

IUPUI
Academic Policies and Procedures Committee
Minutes
Friday 10/11/02

Minutes

- Minutes of the 9/6/02 meeting were corrected to reflect that the NCA accreditation site visit will occur November 18-20. Approval of the amended 9/6/02 minutes was by consent.

Announcements

- Items from the Chair
 - Appreciation was expressed to CLN for hosting the meeting at the Glendale Mall facility.
- Updates on Credit Transfer Issues
 - Transfer of credits among state supported institutions
 - Statewide Study Groups on transfer of associate degrees in the areas of
 - (1) Business Administration
 - (2) Early Childhood Education
 - (3) Computer Information Systems
 - (4) Electronics Technology
 - Groups will consider course to course articulations, 2 + 2 agreements, and transportability of course work among 4 year institutions.
- Appointment of liaison from Learning Environments Committee to APPC will be made in consistent with a recommendation of the Classroom Scheduling Task Force.
- The Bursar has moved offices out of Cavanaugh to an offsite location. Cashier functions will remain in their current Cavanaugh location.

Academic Affairs Committee Report *Ken Rennels, Chair*

- Ken was unable to attend the meeting, but submitted the following report.
- AAC has not met this fall. The policy on requests for withdrawals after the conclusion of the course that was developed by APPC and refined by AAC was passed by Faculty Council. The Registrar is developing a document for students to submit requests.
- The policy on grade changes that was suggested by APPC will be discussed by AAC and presented to the Faculty Council.
- Questions were raised on whether or not there were issues that need to be addressed. (11/4/02 Note: AAC is constructing a policy on time limits for requesting a grade change that will be presented to Faculty Council.)

Items for Review, Discussion, or Action

- Update on SIS
 - Timelines for implementation of SIS were reviewed.
 - SIS and HRMS environments are currently undergoing merger in preparation for HRMS implementation in December.

- Prototyping for the Student Records, Student Financials, Financial Aid, and Academic Advisement is ongoing and is scheduled for completion in February 03.
 - SIS phased implementation will occur from July 03 through December 04.
 - Academic priority issues in implementation of SIS
 - See appended information
 - IUPUI representatives on SIS related committees
 - SES Academic Priorities Committee
 - Sarah Baker
 - Joe Kuczkowski
 - Miriam Langsam
 - Betty Jones
 - Amanda Zimmerman
 - Academic Advising Local Implementation Team
 - Nasser Paydar
 - Jane Lambert
 - Cathy Buyarski
 - Unit representatives
 - SIS Steering Committee
 - Faculty representative--vacant
 - Functional office representatives
- Update on SES
 - SES will be located at both IUPUI and IUB. Space is in the process of being identified.
 - It is anticipated that SES will be fully operational by June of 2006.
 - **Guiding Principles for SES**
 - Service delivery by the campuses should be enhanced by the functions of the SES.
 - Integration and consolidation initiatives should result in efficiency and effectiveness of the systems, services, and processes.
 - Continuous assessment of (a) operational effectiveness and efficiency, and (b) customer/constituency satisfaction should be an integral part of the management plan.
 - Once the SIS Project is fully completed and the SES is subsequently fully established, the SES should:
 - Develop and implement University-wide standards for PS table maintenance and data fields as well as quality control standards to assure data integrity.
 - Implement University-wide policies and process designs that are integrated with campus-based policies and practices.
 - Contain administrative overhead by avoiding unnecessary redundancies at the University and campus levels.
 - Provide services and support at the University level that enhance campus efficiency and effectiveness.
 - Hiring of individuals to staff SES will be implemented when administrative approval of plan is received.
- Library of FOCUS programs— *Mark Grove, Miriam Langsam, Linda Hill, Kathy Burton*

- Mark Grove contacted APPC members via email with a proposal and is seeking feedback. An update will be provided at the next meeting.
- Changing time frame for adding courses during summer sessions—*Linda Haas, Mark Grove*
 - Mark Grove presented the distillation of the issue as concern about students entering a course after the course has already started. This may be particularly problematic during summer sessions due to the condensed nature of the courses.
 - Waitlist is active through the end of the 3rd day of classes. No signature is required to add a course during days 1-3. Faculty signature is required day 4 thorough 7.
 - APPC members were asked to check with their units to determine if there is concern with the current practice.
- Granting IUPUI credit for Purdue credits by earned by examination—*Mike Donahue*
 - Background- When students on any IU campus earn credit by examination (departmental exams), the credit is posted on the IU transcript. Our policy is to transfer that credit when a student relocates to IUPUI.
 - Currently when anyone outside of the IU system earns credit by departmental exam, IUPUI will not transfer the credit unless the student validates the credit by taking another course in the same department. This includes students who received credit from Purdue.
 - We propose that any student enrolled at any Purdue campus who has departmental credit by examination be granted that credit upon transfer to IUPUI. The student would not need to validate the credit by taking a course within the same department.
 - Discussion of the topic raised several questions, particularly in relationship to credit for foreign language courses.
 - Mike Donahue was asked to gather additional information and report back at the next meeting.
- Credit for military training—*Mike Donahue*
 - Background- Our current policy permits IUPUI to grant a maximum of 8 hours of credit for military training if the student enrolls in a Purdue program. This policy is not causing any difficulty for students; however, if a student enrolls in an IU program, there is no limit to the amount of credit that can be posted. All credits are posted as undistributed and may be in a variety of areas including HPER, SPEA, MIL, SOC, COMM, and many others.
 - This policy is causing serious problems for some students.
 - Many students have accumulated 30+ hours. Some as many as 50+. This causes problems with the 56 hour limit in University College especially when they enter as an undecided major.
 - The most serious problem is the determination of satisfactory progress in terms of financial aid eligibility. The student may have accumulated numerous credits and have made very limited progress towards their degree. (Exception is SCS majors.)
 - To alleviate this problem, I propose the following policy:

