

## **November Minutes of the Senate Admissions and Advising Committee Meeting**

**Date:** Friday, November 3, 2017

**Present:** Yi Ching, Diane Lemanski, Theo Randall (chair), Jason Resler, Jannike Seward, Ann Grens, and Hong Zhuang

### **Mandatory Summer Bridge Proposal**

A multitude of concerns were expressed by the committee concerning the Mandatory Summer Bridge Proposal. More clarification was needed to obtain committee approval. The primary concerns were as follows:

- Why is it mandatory? How can we enforce this? A mandatory program available only in the summer could be an issue since many students must work in the summer.
- Who will fund this? Would the students be responsible for paying for the courses or will this be a scholarship? If this is a scholarship, would it be better to invest in fully admitted students?
- Who selects the students? In addition to conditional status, what other criteria such demographics, disciplinary interest, select high schools, etc. are considered for selection and why?
- When do the students apply for the program? Students would have to apply several months before the summer to participate. Furthermore, those students who apply early tend to be better students and thus less likely to be conditional students.
- Why is the stipend for instructors so high, especially for such a small class size? Are there additional duties (e.g., mentoring, more rigorous writing scrutiny, etc.) the instructors must perform than usual?
- What specific courses will be taught? Which courses would most benefit these students? Should we focus on math and writing?
- What specific skills will the students gain through their participation in the program?
- Is there any documented evidence that such a program is effective in improving conditionally admitted student academic outcomes?

## Returning Student Proposal

The committee expressed varying responses to ward the proposal depending on the type of returning student:

- The proposal concerning returning students who separated in good standing was a bit problematic. The committee wondered why it is proposed to add another layer of bureaucracy to the reapplication process for students in good standing. There is a concern that this extra layer would hinder readmission. Additional clarification is requested concerning the types of students who left the university in good standing. For example, would we treat a student who left here in good standing who recently did poorly at another school the same way a student who returned in good standing who attended another school and was doing well at that other school (or for that matter has not recently attended another school)?
- For the proposal concerning returning students dismissed by academic dismissal the committee approves the proposal if clear collaboration occurs and application due dates are standardized between the various academic units and offices.
- For the proposal concerning returning students dismissed by student misconduct, the committee approved the proposal as stated.

Both proposals require more clarification for committee approval.