

Illinois State University

ISU ReD: Research and eData

Academic Senate Minutes

Academic Senate

Fall 10-9-1991

Senate Meeting, October 9, 1991

Academic Senate
Illinois State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes>



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

Recommended Citation

Senate, Academic, "Senate Meeting, October 9, 1991" (1991). *Academic Senate Minutes*. 585.
<https://ir.library.illinoisstate.edu/senateminutes/585>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Academic Senate at ISU ReD: Research and eData. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ISU ReD: Research and eData. For more information, please contact ISUReD@ilstu.edu.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

October 9, 1991 .

Volume XXIII, No. 4

Call to Order

Roll Call

Approval of Minutes of September 25, 1991

Chairperson's Remarks

Vice Chairperson's Remarks

Student Body President's Remarks

Administrators' Remarks

ACTION ITEMS:

1. Approval of Administrative Affairs Committee Recommendation for Two Senate Representatives to Honorary Degree Selection Committee
2. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Probation/Reinstatement Changes
3. Approval of Rules Committee Recommendations for Appointments to External Committees
4. Election of Students to Athletic Council
5. Approval of Graduate Student Member to Council for Teacher Education

INFORMATION ITEM:

1. Faculty Affairs Committee Proposals for University Review Committee Changes in ASPT Handbook

Communications

Committee Reports

Adjournment

Meetings of the Academic Senate are open to members of the University community. Persons attending the meetings may participate in discussion with the consent of the Senate. Persons desiring to bring items to the attention of the Senate may do so by contacting any member of the Senate.

ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

(Not Approved by the Academic Senate)

October 9, 1991

Volume XXIII, No. 4

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chairperson Engelhardt called the meeting of the Academic Senate to order at 7:05 p.m. in the Circus Room of the Bone Student Center. He explained that Chairperson Schmaltz was ill this evening and in his absence he would chair the meeting.

ROLL CALL

Secretary Jan Cook called the roll and declared a quorum present.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 25, 1991

XXIII-12 Motion by Senator White (Second, Hesse) to approve the Minutes of September 25, 1991.

Corrections to Academic Senate Minutes of September 25, 1991:

Senator Walker: Page 30, addition of some words to the third paragraph: "Right now, in order to bring in years applied toward tenure, you must bring in three years. If you elect to bring in any tenure, you must bring in three years applied toward tenure. The proposed change would allow faculty to bring in just one or two years."

Senator Ken Strand: Page 26, paragraph 5, should read: "I can't let this one get by. It doesn't make sense to me that a student with a percentile rank of 76% and an ACT test score of 5 has a .5 probability of graduating."

Page 27, paragraph 4: "While I realize the limitations of the ACT and other tests, as well as percentile rank, the .5 response to Senator Young's question doesn't make sense to me, and suggests weaknesses in the study or in the interpretation of the results."

Senator Zeidenstein: Paragraph at the bottom of the page, strike the word "not." "Does it mean that a program having a standard higher than 2.00 will not remain that way?"

Mr. Snyder: On Page 27, at the bottom, Senator Razaki asked two questions, but only one response is recorded. The answer to the first question: "Can we remove them from the major?" is "No." The answer to the second question "Once they are an Accounting Major, it is their choice to remain an accounting major?" is "Yes."

Senator Collier: On Page 31, my remarks should follow Senator Tuttle's question.

Motion to approve the minutes of September 25, 1991 (White/Hesse) carried on a voice vote.

VICE CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Vice Chairperson Engelhardt had no remarks.

STUDENT BODY PRESIDENT'S REMARKS

Student Body President Romney Ruder had no remarks.

ADMINISTRATORS' REMARKS

President Wallace, Provost Strand, Vice President for Business and Finance Alexander, and Vice President for Student Affairs Gurowitz had no remarks.

ACTION ITEMS

1. **Approval of Administrative Affairs Committee Recommendation for Two Senate Representatives to Honorary Degree Selection Committee**

Senator Comadena, Chair of Administrative Affairs Committee: This request came from Dean Aloia of the Graduate School for a student senator and a faculty senator to serve on the Honorary Degree Selection Committee. The Honorary Degree is awarded to a person who has achieved distinction at the state or national level. This committee begins their work right away and this is something they would like to have the committee composition formalized as soon as possible. That is why we have asked the Senate to act on it this evening. Both the student senator and the faculty senator have been contacted prior to the meeting and have agreed to serve on this committee. We ask that the Senate approve this recommendation.

XIII-13 Motion by Senator Comadena (Second, Shimkus) to approve Administrative Affairs Committee Recommendation for two Senate Representatives to Honorary Degree Selection Committee carried on a voice vote.

Honorary Degree Selection Committee:

Faculty Senator: Sandra Zielinski, Theatre
Student Senator: Bartt Stevens

2. Academic Affairs Committee Proposal for Probation/ Reinstatement Changes

Senator Ritt, Chair of Academic Affairs Committee, introduced a motion for Senate approval. Senators received at their places a copy which is labeled "Draft 2." The contents of that single page with the exception of the bracketed parenthesis directly under Implementation, is the motion that the Academic Affairs Committee has approved in the hopes that the Senate will also approved this as a University Policy in the area of admission standards, selection criteria, and universal grade point standard."

XIII-14 Motion by Ritt (Second, Stearns) to approve the following policy:

ADMISSION STANDARDS, SELECTION CRITERIA, AND UNIVERSAL GRADE POINT STANDARD.

1) The high school rank/test score component of qualification for regular admission will be designed to include only those students for whom the experience of the University indicates a probability of program completion that is .4 or greater.

2) Academic departments, in consultation with College Deans, may establish, for admission to the University and to department programs, supplemental criteria. These may include prerequisites, required levels of previous academic performance and required levels of test scores.

3) The 2.00 grade point average is established as the undergraduate standard for minimum performance in admission of transfer students, admission of reentering students, probation, reinstatement, continuation in the major, and graduation.

For entry to programs that do not impose supplemental admission criteria, the 2.00 grade point average is established as the undergraduate standard for either change or declaration of major.

4) These policies shall not be interpreted to prevent the University from denying or postponing admission in order to comply with target enrollment objectives.

EXCEPTIONS:

a) Students excluded by 1), above, may be admitted under programs designed for athletes, minorities, students with special talents, as well as others on a case-by-case basis. For these students, permission from the department is required for admission to a departmental program. The Provost, or designee, will, at the conclusion of each enrollment period, notify the Senate Academic Affairs Committee of the number of exceptional admissions, by category.

b) If a grade point average higher than 2.00 is required for either admission to Professional Practice or for external certification, this higher grade point average may be used as a standard for continuation in the program, provided it is no higher than the grade point average required for program admission.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The University will include a description of the implementation of this policy in the Undergraduate Catalog. Departments deciding to introduce or change supplemental criteria, or to utilize Exception b), are expected to give timely notice to the Provost or designee.

Changes in the high school rank/test score criteria, based upon analysis of student success rates, must be reviewed by the Senate Academic Affairs Committee before they are published.

Senator Ritt: This copy that you have in front of you is almost identical to the draft that was put in your packets with the following changes. In sentence one of paragraph one, instead of excluding students with a probability of program completion less than .4, we now admit only students for whom the probability of program completion is equal to or greater than .4. In paragraph four, there is a change in word order which does not substantively change the meaning of the sentence. Those are the only changes which have been made. As you know, we had an information session on this last meeting, and the committee set before itself two tasks. One task was to put the proposal into a form which was suitable for legislation, and preferably limited to one page. A second task was to include as part of the legislation the results of many of the comments made at the information session. It is our judgment that most of those comments have been addressed in this revised legislation. The attachment is the catalog copy. The Academic Affairs Committee, with the agreement of Dr. Roy Austensen, agreed that the implementation of the program and these policies is the responsibility of the

Provost's Office. Consequently, our vote in favor of this policy does not necessarily indicate approval of this catalog material. We think that the best way to handle that is to let the Provost's Office have the responsibility of implementing the policy. Of course, in the month or two between now and the time the catalog goes to press, the Provost's Office would be receptive to any suggested changes in grammar or any discussions as to whether these catalog changes do in fact implement the policy. That is not what we are asking the Senate to vote on this evening. We also take into account the fact that there have been other policies which have been approved by the Senate, in particular, the general enrollment management policy that the President asked us to approve about a year ago which states certain target enrollment objectives for the University over the next five year period. The university has already through the planning processes of the university started to implement those changes and we make sure in this particular document, in paragraph four, that those policies are to continue. The committee approved of this legislation unanimously. Mr. David Synder is on my left tonight and Dr. Roy Austensen is in the audience and with the Senate's consent will participate in the debate as we see necessary. I now yield the floor.

Senator Razaki: I will re-ask a question that I asked last time, just to be sure. If a student is admitted into a major, then no matter what their performance is, as long as they are above a 2.0 GPA, they stay in that major.