- For students pursuing an IU major, a maximum of 15 credit hours for military training will be posted as transfer credit. If a student has the possibility of more than 15 credit hours, the credit evaluator will select as many distributive credits as possible, i.e. listing up to 5 different departments to allow the student and the advisor to use those credits for general education.
 - The policy of unlimited credit for General Studies will not change.
 - Students who wish to receive additional credits for military training will need a memo from their academic adviser requesting additional credits. Adviser must explain that posting such credits may cause future difficulties with financial aid awards.
- After discussion of the issues, APPC members were asked to discuss the issue with their academic unit and be prepared to vote on the proposal at the November meeting.
- Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) process—*Barb Thompson*
 - See <http://www.iupui.edu/~finaid/sapPolicy.shtml> for the SAP policy
 - See <http://www.iupui.edu/~finaid/sap1.shtml> to take the Satisfactory Academic Progress Quiz
 - See <http://www.iupui.edu/~finaid/summerSAPAppeal.doc> for information on the appeal process
 - Barb Thompson reviewed the process of determining that a student is not making satisfactory academic progress. She presented the parts of the policy that are required by federal regulations and those areas in which the institution has discretion.
 - After discussion of the printed materials provided to students concerning Standards of Satisfactory Academic Progress, Miriam Langsam volunteered to provide editing feedback to increase the clarity of the document.
 - Barb and staff members of the OSFA are willing to meet with any academic unit that would like to discuss the Financial Aid Satisfactory Academic Progress (SAP) process.
- Common Liberal Arts, Science, UCOL probation, dismissal and readmission policy—*M Langsam, J Kuczkowski, C Buyarski*
 - Status Report
- Administrative Withdrawal procedures—*Gayle Williams*
 - Approximately 1/3 of the students identified for administrative withdrawal are from units other than University. Gayle will work with a group to generate procedures that will be used in subsequent semesters.
- Questions from General Studies—*Amanda Zimmerman*
 - In relationship to our policy on progress toward a degree: What does the overall university community consider “progress”? Financial aid only deals with credit hours and GPA. Does anyone else look at course enrollment? We have commonly, and informally, defined progress as having a 2.0 and at least ½ of the course enrollment count toward degree requirements.
 - Once a student completes all degree requirements, can the academic unit graduate them without the completion of a graduation application? It occasionally happens that

students want to delay graduation, and therefore do not apply when all necessary requirements are met.

- What is the common practice of other units regarding excessive W's? Are students being released for excessive W's from academic units? Are there distinctions made, as in the case with Science, between old work and recent and continuous withdrawal?

Unit Updates

Admissions	<i>Mike Donahue</i>
Enrollment Center	<i>Jennifer Pease</i>
Bursar	<i>Ingrid Toschlog</i>
Registrar	<i>Mark Grove</i>
Student Life & Diversity	<i>John Jones</i>
Academic Units	<i>Unit Representatives</i>

Other Announcements

Future Agenda Items

- Developing faculty understanding of FERPA—*Mark Grove*
- School of Education evaluation of transcripts for licensure—*Linda Houser--November*
- Faculty Sponsorship of Student for Admission as a Beginning Freshman—*November*
- Proposed New Degree BS in Environmental Science
- Print version of schedule of classes

Meeting Schedule

October 11, 2002	2:00 to 4:00	CLN Glendale Mall
November 8, 2002	1:00 to 3:00	AO 103
December 6, 2002	1:00 to 3:00	UL 1126
January 17, 2003	1:00 to 3:00	UC 2110
February 7, 2003	1:00 to 3:00	UC 2110
March 7, 2003	1:00 to 3:00	AO 103
April 11, 2003	1:00 to 3:00	AO 103
May 2, 2003	1:00 to 3:00	AO 103

Academic Priority Issues in the PeopleSoft Conversion Project

Analysis of the functionality of PeopleSoft, as delivered, in the area of student records has identified a range of significant gaps between what PS can do and the practices and policies supported by our current systems. The PS project team has made broad estimates of the likely costs of creating programs to bridge these gaps (and updating those bridges with each subsequent PS release). Student Enrollment Services and system units and faculty need to evaluate the cost-benefit issues entailed in bridging each gap. Unless truly minimal-cost solutions are engineered as we become more familiar with the PS structure, funding for changes will not exist within the SES budget, and there will ultimately be impact on campus service units and academic unit budgets. The new SES Academic Priorities Committee will serve as a clearinghouse for these discussions.

