

AAA Committee
Annual Report for Academic Year 2002/03

Members of the Committee:

Markus Pomper, NSM, Chair;
Lynn Hufford, Library;
Debra May, Nursing;
George Mathew, NSM;
Joanne Passet, HFA;
Cheryl Stolle, Education.

Activities of the Committee during the Academic Year 2002/03:

1. Appeals of Academic Suspension.

The committee met on August 18 and on January 8 to hear appeals of academic suspension for the semesters following these dates. There were two appeals for the fall semester and eleven appeals for the spring semester.

2. Grade Appeals.

Several grade appeals were brought before the committee. One petitioner did not follow the appropriate procedure; the request was forwarded to the instructors for their consideration.

The committee considered three other grade appeals. Each of these appeals was denied; the reasons are outlined in the minutes.

The committee also received a request by VCES Young asking for permission to allow retroactive cancellation of a student's registration, including FN's earned for a certain semester. VCES Young stated that the enrollment of the student was due to a glitch in the computer system. The committee discussed this case on April 10 and decided to grant the request but requested that the glitch in the system be identified and fixed.

3. Extended Grade Replacement (EX) Policy

The committee discussed this policy twice during the semester (November 19 and April 10). During the earlier meeting it was determined that the EX policy should not be implemented under the old (UITS) system because it was not clear whether the policy could continue to be implemented under the PeopleSoft system. At the later meeting, the committee decided to ask Dennis Hicks to inquire about the PeopleSoft's ability to handle an EX policy and to report back to the committee.

4. Academic Standards Policy

The committee discussed the Academic Standards Policy of the Academic Handbook (X-3) during five of its meetings (November 19, January 21, February 11, February 18, and April 10).

The reason for the discussion was a stipulation in the academic probation and suspension part of the policy. In the old version of the policy a student's semester GPA had to be below 2.00, which had to cause the cumulative GPA to drop below 2.00 as well. The concurrence of both events caused a student to be placed on academic probation. In reality both conditions need not occur simultaneously. The committee revised this portion of the policy so that a cumulative GPA of below 2.00 is the only indicator for academic probation. The revised policy also included guidelines for reinstatement after suspension.

VCES Young suggested a change in the academic honors policy to include all students above a certain semester GPA, regardless of credit hours taken.

The revised policy was presented to Faculty senate on March 4. After discussion the revised academic probation, suspension and reinstatement policy were passed, while the honors policy remained unchanged.

At the last meeting (April 10) the committee decided not to take up the issue of academic honors, despite a written request by VCES Young.

5. Admissions Policy and Referral to Community College

The committee discussed this issue at of its meetings (October 8, November 18, February 18, April 10, May 6).

The committee agreed that IUEast should not change its de facto open admissions policy at this time, and should not refer any students to the community college. No action was taken during the first two meetings. During the February 18 meeting, the committee drafted a request for information to interim VCAA Chang. The committee received a partial response on March 23 and drafted a suggested course of action for the campus. Copies of both documents are attached.

Suggestions for the committee during Academic Year 2003/04

1. Extended Grade Replacement. (EX) Policy.

The committee should continue to examine the possibility of an EX policy under PeopleSoft, and propose a new policy the Faculty Senate after the feasibility of such a policy has been established.

2. Admissions Policy

The committee may need to make some minor changes to the current admissions policy so that the federal financial aid guidelines are met. These guidelines specify that placement tests must not be part of the admissions process if students who require remediation are to receive federal financial aid. However, our current admissions policy makes the placement test part of the admissions process.

3. Community College Initiative

The AAA committee and the Curriculum committee should suggest a plan of action to cooperate with the community college while giving IU East the opportunity of proving its strengths to the community. A possible strategy is outlined in the latest letter to interim VCAA Chang (dated May 27). Next steps could be to involve the faculty senate in crafting a strategy for preparing for the community college initiative.

**Appendix A
Minutes.**

**AAA Committee
Meeting May 1, 2002 – 2:00 pm
Community Room
Minutes**

Present: Joanne Passet, Cheryl Stolle, Markus Pomper, George Mathew (by telephone);
Absent: Debbie May, Lynn Hufford;
Guest: David Silverstein.

Agenda

1. First meeting in Fall 02 (Student Appeals)
2. Election of new chair

Minutes

Ad 1.

David Silverstein suggested Monday, August 19 as the date for hearing appeals on academic suspensions. The committee agreed.

Ad 2.

Senate committee bylaws call for a person with committee experience to chair the committee. The only continuing members are Debbie May and Markus Pomper; none of the present members knew whether Lynn Hufford had previously served on the committee. Cheryl Stolle suggested Markus Pomper as new chair and Joanne Passet seconded. George Mathew agreed. The committee elected Markus Pomper as chair.

The committee adjourned at 2:15 pm.

AAA Committee
August 19, 2002
Minutes

Present:

Markus Pomper, Chair,
Debra May,
Cheryl Stolle,
Lynn Hufford,
Joanne Passet
David Silberstein, guest

Absent:

George Mathew

The committee met at 8:00 am in DAR.

The committee heard the suspension appeal of one student (Lori Fudge). Another suspension appeal was brought to the committee, but was moot because a failing grade had been removed by the instructor.

The committee also discussed a grade appeal by Shelly Gast. The appeal was denied.