Mr. Snyder: As long as they are a 2.0 or above, they can stay in that major.

Senator Razaki: On those grounds, I very strongly object to this policy. It seems you are punishing the excellent programs in the departments of this campus by forcing them to retain students who do not meet their requirements after they have been initially selected to stay in that department. You are punishing excellence by forcing them to lower their standards.

Mr. Snyder: My answer to that is that the standards are being moved from the end of the program on graduation to the beginning of the program, the admissions stage. The quality of the student is determined at the time admissions as opposed to the time of graduation, thereby allowing students to remain in the program through graduation, regardless of their grade point average.

Senator Razaki: Then your point is that you cannot make a perfect prediction about the future at the time of admission. This is not a perfect predictor of a student's performance at this university in the future. I personally feel that it is

wrong to move the standards forward rather than sometime later, because a student's performance can improve and it can certainly decline. I am in the accounting department and our students take the CPA examination that is uniform all over the nation and those statistics are published and we are compared on the basis of those. We are in a state with the University of Illinois and Northern Illinois University which both have very distinguished programs and as it is we lose some of the best students in the state to those institutions. If this policy goes into force and our standards decline further and our CPA passing rate declines further, we will be in a much worse comparative position.

Mr. Snyder: I would disagree with that for the reason that from the aspect of marketing a university to prospective students, we find that one of the least attractive elements is the fact that students may be removed from the major program regardless of their entering qualifications. We have admitted students with very high qualifications who for a whole variety of reasons totally unrelated to their academic ability fall below that grade point average and are removed from the program. Students who are removed from the program are basically those in the "boat people" category and they either continuously attempt to get back into the program by raising their grade point average or else they are forced to select another program. The point that I am making is that students have fluctuating grade point averages. If we establish the qualification at the time of admission, it is my belief, and I think it is carried out by the research that we have done on this that the students have a better probability of graduation than students who are admitted under the current standard and then forced out of the program if they don't continue to meet the standard.

Provost Strand: May I add a supplemental comment to Mr. Snyder's reply. I believe that as Mr. Snyder has indicated, there are examples where departments have been able to identify criteria which are, for the most part, guaranteed to insure success with the program. Those criteria have to be refined over time, but those criteria can be established at the front end of admission to the program. Other institutions have done that and we have some programs here that do that. The other point that Mr. Snyder referenced which is fairly problematic is that we do have some students who are in good standing at the institution and have completed all the course requirements in the major and never earned a grade below C in the major, and yet they can't graduate from that major and receive a degree. That I think puts a student in an untenable situation and puts the university in the precarious situation of denying graduation to that individual.

President Wallace: I think we are confusing a number of very important elements. We first of all have a definition of the quality of students entering the program. We also have the quality and rigor of instruction and expectations by the faculty within the department. We have the quality or performance of the student, and the question of what does a C grade mean? If university policy is that 2.0 is going to be required for graduation, how do we defend eliminating a student from a program by the individual departmental discipline deciding that 2.2 or 2.0 is not a passing grade. I think all those elements need to be sorted out in this question. I think what we are saying that if passing is 2.0, then we should be defining what a 2.0 grade point average is in the discipline, what a C is, and then regroup instruction and the faculty expectations to follow that.

Senator Sadeghian: My question goes to the first point: "regular admission will be designed to include only those students for whom the experience of the University indicates a probability of program completion that is .4 or greater." How do you calculate a .4 probability of completion?

Senator Ritt: The wording "probability of program completion" is of course something which is almost impossible to determine. That is why the wording was carefully done. All that we can do, and all that the university does is look at a large group of students, see what the parameters were (what their high school rank test score was) and of the number of students in that classification and the numbers of students who completed the program, and if that ratio is greater than .4, then they assign a probability to that. Now this is not something to which one applies statistical tests. It is an empirical study, and my own feeling is that as long as it is something which is continually monitored, it is as good as any other method of doing it. There might be others who would disagree, but it is probability on an empirical scale -- that is if you toss a coin a hundred times and it comes up 30% heads, you assign a probability to that coin of coming up heads of .3, and if you take the same coin and toss it a thousand times later, and that changes, then your experience has changed.

Senator Sadeghian: You are basing your recommendation on arbitrary numbers. Only students who have a .4 probability of graduation can attend. Why is this so arbitrary?

Senator Ritt: The definition of probability is arbitrary. What we are doing is not arbitrary. What we are doing is a very definite process. We are looking at a pool of students (5,000 or 6,000) and we are looking at the empirical statistics

of what happened with this particular group of students. That is all you can do in prediction.

Senator Sadeghian: Then you aren't going to initiate the .4?

Senator Ritt: You look at the student's high school rank, in quartiles, and their ACT scores, and in each of these clumps they count the number of students who got through the program and divided by the total number of students. That is what is meant by "the experience of the University indicates a probability of program completion that is .4 or greater." That is what empirical probability is.

Senator Baer: I would like to point out what I consider to be some inaccuracies in the wording in point b under exceptions, where you identify professional practice or for external certification. I think the first thing I want to ask is what do you mean by professional practice?

Senator Ritt: What I think we mean by professional practice is that we have a large number of programs within the University which require either an internship program or supervised practicum. In those supervised practica, there are generally grade point requirements in order to qualify for those practica. Or, there are grade point averages which are imposed by the agency which employs the students.

Senator Baer: Do you consider student teaching to fall under that category?

Senator Ritt: Yes.

Senator Baer: One of the problems there is that professional practice is indexed in the undergraduate catalog, therefore is defined as being a program of cooperative education or internship. I think that needs to be more specifically defined. The second thing is external certification. If you are talking about the 2.5 GPA being required to do student teaching, I don't think that is required by any external certifying agency. It is a suggestion by NCATE that a student meets that 2.5 GPA. You can achieve certification without being accredited by NCATE. I am not objecting to 2.5 GPA, but I am saying that it is not accurate. The State of Illinois does not require a 2.5 GPA to student teach. ISU has done that internally to fulfill what they consider to be NCATE standards. Is that not correct? Even when you get the NCATE standards, although they identify a 2.5 GPA in the major or in effect, your whole university program, it also states that you could actually meet that standard without meeting each one of those criterion. I think we need to be very careful about what we say here. To the best of

my knowledge as it relates to education, there is no external certification agency that requires a 2.5 GPA. The State does not.

Senator Walker: Do we need to have the Provost verify that?

Provost Strand: I will speak to that point. The NCATE accreditation requires, as Dr. Baer has indicated, a grade point average in excess of that required for graduation. What has occurred over time is that since student teaching is one of the culminating experiences of a baccalaureate degree, unless the student has a grade point average that approximates the expectations at graduation you could run the risk of being eligible for student teaching, complete student teaching successfully, but not be eligible for graduation. That is the linkage alluded to, although it is not specified in the publication.

Dr. Roy Austensen: This statement was put in to protect NCATE accreditation.

Senator Baer: It is not a matter of being satisfied, I think you have to be accurate. I think you have to define a little more specifically what professional practices are because if those two in the catalog that are identified as professional practices and are not going to apply to this particular exception, then I thought that ought to be understood before it is passed. There may be other external certifying agencies outside of education that require other grade points, I can't speak for them. All I am saying is if there are, you need to keep that in there. But you also need to add something to the effect that in order to keep program accreditation, the GPA needs to be 2.5.

Dr. Roy Austensen: The purpose of this exception was to allow for a student having a higher GPA than 2.0 to participate in external accreditation or for certification.

Senator Stearns: How about using the terms Professional Practice/Student Teaching and external certification or accreditation. (Friendly Amendment Motion: Stearns/Baer)

Senator Ritt: I would accept that as a friendly amendment.

Senator Stearns: I just received the most recent copy of the state certification manual, and according to page 25, Senator Baer is essentially correct in that NCATE Standards strongly recommend a 2.5 GPA.

Senator Zeidenstein: I want to go back to the point Senator Razaki made. A department in consultation with the College Dean can set its own and higher than University level standards for admission (bottom of paragraph two and at the end of par. B under exceptions "no higher than the grade point average required for program admission.") So, is it a fair statement to say that "being admitted to a program, as a freshman from a high school, that a department can have higher standards than even a university table." Could that be a probability?

Mr. David Snyder: Yes. A department could have higher admission standards than a department minimum and then they would then be above the university minimum of .4.

Senator Zeidenstein: In a second situation, if a student who is already on campus and has a grade point from being an ISU student or transfer student in Department X, and that student wants to be admitted as a major to Department Y, Department Y could have under Paragraph 2, "required levels of previous academic performance and required levels of test scores." Could Department Y, if it chose to, say "anybody transferring to our department has to bring with him or her a 3.0 grade point average." In other words, if you had been in another department or a general student, and for this department, either because we don't like the department you are coming from or just to keep the riff-raff out, we insist that you must have a 3.0 average for admission to our department program. That can be done under this proposal as it now reads?

