student who had a 2.25 their first semester, if they earned at least a 2.25 each consecutive semester would end after 8 semesters with almost exactly 2.0. Success would also be dependent on a strong intervention policy.

Steirn wondered if this plan made students less independent, and was concerned about sending out into the world as a representative of a GSU graduate someone who needed 8 semesters of all that support to eke out a 2.0.

Finbarr Curtis (CLASS) thought exactly 2.25 in each of 8 semesters an unlikely scenario, opined that they would likely earn higher, and so wasn't worried about the proposal. Brimeyer liked the fact that someone actually used evidence to support this proposal rather than just saying we like this, so let's do it. He hoped other motions would be similarly supported by evidence.

The motion was Approved.

Attachments: Academic Standing Policy
Academic Standing Policy-Visual (Effective Fall 2018)