The committee was informed that two other grade appeals had been brought to the committee but were referred to the instructors of the courses so that the prescribed course of action would be followed.

The committee adjourned at 9:30 am.

AAA Committee
October 8, 2002
Minutes

Present: Markus Pomper, chair,
Cheryl Stolle,
Joanne Passet

Absent: Debra May,
Lynn Hufford,
George Mathew.

The committee met at 11:00 am in the DAR.

1. Student appeal. The committee discussed the student appeal of Shelly Gast. It was noted that Ms. Gast's appeal did not make a case for her failure to remove the grades 8 years after she earned them. Her academic achievements did not improve after the semester in question; in fact, she continued to earn low grades in classes that were in her major area (Mathematics). The committee decided to recommend denying the student's appeal.
2. Referral to Community College system.
Chair's Suggestion:
 - a. IU East keeps its open admissions policy; the choice between CCI and IUE remains essentially with the students.
 - b. Students are advised to take classes at the community college if they are able to take a full course load there or if their degree objective is only a 2-year degree that is offered by the community college.
 - c. Students are advised to enroll at IU East if they can take a full course load here, and if their degree objective is outside the reach of the community college.

The committee agreed that IU East should retain its open admissions policy. The suggestions (b) and (c) should be revised so that they only refer to students intending to take a full course load. It was noted that students should be referred to the Community College system only if students could not be adequately served by IU East's courses. Such examples may include students who would need too much remedial work in both Mathematics and Writing.

The committee agreed that this topic should be discussed with divisions. The committee members will hold informal discussions with their peers to determine how IU East's faculty feels about these issues.

The committee further discussed other related topics: How should courses and other transfer credit from the Community College be evaluated so that transferring students are adequately prepared for their degree objectives? How can IU East offer an adequate number of upper division classes to improve its competitiveness and service to the community?

Even though this is not a charge to the committee, the need we agreed on the need for discussion.

3. The committee adjourned at 11:30 am. The next meeting will be November 19, 11:00 – 12:00.

AAA – Committee
November 19, 2002
Minutes

Present: Markus Pomper, chair,
Lynn Hufford,
Cheryl Stolle,
Joanne Passet,
Debra May.

Guests: Vandana Rao,
Lynnette Young.

Absent: George Mathew.

The committee met at 11:00 in the DAR

1. Extended X (EX) policy.

The committee was informed about the possibility of implementing the EX-policy the faculty senate passed several years ago. The implementation is possible under the current UITS system, but may or may not be possible under the future PeopleSoft system. It was therefore agreed to begin implementation of the policy only if we are certain that it can be continued once PeopleSoft is in place. The chair of the committee was charged to contact Dennis Hicks and determine the feasibility of the implementation under PeopleSoft.

2. Academic probation.

Vandana and Lynnette informed the committee about an apparent ambiguity in the Academic Handbook, Sec. X-3, dated 12/95. In this version, the provision about probation reads

“Any student who earns less than a 2.0 GPA for any *semester*’s work which causes the cumulative GPA (CGPA) to fall below 2.0 will be placed on academic probation until the CGPA is 2.0 or above. Students will be notified by letter when on probation. Students will not be evaluated for suspension until they have completed 12 credit hours.”

It was discussed that the word “semester” is interpreted as “Fall or Spring Semester”, but not “Summer term”. This allowed students’ GPA to drop below the 2.0 mark without being put on probation. In order for Student Services and Academic Advising to intervene more efficiently and before a student is suspended, the committee agreed to change the paragraph as follows:

“Any student who earns less than a 2.0 GPA for any ~~semester~~’s enrollment period’s work which causes the cumulative GPA (CGPA) to fall below 2.0 will be placed on academic probation until the CGPA is 2.0 or above. An enrollment period is the length of time designated to complete a course. Students will be notified by letter when on probation. Students will not be evaluated for suspension until they have completed 12 credit hours.”

The suggested change will be forwarded to Lynnette Young, Ben Young and Diane Roberts for comments. The committee agreed to the changes as above and will motion and second the change in faculty senate.

3. Referral policy for CCI.

The committee continues discussion of the referral policy to the community college. The discussion is based on the suggestion below.

- a. IU East keeps its open admissions policy; the choice between CCI and IUE remains essentially with the students.
- b. Students should be advised of the consequences of enrolling at IU East versus the Community College. Such implications are
 - i. Financial aid. In order obtain financial aid, students must enroll full-time. Students who are eligible for financial aid should be encouraged to apply at the institution where they can take a full load of courses.
 - ii. Degree objective. Students should consider enrolling at the institution where they can complete the degree they wish to earn. Even though it is possible to transfer credit from one institution to another, prospective students should be advised that this transfer is not guaranteed.
 - iii. Prospective students should be advised of the opportunities that IU East has to offer. For example, IU East offers a broad variety of academic disciplines. Full-time faculty with terminal degrees oversee the instruction. The community college system does not have this luxury.

The committee decided that part (b) is not part of a referral policy and should therefore not be part of the policy. Part (a) does not reflect any changes to the existing policy. Therefore, there is no need to bring forward any motion in faculty senate. The committee agreed to inform the faculty senate that no change in policy is suggested.

The committee discussed the necessity to evaluate or implement a policy for transfer credit. Because the committee has not been specifically changed with this, it was decided that no action should be taken at this time.