Mr. Snyder: Yes. And that practice is currently in effect at the University and has been for quite some time. So, there is no change on internal transfers. But this policy does nothing to interfere with that.

Senator Zeidenstein: It codifies it and makes it clear. So it is theoretically possible that a department could even set various grade point standards from other departments of other students that are coming in. Theoretically, they could say if you come from Department A, we want an A- average, if you come from Department B, a B+ average, it is possible, assuming the Dean would go along.

Mr. Snyder: That concern may be a possibility, remote as it might be. Yes, that is a potential. The department would have to monitor that. They are the ones that set the policy, so if they want to have twenty-two various criteria, then they will have to monitor those requirements.

Senator Zeidenstein: All I am getting at is if there are departments that under current policy have a requirement for a B as the minimum graduation requirement, that department could not allow students to graduate with a 2.0 GPA, that department might jack up their admission standards so conceivably high that they feel they have additional insurance that students who come in will fall below the C+, B-, or B average.

Mr. Snyder: As I indicated last time, the standards that they raise their admission to, will be a function of getting enough students in their major and retaining enough students in their major, that if they raise their GPA unreasonably high, they will exclude more students than they want to, which will affect their resources. The experience I have had with this is that departments will select criteria that tend to be a rational balance between true quality and the number of students required to maintain a viable course.

Senator Zeidenstein: There may well be departments where getting high quality students to enter is not a problem. Where they want to maintain the traditional aura of high quality students, this might be one way to do it.....use very high grade point averages for people coming from high school or from other departments.

Senator Cook: I would also like to address Part B under Exceptions, with regard to Professional Practice. My department does have a required practical experience component, usually satisfied through coop and internship. Ninety-seven percent of our students participate in an off-campus coop or internship, and our experience has been that since they must go through a standard interviewing procedure with the prospective employer, students with less than a 2.5 grade point average simply do not pass the interview. We have not put that down as a grade point requirement for that experience. We counsel them in advising that this is going to be the consequence of their interviewing process. I am now concerned that we will have students in that fine section between 2.0 and 2.5 who will not be able to acquire this necessary experience and that we will not be in a position to say in department documentation that in order to acquire that necessary experience, a 2.5 grade point average is expected. This is not assigned by an accreditation agency, it is not consequence of certification, it is a defacto standard laid down by the external employers.

Mr. Snyder: But, isn't that what part of the educational program is all about? When a student comes, there is no guarantee that he or she will achieve that original goal that they have originally sought. A student should be well aware of any standards that are required for moving on into a professional

area. This is true of students who want to attend medical school, they will need a degree in one of the natural sciences, and will have to have a 3.75 undergraduate grade point average in order to qualify for medical school. I see no difference in this type of situation. As long as the student is informed early in their career of what the requirements are, so that the student then has it on his/her shoulders to achieve that standard if that is their goal.

Senator Cook: This is a senior that has a 2.35 and is interviewing all over for a coop and cannot succeed in being hired. I am not saying what will happen after graduation, I am talking about going through the interviewing process to get professional practice experience before graduation. He has 2.35, but one course missing, what do we do with that student? They have met the 2.0 grade point average.

Mr. Snyder: What do you do with the student now?

Senator Cook: We have a 2.5 grade point average graduation requirement which is sufficient that those students will meet the base criteria to go out and perform these interviews.

Mr. Snyder: But a student who comes into your department and cannot achieve the 2.5, you basically wash out of the program?

Senator Cook: That person has known all along from the catalog copy that in order to be retained in the program they need a 2.5 GPA.

Mr. Snyder: I am not sure that this program will either address, correct or remedy or exacerbate that particular situation. If it is occurring now, regardless of what is going on at the university, I think the students will have to take the responsibility for achieving the standards that are in effect for a particular program. I don't think it is the university's position to legislate a standard that is higher than the university graduation standard.

President Wallace: It is the response of people in business and industry that we are turning that around a little bit and saying why is it that you are turning down students that are passing with a 2.35 or 2.4 and is not functional in business. This may be a problem in our grading system.

Senator Cook: The business and industry council of our department did not agree with you when they met Friday a week ago.

President Wallace: They said that 2.5 was not passing?

Senator Cook: They said that 2.5 was what each of them individually considered to be minimal for doing well in their individual operation. This may be a bit of ego on the part of the particular company: "We need people than better than 2.5." However, the requirement is still there.

Provost Strand: I believe that what we are talking about here is trying to make certain that students are fully informed about all of the various requirements that are necessary for admission and graduation. Practicum experiences are part of the programs of 97% of the students. I believe that it will be possible to make a statement in the catalog that most employers require a 2.5 for students to be eligible to be hired into one of the practicum experiences. Catalog language can be utilized for that purpose, just as we anticipate that with course specific admission requirements there will probably be statements in some department writeups that in order for a student who wishes to major in chemistry, for example, to be successful, the student should take more than the minimum course requirements for high school graduation. There are going to be statements like that in the catalog as well. I believe we are talking about truth in advertising, or truth in describing requirements. There are probably other ways outside of this policy statement to accomplish that objective.

Senator Cook: I don't want to see someone stranded short of graduation through having catalog copy literally and then facing the realities of the commercial world and getting stuck.

Senator Ken Strand: I have a few comments that are meant to be constructive, even though they may not sound that way. These comments refer to previously discussed issues, and they pertain to the study upon which the proposed policy was based. First, relative to the study that was performed by John Chizmar, William Gorrell, and Kathy Snyder, I have a copy of this report in front of me, and I realize that other senators don't have that. There is explanation in the report that while logistic regression analysis may have been preferred over ordinary least squares multiple regression analysis, the results utilizing the techniques and typically close enough to one another that the interpretation relative to the study was made with an ordinary least square approach. While admittedly, it would give ballpark figures, as compared to multiple regression analysis, a discriminant analysis would have been more appropriate. Another relatively minor point is that the analysis does not take into account the degree of success that a student has at this institution. The study centers around whether a student graduates or does not graduate, and does not refer to the degree of success that the student attains at ISU.

Now, the last point refers to the question that Senator Sadeghian asked relative to probability of graduation. This also refers to an answer that I received from Senator Ritt at our last Senate meeting when he was asked what is the probability of graduation of a person with a high school percentile rank of 76 and an ACT score of 5, and the response was given that the student would have a .5 probability of graduating from ISU. In looking at the results of the study, I can see where that figure was obtained. The report of the study lists across the columns high school percentile rank in quartiles -- first quartile, second quartile, third quartile, and fourth quartile. Going down the rows are ACT scores, on the bottom 28, above that 27, and up to 12. Unfortunately, 1 through 12 are collapsed into one category. I don't believe this was a good idea. The point was brought up, and unfortunately this and some other probability values are in the important parts of the distribution, for ACT scores of 1-12 and high school percentile ranks of 76-99, there is indeed a .5 probability value of graduation. But, as ACT scores get lower and lower, there are not many cases in the sample. There are fewer numbers to work with. The .5 probability value, on page nine of the report, is based on ACT scores that range from 1-12. I think the .5 probability value is nowhere near in touch with reality because it is based on likely erroneous assumptions and a small sample in the given portion of the ACT score distribution. A much larger sample would be needed to give a valid probability value. But, I think I have an understanding of the difficulties that were involved in the study. I also liked Senator Ritt's previous response that it is just about impossible to deal with this at a precise level. But, I further feel that the probability given two weeks ago was not valid at all. This same kind of problem occurs in other tables in the report of the study. We need a study with a much larger sample size in some of the critical portions of the ACT distribution in order to deal with this more appropriately.

Senator Ritt: How can I possibly disagree with you in this regard. All I can say is that we have a certain amount of experience and that experience leads us to make a certain type of prediction. With this sample size, I don't think that techniques of regression or anything else are particularly appropriate in the areas that we are talking about. All you have is a certain amount of numerical evidence and you have to make a guess. All we can do is see how the students do under this particular model. We would like to be able to predict for particular students that with this particular range of values, 40% of the people just like them are going to graduate. I don't know whether we can make that prediction, and it is something for which we will have to wait until we get more data later.

Mr. Snyder: I also agree with Senator Strand's concern about the study. However, I think that we need to put this into perspective in which we are proposing it. What we do in the admissions process as far as ascertaining the quality and the success of students is imperfect at best. I would say that this analysis gives us a much better opportunity of achieving a higher degree of student success than the current model we have been using which is an arbitrarily selected ACT score. A department can say, "we don't want anyone below a 25." Yet, we can demonstrate that there are instances where a student with a score of 20 had a higher probability of graduation than a student with a 25 ACT score. So, I think that the study gives us a rational model to view student qualifications. I think as Senator Ritt points out, this is not perfect. I am not certain we fully understand where this is going to go, but as we continue with the studies and experience with the model, I would professionally predict that we will see an increase in the quality of students based on this. My professional experience with other institutions having a model similar to this has been better than just ACT scores alone.