A partial list of functionality and other related issues appears below; these include issues with direct impact on policy, and issues that concern practice norms and service quality.

1. **Grade Replacement** (FX & similar policies). PS calculates academic standing, probation, etc., at the *institutional* (all-IU) level. It can accommodate grade replacement policies and course repeat rules, but not multiple policies by campus or by schools/programs on a campus. Policies in this area are a faculty prerogative, and IU has a tradition of campus autonomy with unit variation. It is not yet clear how high the cost of modifying PS in this area will be, but it does not appear to be low.
2. **Pass/Fail**. At present, the P/F status of course enrollees is by policy not revealed to instructors. In PS this status is displayed. The cost of modifying PS to fit policy does not appear to be high.
3. **Waitlist**. PS assigns students to course waitlists on the section level, rather than the course level, meaning that students cannot be flexibly waitlisted within a multi-section course, or be automatically assigned to newly opened sections. The cost of modification varies according to the target functionality. Replicating the current Automatic Course Exchange system would be high in cost; the cost of more modest solutions to provide flexibility would vary, but remain significant.
4. **“Raincheck.”** Students now request and receive guaranteed priority enrollment for future semesters when they encounter a closed course required for their programs. PS does not support a raincheck function. The cost of building one is relatively low.
5. **GradPact**. The academic advising function in PS does not allow the option of including GradPact benchmarks at the time of degree audits, which is an essential feature of GradPact policy implementation. It would be possible at significant cost to develop features that would include GradPact benchmarks on all degree audits, but not to retain the option of including or excluding them.

6. **Midterm Reports.** PS does not deliver midterm grade reports, other than deficiency reports. The cost of developing a midterm report capability does not appear to be high.

Grade Context Report. PS functionality will not allow the production of grade context reports, such as those mandated by BFC policy. The cost of replicating this functionality is likely to be quite high.

7. **Course Numbering.** The logic in PeopleSoft is not configured precisely the way our current systems are. To get the most functionality out of PeopleSoft, it would be optimal for us to consider using a slightly different course numbering structure. For example in PeopleSoft, ENG W131 could become one of the following: ENG 131; English-W 131; ENG 131W. Any of these configurations would allow us to optimize the logic embedded in PeopleSoft, but if we insist that it remain exactly as is, some other desirable functionality in the software will not work and represent a substantial cost.

8. **General Comments.** Working through this implementation brings to the surface a number of issues that impact faculty policy and lay bare some academic policies that may serve academic units well, but also raise questions about the extent any one campus is really an institution, or whether we are a confederation of separate small colleges held together by a common payroll system. In addition, questions become obvious about the impact of our policies on students. For example, many campuses and academic units on the large campuses, as well as system schools like SPEA may have different policies about how taking classes over again how they count in a GPA. PeopleSoft does not automatically adjust for repeat rule policies on each campus or academic unit. Thus, if a student changed majors three times in one day in three different schools or colleges, he/she could have three different official GPAs. There are a host of these kinds of issues we will continue to deal with. We will also continue to deal with the issue of the ability in the first 2-4 years of each campus/academic unit being able to make requests for policy changes that have to be reflected in the PeopleSoft product.

Faculty Sponsorship of Student for Admission as a Beginning Freshman (Draft 6/6/02)

“Each campus at its discretion may admit a student on a probationary basis and/or through faculty sponsorship.” Academic Handbook 1997, p 115

An individual who has been denied admission to IUPUI based on academic performance in high school or performance on the GED can be conditionally admitted as a beginning freshman if a full time tenure track faculty member assumes the responsibility for sponsorship of the individual. This sponsorship is available in exceptional circumstances as determined by the faculty member. (This policy does not apply to individuals who have been denied admission for reasons other than prior academic record, who have been previously enrolled at IUPUI and who have been dismissed, who have been dismissed from another IU campus or other academic institution, or who are attempting to transfer to IUPUI.)

An individual who is conditionally admitted via faculty sponsorship will be required to agree to comply with the stipulations for admission as determined by the individual's faculty sponsor and academic advisor. At a minimum, the individual will be required to

- Meet with the faculty sponsor monthly during the semester.
- Achieve a minimum GPA of 2.0 to enroll in the subsequent semester.
- Enroll in no more than 9 credit hours.

If the individual successfully completes the stipulations in the admission contract, the individual can enroll in the subsequent semester. Failure to comply with the stipulations in the admission contract will result in the student being dismissed. The Director of Admissions will specify the stipulations for readmission.

Requests to review the stipulations for admission and readmission should be directed to the Executive Director of Enrollment Services.

Each year, the Executive Director of Enrollment Services will report to the Dean of the Faculties and to the University College Admissions Committee on the number of individuals who have enrolled on a sponsored basis and the success of those individuals.

Note: A faculty member can only sponsor one individual per semester. The faculty member is responsible for overseeing the academic progression of the individual in partnership with the individual's academic advisor.