4. Information:

- a. Response from Shelly Gast's husband, Keith Gast. Mr. Gast expressed his disappointment to the wording of the letter of the committee dated October 11, 2002. Mr. Gast felt that the quotation-marks that were used to emphasize quotations from Ms. Gast's documentation ridiculed her situation. The committee agreed that there was no need to reply to the letter.
- b. Next meetings:
 - Wednesday, January 8, 9:00 am (possibly all day) for hearing of student appeals
 - Tuesday, January 21, 11:00 am – 12:00 noon for regular meeting.
 - Tentative agenda: Testing for Computer Literacy requirement.

The committee adjourned at 12:10 pm.

AAA Committee
Meeting January 21, 2003
Minutes

Present:

Markus Pomper, chair
Joanne Passet
Cheryl Stolle

Guests:

Ben Young, VC Enrollment Services
Lanette Young
Kim Ladd
Marcy Hemminger

Absent:

Lynn Hufford
George Mathew
Debra May

The committee met at 11:00 am in DAR to discuss a change in policy regarding academic probation and suspension. The existing policy proved to be too hard and confusing to implement. In particular, it is hard to determine semester GPA if a student only takes Pass/Fail courses. Further, probation will only go into effect if a student earns a semester GPA which causes the cumulative GPA to drop below 2.0. In certain cases (summer classes, incompletes turning into F) this is hard or impossible to determine.

The committee discussed the suggested policy (attached) and decided to adopt it with minor changes.

The next meeting will be held on February 11, 11:00 am in DAR. The committee adjourned at 12:00 noon.

AAA Committee
Meeting January 30, 2003
Minutes

Present:

Markus Pomper, chair
Lynn Hufford
Cheryl Stolle

Absent:

Joanne Passet
George Mathew
Debra May (recused)

The committee met at 9:30 am in 200C Whitewater Hall to discuss the grade appeal of Helen Willis.

The present members discussed the grade appeal of Ms. Willis and found no merit in her argument. The committee decided to decline the appeal and charged the chair to draft a letter explaining the reasoning.

The committee convened at 9:45 am.

AAA Committee
Meeting February 11, 2003
Minutes

Present:

Markus Pomper, chair
Joanne Passet
George Mathew

Guests:

Ben Young
Marcy Hemminger
Kim Ladd
David Silberstein

Absent:

Debra May
Lynn Hufford
Cheryl Stolle

The committee met at 11:00 am in DAR, Whitewater Hall.

Agenda:

1. Discuss Academic Standing policy
2. Appeal of Heather Staggs
3. Referral/Admissions Policy

1. The committee discussed proposed changes to the Academic Standing Policy. Ben Young and Marcy Hemminger proposed changes for determining Honors lists. The proposed change is to eliminate the number of credit hours in each semester from the list of criteria for Chancellor's and Dean's lists. It was decided to exclude transient, non-degree and high-school students from the Honors lists.

The draft of the suspension policy was changed so that only two suspension audits will be held each academic year (after the Fall semester and during Summer II). It was agreed to make a distinction between appeal of suspension and petition for reinstatement after suspension.

2. The remaining members of the AAA committee agreed to deny the appeal of Heather Staggs. Lynn Hufford and Cheryl Stolle had indicated their support for denial earlier. The grade appeal will be denied.

3. There was no time to discuss the referral/admissions policy.

The committee convened at 12:05 pm

AAA Committee
Meeting February 18, 2003
Minutes

Present:

Markus Pomper, chair
Joanne Passet
George Mathew
Debra May
Cheryl Stolle

Absent:

Lynn Hufford

The committee met at 11:00 am in 200 C, Whitewater Hall.

Agenda:

4. Referral/Admissions Policy
 5. Discuss Academic Standing policy
-
1. The committee discussed the implications of the community college, transfer agreements and related topics. It was decided to reply to the VCAA's request for re-examination of the referral and admission policy by asking her supply relevant data. The draft of a letter was discussed and the committee will collaborate on finalizing the draft.
 2. The committee discussed the proposed changes in the meeting today. We feel that students who are still on probation **after** getting a 4.0 or 3.5 – 3.99 semester GPA should not be placed on either of the Honor lists. The proposed change will be forwarded to VCES for discussion.

The committee convened at 11:55 am

AAA Committee
Minutes
April 10, 2003

Present:

Markus Pomper, Chair
George Mathew
Cheryl Stolle
Marilyn Watkins, Guest

Absent:

Lynn Hufford
Joanne Passet
Debra May

The committee met at 10:00 am in the DAR.

1. Academic Honors.

Discussion of Ben Young's suggestion for changing the Academic Honors policy. The committee agreed to reject the administration's request for a sweeping change in the academic honor's policy. It was agreed that the Dean's and Chancellor's lists should continue to represent a sincere commitment to education; therefore, a student who would only take a one-credit hour PE course (and gets an A) should not be honored. VC Young will be asked to submit a proposal that clarifies whether or not pass-fail courses should be included in the 12-credit-hour (6-credit-hour) distinguishing between full-time and part-time students, if the administration feels that clarifications in the current policy need to be made.

2. EX policy.

The committee discussed the EX policy. We will ask Dennis Hicks to evaluate whether such a policy is feasible (and affordable) under the new PeopleSoft system.