Senator Ken Strand: I appreciate your response. I think it should be made very clear that most, if not all, studies of this type are at least moderately imperfect. I would like to know why this probability value of .4 is used as a criterion relative to admission into ISU? I'm sure you have some kind of rationale why the value .4 pops up.

Mr. Snyder: The model is intended to accomplish two things. First, to increase the quality of students based upon the probability of graduation. The .4 was chosen for two reasons. One is that it does allow that increase in quality. As I indicated at the last meeting, it will raise that approximately six more students per admit will have a higher probability of graduation. The second aspect of the study was to determine which of those probabilities would net from the population of high school graduates applying to the University the number of students necessary for ISU to meet its enrollment goals.

Senator Hesse: I think that the University cannot guarantee any student what will happen to him/her outside the university. We can write the best catalog we can with everything pinned down, etc., but we can't say to a student, you will get a \$27,000 a year job when you walk out the door. With the problem of the gray zone of the 2.0 to 2.5 GPA student, I think we are chasing a Camaro by saying we can write catalog copy that is going to solve this. Furthermore, I would be troubled by that kind of philosophy that would say, we will set our academic policy based on our perception of the market-

place outside the university. Secondly, regarding the problem of the 2.0 to 2.5 GPA, departments can control very directly the number of students within the major by being more rigorous with grading in the classes -- so that students who are now getting C's will get D's. If they choose to do so. Again, I am not advocating that, but if departments choose to do so, those means are available. If the problem is that employers have announced that they will not interview anyone with a 2.5 GPA, if that in fact is a minimum requirement for application, then that raises all sorts of questions about the university raising the standards to 2.5. That is a possibility. If on the other hand, it is not an announced policy, but a set of expectations that student must have a 2.5 GPA (Sure, we will interview 2.0 and 2.3 students, but our perception is that 2.3 students will not work very well in our organization.) Again, I think it is a matter of how we work to raise the quality of students that we are getting in the first place. I think that we need to sort out these things, and not let the work world outside the university dictate academic policy. I think that this proposal is a very good compromise.

Senator Sadeghian: Is it your objective to weed out overcrowding in departments and fill underrepresented departments? Is that the objective of this?

Mr. Snyder: No. That will be an effect of this, but the purpose of the proposal is to raise the qualifications of the students entering the university.

Senator Sadeghian: Are we doing anything as far as graduation requirements, or is this just for entrance requirements?

Mr. Snyder: There are three requirements here. Number two deals with establishing selection criteria for admission to the programs. The first one basically is for Freshmen admission requirements. Proposal three establishes a minimum 2.0 GPA for graduation. The goal of these is to increase the quality level of students and to shift the standards from graduation to admission to the program based on criteria that departments already recognize as being particular to success in their specific department. A third proposal is to eliminate the "boat person" syndrome that has been occurring at the University.

Senator Sadeghian: May I ask for a five minute recess before we vote on this? I would like to discuss it with other students.

Vice Chairperson Rob Engelhardt: If there are no objections, you could do that.

Senator Tuttle: I would endorse Senator Hesse's remarks. I would say that I support the proposal for all the same reasons. I think number two gives the departments a lot of controls early on and then they can determine along the way whatever students are not performing, and maybe grades can be evaluated. The policy seems fair to students and gives the departments control over their admissions. Therefore, I will vote for it.

Senator Camp: My remarks are coming from a student's point of view. From what I understand, individual departments will manage their own enrollment. Because they have done this, I think they should be able to set their own enrollment standards to help manage better. For instance, I am in the College of Business and tend to hover around a 2.5 GPA, but if in my last semester before graduating, I were to drop to a 2.0, that would put me in an awkward position. I wouldn't be able to graduate, while still being in the university. However, if I was to hover around a 2.0 and then go up to a 2.5 during my last semester, I would be in the same awkward position. The effect is the same, the standard is the same, but at a different level.

Senator Walker: I would like to speak in favor of the proposal, and encourage you to vote yes. I think the situation Senator Cook brought up would be taken care of by wording in the catalog. I think that the statistics Ken Strand referred to about the 76% percentile ranking with an ACT score of 5, the likelihood of that occurring is very low. I do have a question about the last paragraph under Implementation on page one. Does the fact that any committee of the Senate receive a report require them to give a report to the full Senate?

Senator Ritt: I don't think they are required to, however, I think they would be foolish not to.

Senator Walker: I would offer as a friendly amendment, the addition of the words: "and give a report to the full Senate" after Academic Affairs Committee. (Second, Stearns)

Motion accepted by Ritt.

Senator Stearns: I have a question regarding practical application under exceptions (b). As I read that, it appears to me that if a department has a 2.5 admission requirement, such as the College of Education undergraduate programs have, then they would be well advised to keep that or they would be required to lower it to a 2.0 grade point average.

Mr. Snyder: Yes, that would be the correct interpretation of that. What it is stating here is that if there is an end expectation that the department has to achieve, then they should set the admission requirement such that the student does not come in so much lower that they cannot achieve that end expectation.

Senator Zeidenstein: A thought came to my head in listening to Senators Strand and Wallace as they talked about students who can't graduate. It occurred to me that when your study was done some two years ago, you are proposing in the policy to remove a variable for the future that was present in the past. How many departments or programs had at the time the study was made a grade point requirement above 2.0 which accounted for how many students not graduating, and therefore affected your findings in that study in the past. Now, you are basing your future suggestions on that study, and yet you are removing a variable of a grade point average of higher than 2.0. There are many factors other than high school rank, and ACT scores. How many students who did not graduate, did not graduate because they were above 2.0, but not high enough above 2.0. Should that not be a factor to be monitored in the future.

Mr. Snyder: I sense that you may be correct, particularly as we approach the end of the study which occurs with students five, six or seven years after their initial admission. I think there is potential for some of those students who perhaps have been eliminated and did not graduate. However, many of those students did not leave the university but went from one major to another before they were able to achieve success. I don't know that we could track that through the process. I expect that it would have some impact on this. This is an imprecise study for this very reason, there are so many variables that we cannot put a tag on.

Senator Razaki: I have a philosophical disagreement with the whole premise of this policy. That seems to be that the University was founded to graduate people -- not to educate them, not to let them get gainful employment, but just to give them a piece of paper. I disagree with Senator Hesse. I wish that he would carry out a large survey of students on this campus and ask them why they chose to come to this university and why they are pursuing an education, if it is not to get gainful employment. If the basic purpose for students coming to this university is to get employment later on, then we should take that into account and help them in getting that employment. There is no point in just giving them a piece of paper and saying go in peace.

Senator Alexander: I don't normally engage in discussions on academic issues. However, there are a couple of things that the program is designed and implemented on the basis that normal students will not be accepted. There are grades that are given. If we were all going to be A students, then there would only be a need for an A or an F. The concept of the C student -- most of the world is run on C students. If you are not satisfied with the concept of C students, then you need to raise them. Bring the C student up to a B. But you ought not to say that the concept of a C student is somehow failing the student. I am really troubled at the distinction in academic life or practice when you differentiate between 2.3 or 2.5, because I don't think life is lived like that or education can be measured by that. I am really troubled not by the concern for academic rigor or for the concern for the intellectual development of students, but for artificial measurements. However you view this study, it was designed to feed at whatever level your students are. These criteria are empirical and whatever the statistical measures, you need to look at the students you have produced. I am troubled that we get overly concerned about the difference between 2.1 and 2.5 and what constitutes an average student, a good student, and A student as opposed to a C student. I don't know where the concept of value added becomes important in academics, but I do know that I went to a very selective institution, and that you can start off very poorly, and it takes along time for the adjustment of the first year to get to a significant grade point average. The difference between 2.3 and 2.5 is hardly a measure of a person's accomplishments or his abilities. I am really troubled by the discussion and the way it is being told. I thought this proposal was trying to address the admission of students and legitimate criteria regarding their capabilities to complete the program in saying how can we look at what we are doing with students. We seem to be turning the discussion into something that is entirely different from our measure of how students are succeeding at this institution. To me that is very troubling.

Senator Hall: I have a three point question. First of all, I was a little bit confused by Senator Zeidenstein's response on Point B under Exceptions, about department having higher standards than the university, are you denying the existence of grade inflation. That is probably why Senator Cook was concerned about employers who interview for internships requiring a 2.5 GPA for students. With grade inflation, a C is not what it used to be in the past.

Mr. Snyder: No. The higher requirement as opposed to being set for graduation is being allowed for admission to the university instead. So in the admissions part of the process, departments are encouraged to set higher standards for a

variety of reasons they may wish to use. However, once a student has crossed that threshold, the student may remain in that program as long as they remain in good academic standing clear through graduation. That is the intent of that. What we are saying is that a department can set admission standards, but not higher graduation standards.

