

IFC Academic Affairs Committee - Meeting Notes
Thursday, February 9, 2012 from 11a-1p in UL 2115J

Members Present: Janice Buelow (Nursing), Peggy Daniels (Business), Kathy Johnson (Administrative Liaison, University College), Josh Manlove (Guest), Mary Beth Myers (Ex-Officio, Registrar), Marquita Walker (Labor Studies), Jeff Watt (Executive Committee Liaison, Science: Mathematics), Gina Gibau (SLA: Anthro), Vanchit John, Eric R. Wright (Chair)

11:00-11:05 Welcome, Introductions, Review of Minutes

Eric Wright welcomed the committee and proposed moving the student services discussion to accommodate changing schedules and guest Student Advocate, Josh Manlove. Eric outlined the order of business - introductions followed. Vanchit John will be added to the 1/12 meeting notes. The committee reviewed and discussed the changes and revisions to the Administrative Withdrawal Policy document.

11:05-11:45 Discussion of Student Services Initiative (SSI) Phase I Report

A general discussion ensued; the university anticipates gaining efficiencies by capturing and centralizing certain "back room" functions. The pilot process has been well-received but several potential faculty concerns remain:

- Ask for more information about the methods and assumptions underlying the projected savings (particularly the savings on advising in academic units) – how many FTE in the academic units are needed? (propose ↓ 58 administrative staff)
- Harmonizing Academic Policies – who will make these decisions and how will they be made? Missions/student constituents are different; may be difficult to do this? How deep? Across all units/campuses? Grade forgiveness varies by school.
 - Three Goals:
 1. Customer Service (basis for concerns not well-established)
 2. Introduce best practices
 3. Cost savings
- Veterans Office is critical at IUPUI
- Centralization of IMIR function could create backlog and reduce responsiveness
- University Registrar – we need involvement in selection of a University Registrar
 - Would run back room operations
 - Oversight of university-wide policy
- Consulting firm – no experience with higher education / applying manufacturing logic to higher education
- Impact on online classes?
- Changes in direction seem to be dramatic
- Argument for separate accreditation
- Difference between student services and academic mission
- Concerns about impeding progress on student recruitment, retention, and persistence to graduation
- Over-emphasis on the technologies needed for implementation will increase costs in short-term and may undermine academic mission
 - Training / ramp-up process needs to be considered (E-Text – faculty need longer horizon to get up to speed)
 - Resourced appropriately

11:45-12:40 Review and Discuss the Development of a Campus-wide Policy and Procedure for Handling Medical Withdrawals / Guests: Josh Manlove, Student Advocate Coordinator

Josh Manlove provided an overview of the Medical Withdrawal – if a student drops a class with reasons beyond their control, they are due a complete refund for classes. Josh explained IUB has a different withdrawal process where the student can withdraw from the *university* – at IUPUI, the student would simply just drop all classes to withdraw from courses. Mandating a list of “acceptable medical reasons” as they can be very diverse (ie bereavement, care for a sick family member, pregnancy, etc) could be problematic. Myers suggested a central place/point of contact to receive valid, current, withdrawal information. This could be on the Web, a central office contact, student advocate etc. Josh agreed the decision should be left to the discretion of the instructor but was willing to be the point of contact. Some members voiced a need for just a “generic” umbrella withdrawal policy and not discern whether the need for withdrawal is medical or otherwise.

Eric – could we adapt the veteran services model to reduce overall burden on the student and faculty member? Is Manlove’s office the place to originate these conversations?

Students and faculty seem confused about the medical withdrawal process. Myers explained students can receive a W or an incomplete but who authorizes the document as being a medical withdrawal (assign “W”)? Daniels provided a current student scenario and stated the faculty need to discern what constitutes a medical emergency but feels faculty have a moral obligation to assist students in diverse medical situations. Eliminate the need for students to come to campus and “chase” paper and faculty – develop a process that is easier for students and faculty during sensitive medical situations.

1. What constitutes a medical withdrawal?
2. Can we do via an E-Drop? (until auto “W”) threshold $\frac{3}{4}$ into semester
3. Do we really need an official policy or create a medical withdrawal *procedure*?

The group agreed a procedure is needed more than developing a new policy.

ACTION: Individual units/schools create a point of contact/web page containing contact information, forms, procedures, etc. and forward to Myers and Manlove. This would not be a policy but rather a ***well-defined procedure*** – units would need to communicate this information internally as well. Define a formal policy for those affected after the automatic withdrawal period? Wright requested Manlove draft a process with Manlove being the point of contact and record keeper so the process is administered consistently and fairly across the campus.

Follow up / next meeting: Manlove will bring a draft procedure and Myers’ policy statement.

12:40-12:45 Report from the Undergraduate Admissions Committee (Marquita Walker)

Walker provided an update of conversation regarding undergraduate admissions and retention policies – where to move the lines with GPA issues and different scenarios. Dr. Gary Pike is assessing the impact to different ethnicities and groups if the “predicted” GPA requirement of 2.0 to a 2.1 was lowered and will report at the next meeting. Proposed admission standards were based on 5 years of data. Conversation of shifting resources

from the summer academy to other areas as it has been determined it was not as successful as hoped. Eric explained one of the IFC/AAA roles is to oversee the actions of the UGAC and report back to the IFC as a whole and requested Walker provide a timeline of the UGAC process to report back to Karen Lee for agenda purposes. **Follow up:** This topic will be addressed at the March Academic Affairs meeting.

12:45-12:50 Report on IFC Discussion and Requested Changes to Proposed Administrative Withdrawal Policy

Wright provided an overview of the revisions made to the Administrative Withdrawal Policy at the January meeting and various email conversations. A track-changes document was provided for committee perusal and feedback. Wright asked for the committee's assent to the changes and it was granted.

ACTION: The committee agreed to the proposed revised version of the Administrative Withdrawal Policy and submission to the IFC for a second reading at the March meeting.

12:50-12:55 Report on IFC Discussion of the Proposed Policy Regarding the BGS Program

Gibau's and several other revisions were incorporated into the document – Eric read the revisions for feedback and consideration.

Action: The committee agreed the revised BGS policy will go up for a second read at the March IFC meeting

12:55 – 1:00 Other Committee Matters – The ISG representative has decided not to pursue the issue further

Common Core Curriculum – Watt stated a presentation to the IFC EC is forthcoming – Johnson provided a brief history of the “common ground” approach and implementation at IUB. She has been waiting for further direction and plans to put the issue up for a vote at the IFC EC. Concerns included the common ground approach and PULs have a lot of overlap – the IUB model has already been implemented but adopting the IUB model may affect the Purdue schools.

1:00 - Adjourned