3. Student Grade Appeal.

The committee considered Brooke Collin's appeal of her FN grades. The request was communicated to the committee through VCES Young and VCAA Chang. It appears that a systemic mistake allowed the student to stay registered without paying her tuition. University staff apparently incorrectly advised the student who asked what she needed to do in order to cancel her registration. The committee recommends that the administration should take steps to ensure that this type of

misunderstanding do not occur again. We recommend that the methods by which the student should have been “washed out” be examined and corrected, if needed. Further, the committee does not object the administration canceling this student’s registration for the semester in question.

4. Admissions Policy.

Discussion of interim VCAA Chang’s response to the request for information.

a. Articulation of Programs, Transferability of Courses, and STAC committee

The committee recognizes that the STAC committee has been created by the passing of house bill 1209. However, this bill does not automatically create articulation agreements between programs or transfer agreements between courses. The STAC committee is charged with creating such agreements in consultation with the constituents. Since Indiana University East is one of the constituents, we urge the administration to defend the faculty’s concerns in STAC’s discussion.

It was pointed out that lawmakers recognize the faculty’s concerns regarding different standards, as is evidenced by the clause “to develop through the committee statewide agreements” of transfer between courses and articulation of associate degree programs. [See (15) and (16) of HB 1209]. The words “develop” and “agreement” clearly indicate that no such agreements have been made yet, and that the constituents must agree on the terms of the agreement.

The faculty’s concern regarding disparity of standards at various institutions is therefore still valid. In order to address this issue, the committee recommends:

- i. That course transfer agreements between IU East and other institutions should only be made after carefully scrutinizing the course’s syllabus, textbook, and assessment plan;
- ii. That the administration makes all possible effort to ensure that a statewide agreement for transfer between courses and or articulation of programs is based on comprehensive standards and assessment of course/program objectives.

b. Implications of the P-16 education roundtable paper.

The P-16 is still being discussed and IU is providing input to the discussion. The committee commends the administration for recognizing the need for asking for “measurable objectives and specific, measurable responsibilities” for each stakeholder in the P-16 process. (Executive summary – IU’s support for the ICHE Plan... Part II, Par. 2.)

However, the committee is concerned about the lack of provisions for students with high-school equivalent diplomas (GED, diplomas from private schools). GED-holders, in particular, make up a large proportion of this region's constituents and of IU East's students. Because the Agreement for Continued Development (of the Regional Campuses of IU and PU) specifies that the regional campuses are responsible to maintain a student body "that is consistent with its respective service area" (Section on Campus Diversity, first sentence of the agreement), the committee recommends that the administration will lobby for clauses that will let IU East continue to serve its constituents in accordance with this agreement.

c. Financial Analysis of Remedial Courses.

The committee does not agree with the conclusion that the remedial courses "drain resources" as is stated in interim VCAA Chang's letter. The committee feels that

- i. The remedial courses are financially sound, and actually offer a significant source of revenue to the university (on the order of \$130,000).
- ii. Remedial courses are part of the work of four-year institutions. It was pointed out that even large research universities (eg, UIUC) offer remediation. George Mathew will conduct a survey of other 4-year institutions to assess their effort in remediation.
- iii. Remedial instruction in Mathematics may be necessary, even if all the stricter admissions standards are implemented, because mathematical skills tend to deteriorate.
- iv. Student Success reports that remedial efforts actually enhance retention of students from the Freshman to the Sophomore level. As a full four-year institution, retention at this level is essential and it would be unwise to drop these services.

It was agreed to review the Student Success statistics, and invite Lanette Young to the next meeting.

d. Final thoughts.

The committee examined the final thoughts of interim VCAA Chang's letter. It was agreed that the existing baccalaureate degree programs should be strengthened. It was, however, found that the administration has not done its part to get these programs on their feet. In particular, the enrollment minimum of 10 students was quoted as a major factor preventing baccalaureate degrees.

Further, the committee feels that the call for increased research and professional development is uncalled for. The faculty of Indiana University East is already engaged in more research than most four-year

institutions are. The committee feels the resources that would be allocated for increased research (as suggested by interim VCAA Chang's workload proposal) would serve the institution, its mission and its constituent's better, if they were applied to instruction at the upper end of the baccalaureate instruction.

The committee adjourned at 10:50 am.

AAA Committee
Meeting May 6, 2003
Minutes

Present:

Markus Pomper, Chair
Joanne Passet,
Debra May,
George Mathew

Absent:

Lynn Hufford
Cheryl Stolle

The committee met at 10:00 am in 200 C Whitewater Hall.

The final version of the draft response to interim VCAA was discussed and approved with minor modifications.

The committee adjourned at 10:30 am.

Appendix B.

Approved version of Academic Standards Policy

Title: The Faculty and the Student
Subtitle: Academic Standards
Section: X-3
Responsibility: Administration and Faculty

Good Standing

The minimum standard for academic good standing at IU is a cumulative grade point average of 2.00, or a C average.

Chancellor's List

The Chancellor's list is tabulated each semester and includes the following:

Full-time: Any student taking at least twelve (12) credit hours and who attains a grade point average of 4.0 in a fall or spring semester.

Part-time: Any student taking six (6) to eleven (11) credit hours and who attains a grade point average of 4.0 in a fall or spring semester.

Dean's List

The Dean's list is tabulated each semester and includes the following:

Full-time: Any student taking at least twelve (12) credit hours and who attains a grade point average of at least 3.50 in a fall or spring semester and who does not qualify for the chancellor's list.