Mr. Snyder: I don't believe that we are attempting to define that. If a department has a request, then the department may indeed make that request and go through the appropriate committee of the Academic Senate, and should the Senate then agree that "yes, that is indeed a requirement that is external to the University" then it would be correct in establishing that as a professional program.

Senator Hall: In the matter of grade inflation, a C is not what it used to be.

Mr. Snyder: In the admissions and records area I am not involved with grade inflation. The only grade inflation I know is when we receive more grades to post.

Senator Hall: Are the expectations of students higher or greater?

Mr. Snyder: I would say yes. Those would be quite valid criteria. If there is that expectation that students have a particular type of experience, then they can certainly select students who have those prerequisites. Yes, that would be quite valid in my opinion.

Senator Sadeghian: Is it right that you are setting a limit on graduation requirements in the department?

Mr. Snyder: I'm sorry, I don't quite follow.

Senator Hall: For example, the department has a 2.5 minimum standard. Say that the department would like students to maintain that high standard. This policy would prevent them from doing so.

Senator Sadeghian: You are taking that decision away from the departments.

Mr. Snyder: No. The department will have the opportunity to set those criteria initially for selecting students into the program who essentially meet the profile of successful students.

Senator Sadeghian: You have a university-wide requirement of 2.0. Then you allow departments to have a higher requirement if they decide to do so.

Mr. Snyder: If I follow what you said, the answer would be that once in the program, the student has met all of the criteria in the department then, as long as the student has a 2.0 average would be allowed to graduate.

Senator Sadeghian: Then as I understand it, you are proposing a 2.0 minimum graduation requirement across the board.

Mr. Snyder: Yes. That is the university standard now.

XIII-17 Motion by Senator White (Second, Comadena) to move the question carried with a 2/3 majority.

XIII-14) Roll call vote on original motion: 31 yes, 9 no, 1 abstention. Motion carried. Policy approved by Academic Senate:

ADMISSION STANDARDS, SELECTION CRITERIA, AND UNIVERSAL

GRADE POINT STANDARD.

1) The high school rank/test score component of qualification for regular admission will be designed to include only those students for whom the experience of the University indicates a probability of program completion that is .4 or greater.

2) Academic departments, in consultation with College Deans, may establish, for admission to the University and to department programs, supplemental criteria. These may include prerequisites, required levels of previous academic performance and required levels of test scores.

3) The 2.00 grade point average is established as the undergraduate standard for minimum performance in admission of transfer students, admission of reentering students, probation, reinstatement, continuation in the major, and graduation.

For entry to programs that do not impose supplemental admission criteria, the 2.00 grade point average is established as the undergraduate standard for either change or declaration of major.

4) These policies shall not be interpreted to prevent the University from denying or postponing admission in order to comply with target enrollment objectives.

EXCEPTIONS:

a) Students excluded by 1), above, may be admitted under programs designed for athletes, minorities, students with special talents, as well as others on a case-by-case basis. For these students, permission from the department is required for admission to a departmental program. The Provost, or designee, will, at the conclusion of each enrollment period, notify the Senate Academic Affairs Committee of the number of exceptional admissions, by category.

b) If a grade point average higher than 2.00 is required for either admission to Professional Practice/Student Teaching or for external certification or accreditation, this higher grade point average may be used as a standard for continuation in the program, provided it is no higher than the grade point average required for program admission.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The University will include a description of the implementation of this policy in the Undergraduate Catalog. Departments deciding to introduce or change supplemental criteria, or to utilize Exception b), are expected to give timely notice to the Provost or designee.

Changes in the high school rank/test score criteria, based upon analysis of student success rates, must be reviewed by the Senate Academic Affairs Committee and reported to the full Senate before they are published.

3. Approval of Rules Committee Recommendations for Appointments to External Committees

XIII-18 Motion by Senator Cook (Second, Tuttle) to approve the Rules Committee Recommendations for Appointments to External Committees carried on a voice vote.

ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE

(To fill Judith Lyle's 1993 term)
Rodger Singley, Marketing

COUNCIL ON UNIVERSITY STUDIES

(To fill Mark Kaiser's 1993 term)
Charles Griffin, SASW

ECONOMIC WELL BEING COMMITTEE

(To fill Ken Strand's 1992 term)
Ken Crepas, FAL

ENTERTAINMENT COMMITTEE

(To fill Prakash Dhreerija's 1993 term)
Jeff Hecht, EAF

FACILITIES PLANNING COMMITTEE

(To fill Douglas Hardwick's 1993 term)
Dave Weber, Biology

FACULTY ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

(To fill Judith Lyles' 1992 term)
Teresa Palmer, BEA

STUDENT CENTER AUDITORIUM POLICY BOARD

(To fill Manhar Thakore's 1994 term)
Maurice Scharton, English

STUDENT CENTER PROGRAMMING BOARD

(To fill Michael Dicker's 1994 term)
Susan Amster, Art

STUDENT CODE ENFORCEMENT & REVIEW BOARD (SCERB)

(To fill Emily Long's 1992 term)
Jean Pankonin, HPERD

SCERB UNIVERSITY HEARING PANEL

(To fill Jane Lee's 1993 term)
John Walker, Art
Michael Lorber, C&I, Alternate

SCERB STUDENT GRIEVANCE PANEL

(To fill Ted Jackson's 1992 term)
Jeanette Crooks, SASW

UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

(To fill Donna Bagley's 1994 term)
Marilyn Ruddy, C & I
(To fill Robert Franklin's 1993 term)
Joseph Solberg, Finance and Law

4. Election of Students to Athletic Council

The following two athletes were elected to serve on the Athletic Council:

Tammy Kocher .
Vander Harris

5. **Approval of Graduate Student Member to Council for
Teacher Education**

XIII-19 Motion by Senator Stearns (Second, Zielinski) to approve recommendation of graduate student, Jan Maier, Curriculum and Instruction, to serve on the Council for Teacher Education carried on a voice vote.

INFORMATION ITEMS

1. **Faculty Affairs Committee Proposals for University
Review Committee Changes in ASPT Handbook**

Senator Walker: As Chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, we are bringing forth these proposals for University Review Committee Changes in the ASPT Handbook. Dr. Chris Eisele, Chair of University Review Committee, and Steve Meckstroth, Milner Library, are present for questioning. These changes were unanimously approved by the Faculty Affairs Committee.

The first proposal is for a suggested ASPT Document Clarification on Late Submission of DFSC Materials. The only changes are words to be deleted shown by the dashes, and inclusion of underlined words. Essentially what has been done is that it is being suggested that no additional materials be added after the calendar date, unless those materials were not reasonably available before the deadline.

No questions.

Proposal two is for a Change in Promotion/Tenure Policy Examples, under tenure policies and in Section X University Evaluation Policies and Salary Increment Procedures. Essentially what has been added is "external grand awards."

Senator White: Is the purpose of adding external grant awards to make what has been a "de facto" sort of criteria for evaluation part of the ASPT document? Isn't it a fact that departments are already using such material. Don't they already have the option of doing that?

Senator Walker: Under "etc.," they already have the option to do that. The reason for adding it was for clarification.

Dr. Chris Eisele: This request came from the University Research Committee because it is important to emphasize faculty research. Secondly, they felt that there was evidence that some departments did not use the "etc." to include research.

Senator Nelsen: Under VIII. Tenure Policies (page 12) C.2: What is the significance of adding (including publications..... art shows, performances, honors, etc.)?

Senator Walker: In the other paragraphs, it was already there. In this paragraph, publications, art shows, performances, honors, etc. was not there. We tried to keep it uniform throughout.

Proposal number three is for Milner ASPT Changes. Essentially, the URC requested that the Library consider a change to keep their procedure in line with the other procedures in the other departments on campus according to the ASPT handbook. The changes include the Library having a College Faculty Status Committee. At the present time the CFSC for the Library is the University Librarian. With these proposed changes, they will now have a committee.

Dr. Chris Eisele: This change in no way reflects on the University Librarian or anything that has been done in the past. This change is being asked for to make the University Library parallel to other departments on campus.

Steven Meckstroth: I would like to add that the Library faculty supports these changes.

COMMUNICATIONS

Senator Nelsen: At your tables this evening was a single page communication from JUAC regarding the ongoing process of a five-year presidential review. I would point out to you that this will appear in the Illinois State University Report and the Vidette. The important part is to say that there will be access to the consultants on an individually scheduled basis, if you will make a written request to JUAC in care of the Senate Office. The current schedule calls for the consultants to be available on Monday the 28th at 1:00 in the afternoon, and also on Tuesday from 2:00 to 4:00 in the afternoon. You could schedule ten or fifteen minutes to speak with the consultant. Both consultants indicated that they will be more than happy to take written comments. One request was that your written comments be signed. They do not put a lot of stock or credence in anonymous comments. Those types of comments will not carry much weight. All the Deans and Vice Presidents have copies of the schedule by this time.