Part-time: Any student taking six (6) to eleven (11) credit hours and who attains a grade point average of 4 of at least 3.50 in a fall or spring semester and who does not qualify for the chancellor's list.

Academic Probation

A student whose cumulative grade point average at the beginning of a semester is below 2.00 will be placed on probation. The student will remain on academic probation until the cumulative grade point average is 2.00 or above. (Passed Faculty Senate 3/4/03)

[Explanation and Suggested Procedure

A probation audit is conducted at the beginning of each Fall, Spring, Summer I and Summer II (6 weeks) term. Depending on the academic calendar, this will be at the beginning of September, mid-January, mid-May and mid-July; the exact schedule is determined by the Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Services in consultation with the Registrar. The timeline for the audit is chosen so that "Incomplete" grades will have turned into "F" if the set time for completion has been expired and so that grade corrections from previous semesters have been made. For this policy, cumulative grade point average (cGPA) shall mean the quotient of Total Grade Points and Total of Graded Hours. Students whose cumulative grade point average is below 2.00 will be placed on

probation. For the interpretation of this policy, the reported cGPA at the date of the audit will determine that a student is on probation. Students will be notified by mail that they are on probation, however, the policy states that a student whose cGPA is less than 2.00 is on probation regardless whether he/she is notified of this fact. The Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Services / Dean of Students is responsible for keeping a record of students who were notified. The letter should explain the consequences of probation and suspension. Students should be urged to seek advising from Academic Advising Center, or the student's academic advisor. (Passed Faculty Senate 3/4/03)]

Academic Suspension

A student whose cumulative grade point average is below 2.00 and who has completed at least 12 credit hours of graded course work while continuously on probation will be suspended. The student may appeal this suspension to the Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee. (Passed Faculty Senate 3/4/03)

[Explanation and Suggested Procedure

A suspension audit is conducted at the end of each Fall and Spring term. The exact date will be determined by the academic calendar, and will be decided by the Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Services in consultation with the Registrar. The date of the audit must be after final grades are processed and long enough before the beginning of the following semester so that student who wish to appeal their suspension can do so before the semester begins. Students will be notified by Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services that they are suspended through certified mail and return receipt. The office of the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services will keep the return receipts. The letter should detail the policy and procedure for reinstatement. The Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services will notify the Registrar who will prevent students from enrolling in courses unless they are reinstated. (Passed Faculty Senate 3/4/03)]

Appeal of Suspension

Students may appeal the suspension to the Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee. Any appeal of suspension must be made in writing and prior to the beginning of the semester in which the student wishes to enroll, according to a schedule established by the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services/ Dean of Students. The appeal should explain any extenuating circumstances that may have hindered academic performance and must offer a clear explanation for further study and schedule plans. The Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee determines the conditions under which the student may re-enroll, depending on the severity of the student's academic deficiency. Students who obtain permission to re-enroll will continue to be on probation. Sanctions may range from affirmation of the suspension to permission be re-enroll. The decision of the Admissions and Academic Affairs committee is final. (Passed Faculty Senate 3/4/03)

Reinstatement

A suspended student may petition to be reinstated after at least one spring or fall semester has passed. The petition for reinstatement must be made in writing and prior to the beginning of the semester in which the student wishes to enroll, according to a schedule

established by the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services/ Dean of Students. The petition should explain any extenuating circumstances that may have hindered academic performance and must offer a clear explanation for of further study and schedule plans. The Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee determines the conditions under which the student is reinstated, depending on the severity of the student's academic deficiency. Sanctions may range from affirmation of the suspension to permission to be reinstated. The decision of the Admissions and Academic Affairs committee is final. A student who is reinstated will continue to be on probation. (Passed Faculty Senate 3/4/03)

[Explanation and Suggested Procedure

Appeals of suspension and petitions for reinstatement after suspension must be made in writing to the Admission and Academic Affairs committee by way of the Vice Chancellor for Enrollment Services. The appeal (or petition) must specifically state for which semester the student seeks to be reinstated. It must further provide a detailed analysis of the situation that led to the student's poor performance in previous semesters. The student must provide evidence that he/she has taken steps to overcome this situation. It is further expected that students provide the committee with a detailed plan of study for the next academic year.

Students who petition for reinstatement after suspension must do so least one month before the beginning of the semester in which they wish to be reinstated. It is recommended that students also schedule to meet with the Admission and Academic Affairs committee to discuss their plan of study.

Students who wish to appeal a suspension must usually appeal at least 10 days prior to the beginning of the semester in which they wish to be reinstated. The exact time is determined by the Vice Chancellor of Enrollment Services / Dean of Students. In this case, students must submit the petition in writing and must appear before the committee.

In either case, the AAA committee will review the student's appeal and decide on sanctions depending on the degree of the student's academic deficiency. Sanctions may range from permission to be reinstated under probation to upholding of the suspension. The decision of the Admissions and Academic Affairs Committee is final. Regardless of the decision, students may appeal to be reinstated at a later semester. A student will usually not be reinstated if it is not possible to achieve a cumulative grade point average of 2.00 with a total of less than 150 credit hours (i.e., graded hours including transfer work) . If reinstated, the student will continue to be on probation and will be automatically re-evaluated at the next suspension audit. (Passed Faculty Senate 3/4/03)]

Appendix C.

Correspondence with interim VCAA Chang Regarding Community College and Admissions Policy.

From: IU East Faculty Senate, AAA Committee
To: Wendy Chang, Interim Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Cc: Division Chairs, Faculty Senate Agenda Committee
Re: Admissions and Referral Policy
Date: February 21, 2003

Dear Wendy,

The AAA committee acknowledges your request to re-examine the admissions and referral policy of IU East. As you are aware, the jurisdiction for these policies lies with the faculty (Academic Handbook, Sec. VI-1, Article II.1.A.8). Because this decision will have far-reaching consequences for the future of Indiana University East, we will need more information regarding this and related issues.

Articulation Agreements

In recent weeks, the faculty has been informed that various articulation agreements have been signed. The flow of information was informal through motivational speeches given by the chancellor. The exact extent of the articulation agreements has not been fully disclosed yet. It is our understanding that such agreements guarantee the transfer of credit for academic courses between colleges. Because evaluation of transfer credit is a prerogative of the faculty (Academic Handbook, Sec. X-1) such agreements should be made in consultation with the faculty. The committee is not aware that the faculty have been consulted. To be able to evaluate the situation we need answers to the following questions:

1. What is the exact extent of the articulation agreements? Moreover, how recently have the articulation agreements between the colleges been updated to address curriculum changes within the various programs of each? Providing documentation of the agreements between the colleges would be useful as a first step to determine congruency of articulation between the colleges. Please provide us with copies of the documents.
2. If faculty have been consulted, please provide their recommendations.
3. We are in receipt of the agreement between I, Purdue and the ICHE. If there are any other documents pertaining to articulation please provide us with copies of these documents.

Integrity of academic standards and programs

The faculty is particularly concerned that expectations of student work at the developing Community College may not be the same as they are at Indiana University East, i.e., a passing grade at the Community College may not constitute a passing grade here. A mere comparison of course descriptions and syllabi cannot be assumed to guarantee this comparability.

NCA accreditation of the Community College does not guarantee this comparability either, because the accreditation process evaluates only the internal assessment process. That is, the NCA only determines whether the Community College assesses its own learning objectives. The NCA does not consider how the expected learning outcomes compare with other colleges.

Further, accreditation mostly considers degree programs as opposed to individual courses. Students may therefore take courses at the Community College that are not required for the Community College's associate degrees, and transfer these courses to IU East, where these courses are required for our degree programs. Mastery of learning objectives in those courses is therefore not considered in the NCA accreditation.

Of further concern, specific to our professional programs, is the inability to apply the constructivist approach, with continuous application of theory, at increasingly sophisticated levels of comprehension and practice. Preparation and application may lack continuity and comparable assessment to assure the preparedness and professional suitability of transferring students.

The faculty's questions are the following:

1. What steps have been taken to insure the comparability of grades between the Community College and IU East? For courses in which a large number of transfers is expected, the committee would like to examine the syllabus, the list of topics, the expectations of student learning outcomes and the associated assessment plan. In particular, we would like to convince ourselves that the expectations are assessed and the mastery of the expectations is adequately reflected in students' grades.
2. How does the Community College supervise its instructors, what is the academic preparation of its instructors and how is the course assessment being conducted?
3. What steps will be taken to insure the integrity of professional programs? Courses for these programs must be specially examined so that accreditation from the professional organizations will not be jeopardized. Have any agreements been made which allow two-year degrees from the Community College to be substituted as the first two years of a Baccalaureate degree at IU East?

Institutional Mission

The primary institutional mission of Indiana University East is to provide quality instruction at the Associate and Baccalaureate level . The faculty has the legislative power to change this mission (Academic Handbook, Sec. VII-1, Article 2.1.B.1). Current administrative policy, however, impedes this mission: Upper-division courses are routinely cancelled due to low enrollment (<10). Consequently, Indiana University East loses students to other institutions that offer such upper-division courses and our constituents do not view us as the provider of baccalaureate degrees. Because a change in admissions policy will reflect a shift of emphasis from lower-division to upper-division courses, the faculty suggests that the administration changes its policy for upper-division courses.

The faculty strongly supports the mission of Indiana University East as a full four-year college. It is the desire of the faculty to continue to offer all college level courses to students who wish to pursue a 4-year degree.

Currently, students have the option of taking developmental courses at Ivy Tech State College. Despite the fact that courses at Ivy Tech are offered at a much lower cost to students, many still choose to take these courses here. The faculty would like to continue to offer this choice to the community. To our knowledge, the agreement, between the ICHE, IU and Purdue regarding the Community College only specifies that the Universities offer no more that 3 credit hours of remedial English and no more than 6 credit hours of remedial Mathematics. With this agreement, the ICHE has affirmed the role of the regional campuses in providing remediation. It is the faculty's interpretation of this document that we are currently in full compliance with the ICHE. Please inform us if there are agreements or documents that contradict our interpretation.

Budgetary Implications

A change in the admissions and referral policies will have severe budgetary consequences for IU East. The faculty have legislative and consultative authority in budgetary issues (Academic Handbook, Sec. VII-1, Article 2.1.B.8). The committee asks you to provide us with the administration's plans as to how such shortfalls in revenue will be absorbed.

To make a sound decision, we need an analysis of projected enrollment changes, and their budgetary implications under the assumption that were referring a potentially significant number of students at the developmental and 100-level to the Community College. We are aware that this is not an easy task, since tuition revenue in the affected courses alone will not give adequate figures. A change in student credit hours will affect the funds the University obtains from the state. We suggest using last year's enrollment and financial data as a basis to give scenarios for various referral policies.