Senator Sadeghian: I have a communication for Provost Strand in relation to his comments two meetings ago concerning the term: "people of color." I have been informed by the President of the Graduate Student Advisory Council that the preferred term is "under-represented group."

President Wallace: The term "under-represented group" could also include white male students on the ISU campus.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Academic Affairs Committee - Senator Ritt had no report.

Administrative Affairs Committee - No report. Senator Comadena announced that the committee would meet briefly following the Academic Senate Meeting.

Budget Committee - Senator George Tuttle reported that the Budget Committee would meet briefly tonight after Senate adjourned.

Faculty Affairs Committee - Senator Paul Walker had no report.

Rules Committee - Senator Rob Engelhardt reported that the Rules Committee would meet after Academic Senate.

Student Affairs Committee - Senator Heather Manns called a short meeting following Academic Senate.

Adjournment

KIII-20 Motion by Hall (Second, Adams) to adjourn carried on a voice vote. Academic Senate adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

**FOR THE ACADEMIC SENATE
JAN COOK, SECRETARY**

NOV 8 - 1991

MEMO

ISU

ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Office of the Vice President and Provost

November 6, 1991

TO: Len Schmaltz

FROM: David A. Strand

RE: October 9, 1991, Action on Admissions Standards, Selection Criteria, and Universal Grade Point Average Standard

This memo is sent in reference to the action of the Academic Senate on October 9, 1991, during which the Senate voted to approve policies relating to Admission Standards, Selection Criteria, and Universal Grade Point Average Standard (copy attached). While the minutes may accurately reflect the intent of the Senate on October 9, 1991, I am certain that you and the other Senate members recall that the original packet of materials relating to Freshmen Admission Requirements, Selection Criteria, and Universal Grade Point Average Standard was much more detailed.

The purpose of this memo is to request that the original materials submitted to the Academic Senate entitled Proposal Number 1 (Freshmen Admissions Requirement), Proposal Number 2 (Selection Criteria), and Proposal Number 3 (Universal Grade Point Average Standard) be appended to the October 9, 1991, minutes as a basis of understanding the action of the Senate at the October 9 meeting. You will recall that the single sheet, which was distributed to Senate members during the information and action stages on this item, was designed to help clarify the contents of the original documents but not to supplant them. You may also recall that the final interpretation and implementation of these documents was left to the Office of the Provost, which was asked to provide an annual report on the implementation of some of these documents to the Senate each year. In order to avoid any confusion in the future on what action the Senate took on October 9 as well as to provide a framework for my future reports to the Academic Senate, I would like to formally request that the source documents referenced above and which are also attached to this memo be appended to the October 9 minutes.

If you have any questions about this request, I would be happy to respond to them.

jc

Attachments

11. 8. 91. 1

Roll call vote on original motion: 31 yes, 9 no, 1 abstention.
Motion carried. Policy approved by Academic Senate:

ADMISSION STANDARDS, SELECTION CRITERIA, AND UNIVERSAL

GRADE POINT STANDARD.

- 1) The high school rank/test score component of qualification for regular admission will be designed to include only those students for whom the experience of the University indicates a probability of program completion that is .4 or greater.
- 2) Academic departments, in consultation with College Deans, may establish, for admission to the University and to department programs, supplemental criteria. These may include prerequisites, required levels of previous academic performance and required levels of test scores.
- 3) The 2.00 grade point average is established as the undergraduate standard for minimum performance in admission of transfer students, admission of reentering students, probation, reinstatement, continuation in the major, and graduation.

For entry to programs that do not impose supplemental admission criteria, the 2.00 grade point average is established as the undergraduate standard for either change or declaration of major.

- 4) These policies shall not be interpreted to prevent the University from denying or postponing admission in order to comply with target enrollment objectives.

EXCEPTIONS:

- a) Students excluded by 1), above, may be admitted under programs designed for athletes, minorities, students with special talents, as well as others on a case-by-case basis. For these students, permission from the department is required for admission to a departmental program. The Provost, or designee, will, at the conclusion of each enrollment period, notify the Senate Academic Affairs Committee of the number of exceptional admissions, by category.
- b) If a grade point average higher than 2.00 is required for either admission to Professional Practice/Student Teaching or for external certification or accreditation, this higher grade point average may be used as a standard for continuation in the program, provided it is no higher than the grade point average required for program admission.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The University will include a description of the implementation of this policy in the Undergraduate Catalog. Departments deciding to introduce or change supplemental criteria, or to utilize Exception b), are expected to give timely notice to the Provost or designee.

Changes in the high school rank/test score criteria, based upon analysis of student success rates, must be reviewed by the Senate Academic Affairs Committee and reported to the full Senate before they are published.

PROPOSAL NUMBER 1

Date: November 30, 1990

Subject: Freshmen admissions requirement

Nature of Proposed Change:

The change proposes to restructure the admission requirement for beginning freshmen. The proposal is to adopt a freshman eligibility index based on a combination of high school rank and admission test score. This combination of factors ensures the highest probability of graduation and will replace the present ACT score priority/calendar-based methodology.

This recommendation, which is based on an extensive study conducted by the Office of Institutional Research, factors together class rank and admissions test score and correlates the resulting index with graduation from ISU to establish a probability of graduation (POG) for each rank/test index.

Based on evaluation of this study, it is recommended that the University adopt a minimum freshmen admissions requirement such that each student admitted has a probability of graduation of no less than 0.4; in other words, such that four of every ten students admitted have a chance of graduating.

Raising the minimum probability of graduation to 0.4, raises the average freshmen probability of graduation to 0.592 -- or six of every ten. The average POG for the study cohort is 0.535.

As graduation data is accumulated and evaluated, it may become necessary to modify the index by raising or lowering the admissions test score to maintain the minimum 0.4 POG admissions standard. Such change would be administrative in nature.

I- PROPOSED CHANGE:

1- Provide a statement of the proposed change (e.g., revised catalog copy).

Freshman Requirements

You will qualify for regular admission when the Admissions Office verifies that you meet the high school rank and admissions test score requirement, have completed the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects, and if applying to

an oversubscribed area of study, meet supplementary selection criteria. Regular admission requires:

a- graduation from an accredited high school, a school recognized by the Illinois State Superintendent of Education, or a General Equivalency Degree (GED) certificate,

b- successful completion of the courses in the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subject requirements (following), and

c- a qualifying high school percentile rank and admissions test score.

Admissions Eligibility Table

High School Percentile Rank	ACT Composite* Score	SAT Total Score
76-99	eligible with any test score	
51-75	17 or above	520 or above
26-50	23 or above	880 or above
1 -25	not eligible with any test score	

* expressed as the enhanced ACT Composite score
-- concordance is respectively, enhanced/standard:
17/14, 23/22.

2- Provide a statement (e.g., catalog copy) of the existing standard, if any.

See attached.

3- Indicate other departments or programs which will be affected and how.

The proposed change will affect all programs within the University which admit beginning freshmen by reducing the number of qualifying applicants, by raising the minimum ACT score of those admitted in the 3rd Quartile, and by admitting Top Half students whose probability of graduation is 0.4 or better.

The application pool will be sized-down about 250 applicants per year. These applicants typically have a probability of graduation of less than 0.30 (30 out of 100).

Overall, it has been demonstrated that the indexing model raises the rate of graduation from

53.5 per 100 admits to 59.2, an increase of nearly six (5.7) successful students per 100 admitted -- in a base of 3500 new freshmen enrollments per year, this translates into 200 or more additional graduates per entering freshmen class.

4- Indicate the date for implementing the proposed change.

The change will affect all beginning freshmen students admitted for the 1992 Fall semester.

II- JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGE:

1- Why is this change proposed?

The change is part of a package of changes to raise student qualification as proposed by the Enrollment Management Committee. This specific change raises the quality of beginning freshmen and ensures a higher probability of graduation.

Changing the freshmen admission standard from the current multiple-factor (ACT score and calender) to a constant index is the keystone to applicant selection. The index allows opportunity to define the applicant pool as eligible/not eligible at an early date, and this, combined with admission targets, sets up decision points to determine programs that are oversubscribed and limit the number of students admitted. Applicants to these programs will be required to meet different and higher standards of selection. All must meet the admissions eligibility standard to receive regular admission approval.

2- How does the proposed change relate to the missions/goals of the program/department/college/university?

The 1988 Educational Leadership Alternative, a survey of faculty members, identified characteristics considered essential to an ideal multi-purpose university. A high quality student body was ranked fifth in a list of twenty ideals by 63.2 percent of the responding faculty.

The March, 1990 Vision Statement states within Theme 1 is the action statement, "implement more selective recruitment and admission policies."

The February, 1990 A Plan for Enrollment Management establishes the goal to "increase the

quality and success rate of the student body at Illinois State University."

3- How was the decision reached to make this change?

The Enrollment Management Committee, in consultation with department chairs, faculty, campus administrators of student services, and the Provost considered the impact this change would have on the campus' ability to attract and enroll qualified students. While raising the standard will decrease the qualified applicant pool by about 250 students, it is expected that an additional 250 to 500 students outside this group will continue to be admitted under programs designed for athletes, minorities, and students with special talents.

4- How does the proposed change compare to standards in this program/major in other universities statewide? nationally?

The change will raise the entering student average ACT score and increase the probability of graduation. The entering ACT average will still be below that of the University of Illinois but is expected to be higher than other BOR campuses. The higher average ACT score will place us on par with many moderately selective public and private colleges and universities nationwide and above all campuses which admit most applicants.

5- Is this change required by an accrediting agency? If so, explain and provide supporting documents.

No.

III- CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE:

1- How will this change affect students? majors, non-majors, minority students, adult reentering learners and/or overall enrollments?

Beginning with applicants to the 1992 Fall term, the change will affect freshmen applicants in the Bottom Quartile in that none will be admitted regardless of admissions test score. Those applicants ranked in the Second Quartile (26th to 50th percentiles) with enhanced ACT scores of 22 will also no longer be eligible for regular admission. The new requirement has the potential of eliminating some 250 applicants from the

applicant pool. Minority, adult reentering, and students with special talents will continue to be admitted under programs specifically designed to weigh their special characteristics and qualifications.

**2- How will this change affect other programs/
majors?**

The change will have a positive benefit upon all campus programs by raising the quality of incoming freshmen students.

**3- What are the implications of this change for
students currently enrolled in the University or
readmissible to the University under the current
standard who might yet choose this program/major?**

It will have no impact on currently enrolled students or students seeking readmission. It may impact some students graduating from high school prior to Spring 1992 who chose to delay their admission to ISU until Fall 1992 or after. Admissions will review this situations on a case by case basis.

Attachment

PROPOSAL NUMBER 2

Date: November 30, 1990

Subject: Selection criteria

Nature of Proposed Change:

That the use of selection criteria be approved in principle for the selection of new applicants seeking admission to an oversubscribed or restricted-admission major course of study.

Definitions:

oversubscribed major -- a program for which applications from potential applicants or internal-transfer students exceed the resources of the department; selection criteria are imposed to regulate the number and quality of students admitted.

restricted-admission major -- a program, not oversubscribed, which has established selection criteria to regulate the quality of incoming new or internal-transfer students.

The selection criteria principle is already in effect for students seeking internal changes of major or declaring a change-of-major from general student to academic major.

I- PROPOSED CHANGE:

1- Provide a statement of the proposed change (e.g., revised catalog copy).

OVERSUBSCRIBED MAJORS AND SUPPLEMENTARY ADMISSIONS CRITERIA -- Illinois State University designates areas of study as **oversubscribed** when more applications are received than applicants can be accommodated. Applicants filing during the Priority Filing Period will receive highest priority for admission, but you may be subject to supplementary selection criteria (see below). If you are required to submit admissions test scores (ACT or SAT), you should take the test during your high school junior year or no later than early October of your high school senior year when applying for fall admission. Note that if you apply by mail, the postmark will be used to determine if you filed during the Priority Filing Period.

Popular areas of study frequently oversubscribed are: Business (including Accounting, Finance, International Business, Management, Marketing, and Pre-Business), Communication (including Mass Communication and Public Relations), Criminal Justice Sciences, Economics, Education (including Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, and Special Education), Psychology, Sociology, and Social Work.

If you apply to these programs and are not accommodated, you can be considered in an alternate area of study. You are strongly urged to indicate a second choice area of study on the application--this can include the General Student program. Please consult with the Admissions or Student Recruitment office for further information and program status. Please note that transfer to an oversubscribed program at a later date may be subject to additional requirements.

In addition to programs which are oversubscribed, Illinois State University may regulate admission to programs which require strong coursework or other preparation. Supplementary selection criteria (following) are used to verify applicant qualification. These programs are designated as **Restricted Admission** and admission procedures are similar to those for oversubscribed majors.

Supplementary selection criteria -- Supplementary selection criteria will be based, in-part, on scholastic achievement and may include higher levels of prerequisite coursework in addition to standardized admissions test scores and subscores, work experience, extra-curricular activities, etc. For example, freshmen applicants for Pre-Business may be required to have completed four-years of high school math to include pre-calculus algebra, transfer students for Marketing may be required to have completed calculus and statistics, or prospective Art applicants may be required to submit portfolios demonstrative of their work.

Illinois State University announces each fall the majors that are oversubscribed and the supplementary criteria required. That announcement is published in appropriate newsletters distributed to high school and college counselors. Information about the supplementary criteria will also be provided to each program applicant.

The above statements are to be inserted within the Admission section of the catalog. The following statement is to be inserted within the Academic Policies and Opportunities section of the catalog and variations thereof within the Colleges' admissions requirement sections.

OVERSUBSCRIBED MAJORS AND SUPPLEMENTARY ADMISSIONS CRITERIA -- Illinois State University regulates admission to designated major programs when the number of students seeking to transfer-internally exceeds the available educational resources of the department and/or to raise the level of student preparation and qualification. Students must meet supplementary selection criteria (following). Applicants to regulated majors must file the appropriate application for change of major with their intended major department during the announced filing period.

Supplementary selection criteria -- Supplementary selection criteria may be based, in part, on scholastic achievement and include higher levels of prerequisite and University Studies coursework (for example, students may be required to complete calculus and statistics before admission will be granted to Management). Other criteria may include auditions, portfolios, work experience, etc. The selection criteria can be obtained from Academic Advising or the intended-major department advisor.

2- Provide a statement (e.g., catalog copy) of the existing standard, if any.

Not applicable.

3- Indicate other departments or programs which will be affected and how.

The proposed change will affect all programs within the University which are declared oversubscribed or restricted-admission in order to raise entering student qualification and or regulate enrollment.

4- Indicate the date for implementing the proposed change.

The use of selection criteria for new students will become effective with applicants for admission to the University for the 1992 Fall semester.

Selection criteria are currently required for currently enrolled student admission to regulated programs and have been approved for limited use in new-student admission.

II- JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGE:

1- Why is this change proposed?

The change is part of a comprehensive package of changes designed to raise student qualification as proposed by the Enrollment Management Committee. This specific change is part of the package which, on the one hand, raises the quality of students entering the major as new students or as internal transfers, but stipulates that once admitted, they cannot be disenrolled from the program nor denied graduation as long as the 2.0 grade point average is maintained in all required areas, e.g., all courses, major and minor, etc.

2- How does the proposed change relate to the missions/goals of the program/department/college/university?

The 1988 Educational Leadership Alternative, a survey of faculty members, identified characteristics considered essential to an ideal multi-purpose university. A high quality student body was ranked fifth in a list of twenty ideals by 63.2 percent of the responding faculty.

The March, 1990 Vision Statement posits within Theme 1 the action statements, "implement more selective recruitment and admission policies" and "improve the advisement system's ability to provide students with guidance and mentorship."

The February, 1990 A Plan for Enrollment Management, established as a goal, "Eliminate the problem of having upper-division students in good standing (e.g., 2.0 grade point or above) without majors. That document also posits, "Beginning with students entering the University in Fall semester, 1991, the minimum standard for remaining in the major and for earning graduation from the University in that major will be a 2.00 GPA."

3- How was the decision reached to make this change?

The Enrollment Management Committee, in consultation with department chairs, faculty, campus administrators of student services, and the Provost recommend the establishment of higher

admissions standards and rededication to the peerless standard of a 2.00 grade point average for academic performance and graduation. To insure that students are qualified to undertake a program of study, supplementary selection criteria are established to raise the qualification of students admitted to the program.

4- How does the proposed change compare to standards in this program/major in other universities statewide? nationally?

The 2.00 grade point average is the nationally recognized standard for academic performance and graduation.

The use of supplementary admission criteria is a well recognized principle currently in effect at ISU, most private colleges, state and nationwide, and public institutions required to limit enrollment.

5- Is this change required by an accrediting agency? If so, explain and provide supporting documents.

Not applicable, although it should be noted that the use of supplementary selection criteria to raise the qualification of students is viewed favorably by accrediting agencies.

III- CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE:

1- How will this change affect students? majors, non-majors, minority students, adult reentering learners and/or overall enrollments?

The policy will require that all new students and re-admits from other majors, seeking admission to majors which are designated oversubscribed or restricted meet supplementary selection criteria. Students seeking readmission to such programs will not be affected if they left the University in good academic standing.

This change will affect positively all students in that once admitted to a major, they cannot be dropped from or denied readmission to the program as long as the 2.0 GPA is maintained.

2- How will this change affect other programs/majors?

The changes will shift the burden of establishing student quality from the graduation stage to initial admission stage. In other words, student

qualification will be established before the student gains entry to the major. Selection criteria at time of admission will establish this level of qualification.