A change in referral policy will negatively affect enrollment in all courses. Please consider that students who are referred to the Community College system will not only affect enrollment in developmental courses, as they are likely to take an entire course

load at the Community College, rather than just the remedial courses. We would also like to remind you of the past experience: Students who were referred to other institutions for remediation did not return to complete their degree at IU East.

The decrease in revenue will almost certainly not be absorbed by the reduction of adjunct salaries and course-related expenses. For each scenario, we would like to see the administration's plan for how the budgetary shortfall will be absorbed. In particular, we would like to get an understanding in which way academic services (teaching, research, library, academic advising, and tutorial services) as well as non-academic services (cultural events, student life, athletics, pro-bono community services) will be affected.

Split Enrollment

You have informed the committee that students can obtain full financial aid while simultaneously being enrolled in Community College and Indiana University East courses. The faculty was interested to learn about such arrangements. In the past, students who even tried to enroll dually in two IU campuses faced major administrative hurdles and were often denied full financial aid. In order to better advise our students it would be helpful if you could provide us with the details.

Immediate Action

The faculty is supportive of a concerted supervision of courses common to the Community College and Indiana University East. We feel that such an effort is a good way to ensure quality of instruction and the integrity of academic programs. We ask you to inquire about the model of cooperation used in Kokomo and to contact the appropriate officers at the local Community College to determine feasibility of such a project.

Once the AAA Committee has received your response to our questions, we will begin to reexamine this topic. It is our expectation that several of the items that would need to be worked out would need to be referred to either the HFA or NSM division and their faculty. Provided all of our significant questions are answered and that the academic divisions most affected by any change were in agreement, the committee would then be in a position to make a recommendation to the entire IU East Faculty Senate regarding a change in the campus admissions and referral policy.

Sincerely,

Markus Pomper
Chair, AAA Committee

From: Faculty Senate, AAA Committee
To: Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
Cc: Division Chairs, Faculty Senate Agenda Committee
Date: May 27, 2003
Re: Admissions and Referral Policy

Thank you for your memo dated March 24, 2003 re: Articulation Agreements & Academic Standards. The AAA Committee has been considering your concerns and ideas, and has reviewed the documents you attached. Given the passage of HB 1209 and the on-going P-16 Education Roundtable discussion, it is obvious that there are a number of issues about in which the faculty and administration of Indiana University East needs to be involved and which must be thoroughly discussed. Below are our recommendations for action.

First, the Chancellor and Vice Chancellor Young should begin immediate discussions with Ivy Tech Richmond to reach a formal agreement similar (or identical if appropriate) to the agreement between IUPUI and Ivy Tech Indianapolis regarding a formal consortium between the two institutions. We see such a document as being of significant benefit to students at both institutions in terms of their financial aid. In addition, such a document would begin to lay the ground work for increased discussion about the transferability of courses between the two institutions. In the absence of such an agreement, students cannot receive full financial aid if they enroll at both institutions. If such an agreement is reached, the AAA Committee could reexamine IUEast's admissions and referral policies.

Second, it appears that the COMPASS scores for IUEast and Ivy Tech Richmond are not significantly different when comparable courses are examined. That is, the COMPASS score of 71 at IU East for W131 is about the same as the COMPASS score of 70 for Ivy Tech's ENG 111. For mathematics, there is a slightly greater difference (IU East M117 has a COMPASS of 46; Ivy Tech's MAT 111 has a COMPASS of 41). The AAA Committee recommends that the Division Chair of NSM (or her designated faculty) meet with their counterpart from Ivy Tech Richmond to discuss this difference and see if an agreement can be worked out to address this issue. In addition, Ivy Tech Richmond does not currently offer remediation for reading deficiency. Indeed, it appears from Ivy Tech's placement policy that reading deficiencies are addressed together with writing deficiencies in English composition classes. Indiana University East on the other hand offers a focused reading remediation program (EDUC X050). The faculty at Indiana University East have found this to be an important factor in student success, and we recommend that the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (or her representative from the Student Success office) and Ivy Tech's Academic Dean meet to discuss this issue. Until such a time as either the consortial agreement is reached or the state of Indiana legislates all remedial coursework be done at the community college level, the committee considers the continued offering of its remedial courses a necessity in order to serve the needs of its students.

Third, with regard to the P-16 Education Roundtable paper, the campus administration should be raising several issues.

(1) There was no recognition that a considerable number of students, for one reason or another, earn GED rather than regular high school diplomas. There are also a number of students who are either home schooled or who graduate from private high schools for which Core 40 is not an option. In addition, there was no consideration for non-traditional students, i.e., those not entering college straight out of high school, and who have changed their mind regarding their desire to attend college. The draft of the P-16 document would eliminate all state financial aid to all of these students until they had completed 30 credit hours of instruction. Many of these individuals may be those who need state financial aid the most to elevate themselves, and their families, out of poverty. The AAA committee recommends that the Chancellor voice this concern at the university level and/or to local legislators.

(2) While the community college system (assuming that there is one) may be a place where much remediation is offered, there are likely to be a number of students for which different levels of courses in different disciplines is the best fit. For example, mathematics skills decline rapidly when an individual does not take mathematics courses on a continuing basis. Writing skills seem to be lost at a slower rate. It could very well be that a student who passed the New Core 40 requirements might retain their writing abilities well enough to place out of remedial English, but still need to take remedial mathematics. It would seem that there should be some way for IU East to accommodate the needs of these students other than just sending them to the community college. More importantly, the needs and expectations of the students should be examined. This is another area where students would benefit from the consortium agreement mentioned in item one.

Fourth, we strongly recommend that the IU East faculty who are representatives to the STAC meet as often as necessary with either the AAA or the Curriculum Committee (as appropriate) to review the discussions and items being considered by the STAC which could impact the IU East curriculum, students and faculty. In addition, we recommend that the IU East Curriculum Committee be asked to regularly monitor all recommendations of the ICHE with regard to HB 1209 and especially those items dealing with parts 15 (developing statewide transfer of credit agreements for courses taken most frequently by undergraduates) and part 16 (the development of statewide agreements under which associate of arts and associate of science programs articulate fully with related baccalaureate degree programs). We also ask the Chancellor to provide the faculty with draft documents of recommendations before they are sent to the STAC, so that the faculty can provide input in the discussion.

House Bill 1209 charges the STAC to create agreements for articulation of degrees and transfer of courses between the institutions of higher education. It seems clear that this is an ongoing process which is just now beginning. In order to facilitate this process, the AAA committee suggests that divisions begin to create clear and measurable objectives

for courses that are likely to be involved in the discussions of the STAC committee. Having such measurable objectives would allow our campus to contribute positively to the discussion without appearing protective of monetary interests. Once completed, the objectives could also be used in reviewing existing transfer and articulation agreements and would help the administration in arguing for a statewide adoption of course objectives and standards.

Finally, with regard to our overall admissions of freshman students, we recognize the validity of the P-16 statement of the need for adequate preparation at the secondary level as a key factor in success in college. However, we also believe that student success (and by extension student retention and increased graduation rates) is strongly influenced by an individual's freshman year experience. IU East has a significant, on-going, investment in student support services which, given the steadily increasing retention rates, seems to be having a positive impact. We recommend that the campus expand our involvement with freshman students and implement new programs that clearly distinguish the academic experience a student receives from IU East from what they get at a community college while maintaining or expanding the student support functions. For example, in the past the faculty discussed a freshman seminar. Unfortunately the first of these courses were not especially helpful in creating a common experience for all students. The fact that the course was optional and that the only items each section had in common with any other section was the course title did not help. We recommend that someone like IUB's George Kuh or John Gardner of the National Resource Center for First-Year Experience be invited to campus to discuss with the faculty those factors that are important in a student's first year of college. The goal of these discussions would be to motivate the faculty to create a new Freshman Seminar that would help to clearly set IU East apart from the community college and move the campus away from the "IUEasy" stereotype it suffers from.

Indiana University East's mission is (as defined in the Agreement with ICHE) to serve its constituents. In its communication through interim VCAA Chang's letter the administration calls for the implementation of master's programs. The committee is not opposed to graduate programs that are carefully selected to serve the region. However, we feel that the sustainability of such programs must first be demonstrated and that funding and faculty positions must first be secured. As a provider of post-secondary education in our region, we believe that our primary role must be to first be accepted by this community as a provider of baccalaureate degrees. In particular, we cite the NCHEMS report which states that 50% of our constituents read at the two lowest reading levels, i.e., are close to being illiterate. We therefore believe that a strengthening of all services of our university, including remediation and baccalaureate programs is the most urgent need of our community.

Further, the committee feels that the suggestion for increased research and professional development is uncalled for at this time. The committee feels the resources that would be allocated for increased research (as suggested by the recent proposal that was communicated to the workload committee through interim VCAA Chang) would serve the institution, its mission, and its constituents better, if they were applied to instruction

at the upper end of the baccalaureate instruction. The AAA committee therefore reiterates its request that the administration decrease the minimum number of students enrolled in required upper division courses in order for more of those courses to be offered in a more timely fashion.

The members of the AAA Committee look forward to working with the campus administration and to continue to represent the faculty in addressing the changing landscape of articulation and academic standards in Indiana and especially at Indiana University East.

We suggest the following course of action:

- The administration develops a formal consortium between Ivy Tech and IU East.
- The divisions develop measurable objectives for lower-division courses and include these in their assessment plans.
- The administration recommends inclusion of the divisional objectives as criterion for transferability of courses in the discussion of the STAC.
- The curriculum committee re-examines the possibility of a mandatory freshman seminar at Indiana University East.
- The administration continues to market IU East's strength as the primary provider of four-year baccalaureate programs in this area.
- Academic divisions propose a course of study for existing baccalaureate programs which would allow full-time students to finish a baccalaureate degree (without remediation) in four years. This long-range schedule of classes should be made to include evening or weekend classes for part-time students, who should be able to complete the degree in eight years.
- The administration strengthens its commitment to these baccalaureate degrees by reducing the minimum course enrollment for classes on this long-range schedule.
- The AAA or the Curriculum committee reviews the remedial course offerings at the Community College. Once a comprehensive system of remediation and tutoring has been established, the AAA committee and the academic divisions (as appropriate) will revisit IU East's offering of remedial courses, admissions standards, and referral.

Sincerely,

Markus Pomper
Chair, AAA Committee