3- What are the implications of this change for students currently enrolled in the University or readmissible to the University under the current standard who might yet choose this program/major?

The use of supplementary selection criteria is already in effect for currently enrolled students. This proposal deals only with the use of supplementary selection criteria for new students seeking admission to oversubscribed or restricted majors.

PROPOSAL NUMBER 3

Date: November 30, 1990

Subject: Universal Grade Point Average Standard

Nature of Proposed Change:

Establish the 2.00 grade point average as the undergraduate standard for minimum academic performance with specific application to the following:

- a- Transfer student admission
- b- Admission of re-entering students
- c- Change of major**
- d- Declaration of major**
- e- Continuation in the major
- f- Probation and reinstatement
- g- Graduation

**In the case of certain programs, including those that are oversubscribed, additional selection or performance criteria may be imposed.

The primary thrust of this proposal is to establish the 2.00 grade point average as the standard for satisfactory academic performance, admission, and graduation. Most departments currently conform to this standard.

I- PROPOSED CHANGE:

- 1- Provide a statement of the proposed change (e.g., revised catalog copy).**

See attachment 1. This attachment does not identify and change specific reference made to grade point average for admission or readmission, retention, and/or graduation by the faculty of any academic department, e.g., see pp 2 and 3, for the ACS and HPRD copy. These changes will only be made if this policy is approved. At that time, departments will have to consider the effect upon their requirements and propose changes in accordance with the approved policy.

- 2- Provide a statement (e.g., catalog copy) of the existing standard, if any.**

See attachment 2. Note that as is 1, above, specific department copy is not included except for ACS and HPRD.

3- Indicate other departments or programs which will be affected and how.

The proposed change will affect all programs within the University which have instituted GPA requirements higher than 2.0 for admission or readmission, change of major, declaration of major, and/or graduation. This proposal also eliminates the 1.80 probation standard for students with less than 30 hours.

4- Indicate the date for implementing the proposed change.

The 2.0 grade point average standard will be instituted for all undergraduate students beginning Fall 1991.

II- JUSTIFICATION FOR THE PROPOSED CHANGE:

1- Why is this change proposed?

The change is part of a comprehensive package of changes designed to raise student qualification as proposed by the Enrollment Management Committee. This specific change is part of the package which, on the one hand, raises the quality of students entering the major as new students or as internal transfers, but stipulates that once admitted, they cannot be disenrolled from the program nor denied graduation as long as the 2.0 grade point average is maintained in all required areas, e.g., all courses, major and minor, etc.

2- How does the proposed change relate to the missions/goals of the program/department/college/university?

The 1988 Educational Leadership Alternative, a survey of faculty members, identified characteristics considered essential to an ideal multi-purpose university. A high quality student body was ranked fifth in a list of twenty ideals by 63.2 percent of the responding faculty.

The March, 1990 Vision Statement posits within "Theme 1: Provide the premier undergraduate education in Illinois," the action statements, "implement more selective recruitment and admission policies" and "improve the advisement system's ability to provide students with guidance and mentorship."

The February, 1990 "A Plan for Enrollment Management" established as a goal, "Eliminate the problem of having upper-division students in good standing (e.g., 2.0 grade point or above) without majors. That document also posits, "Beginning with students entering the University in Fall semester, 1991, the minimum standard for remaining in the major and for earning graduation from the University in that major will be a 2.00 GPA."

3- How was the decision reached to make this change?

The Enrollment Management Committee, in consultation with department chairs, faculty, campus administrators of student services, and the Provost recommend the establishment of higher admissions standards and rededication to the peerless standard of a 2.00 grade point average for academic performance and graduation.

4- How does the proposed change compare to standards in this program/major in other universities statewide? nationally?

The 2.00 grade point average is the nationally recognized standard for academic performance and graduation.

5- Is this change required by an accrediting agency? If so, explain and provide supporting documents.

No.

III- CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED CHANGE:

1- How will this change affect students? majors, non-majors, minority students, adult reentering learners and/or overall enrollments?

This change will positively affect all students in that once admitted to a major, they cannot be dropped from or denied readmission to the program as long as the 2.0 GPA is maintained.

2- How will this change affect other programs/ majors?

The change will shift the burden of establishing student quality from the graduation stage to initial admission stage. In other words, student qualification will be established before the student gains entry to the major. The consequences

will be wideranging and positive: students in good standing will no longer be subject to disenrollment, which action placed them in a nebulous academic advisement and direction "gray area" where they strained faculty and Academic Advisement resources and were delayed in their progress toward graduation.

3- What are the implications of this change for students currently enrolled in the University or readmissible to the University under the current standard who might yet choose this program/major?

The statement in III-2 above, illustrate that currently enrolled students will be the primary beneficiaries of this policy. It will have little effect upon students reenrolling except to guarantee that those in good standing can reenroll in their declared major after stopping out. Students seeking to declare a major or change majors may be required to meet higher selection requirements in those departments instituting them.

Attachments

Admission standards, selection criteria, and universal grade point standard. DRAFT 2

- 1) The high school rank/test score component of qualification for regular admission will be designed to include only those students for whom the experience of the University indicates a probability of program completion that is .4 or greater.
- 2) Academic departments, in consultation with College Deans, may establish, for admission to the University and to department programs, supplemental criteria. These may include prerequisites, required levels of previous academic performance and required levels of test scores.
- 3) The 2.00 grade point average is established as the undergraduate standard for minimum performance in admission of transfer students, admission of reentering students, probation, reinstatement, continuation in the major, and graduation.

For entry to programs that do not impose supplemental admission criteria, the 2.00 grade point average is established as the undergraduate standard for either change or declaration of major.

- 4) These policies shall not be interpreted to prevent the University from denying or postponing admission in order to comply with target enrollment objectives.

EXCEPTIONS:

- a) Students excluded by 1), above, may be admitted under programs designed for athletes, minorities, students with special talents, as well as others on a case-by-case basis. For these students, permission from the department is required for admission to a departmental program. The Provost, or designee, will, at the conclusion of each enrollment period, notify the Senate Academic Affairs Committee of the number of exceptional admissions, by category.
- b) If a grade point average higher than 2.00 is required for either admission to Professional Practice ^{or for external certification}, this higher grade point average may be used as a standard for continuation in the program, provided it is no higher than the grade point average required for program admission.

IMPLEMENTATION:

The University will include a description of the implementation of this policy in the Undergraduate Catalog [The proposed catalog changes for the 1992-1993 Catalog are attached to this legislation]. Departments deciding to introduce or change supplemental criteria, or to utilize Exception b), are expected to give timely notice to the Provost or designee.

Changes in the high school rank/test score criteria, based upon analysis of student success rates, must be reviewed by the Senate Academic Affairs Committee before they are published.

and give report to the full Senate

Subject: Attachment: Enrollment Management Committee
Proposal

**Item 1. High school rank/test score component of
qualification for regular admission.**

o The following statement replaces the copy starting with the BEGINNING FRESHMAN heading on page 9 to the Course Specific Admissions Requirements heading on page 10 of the 1991-1992 undergraduate catalog. The purpose of this change is to modify freshmen regular admissions requirements.

BEGINNING FRESHMEN: You will qualify for regular admission when the Admissions Office verifies that you meet the high school rank and admissions test score requirement indicated in the Admissions Eligibility Table (below), have completed the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subjects, and if applying to an oversubscribed area of study, meet supplementary selection criteria. Regular admission requires:

a- graduation from an accredited high school, a school recognized by the Illinois State Superintendent of Education, or a General Equivalency Degree (GED) certificate,

b- successful completion of the courses in the comprehensive pattern of college preparatory subject requirements (following), and

c- a qualifying high school percentile rank and admissions test score.

Admissions Eligibility Table

High School Percentile Rank	ACT Composite Score	SAT Total Score
76-99	eligible with any test score	
51-75	17 or above	520 or above
26-50	23 or above	880 or above
1 -25	not eligible with any test score	

Item 2. Supplemental criteria.

o The following statement replaces existing copy or is new copy to be inserted within the **Admission Applications** section on page 9 of the 1991-1992 undergraduate catalog. The purpose of this change is to introduce oversubscribed programs, the priority filing period and supplementary selection criteria.

Admission Applications.

Prospective students may obtain applications for admission from a high school or community college counselor or by writing, calling or visiting:

The Office of Admissions and Records

201 Hovey Hall

Illinois State University

P.O. Box 6901, Normal, Illinois 61761-6901

toll free: 1-800-366-2478

local area: 309-438-2181

Admission to the University does not guarantee housing in residence halls. The Office of Residential Life will mail housing applications to students who have been admitted to the University.

Applicants who are not United States' citizens should request a foreign student application. Prospective graduate students should request a graduate application. Applicants 25 years of age or older who are interested in the Adult

Learner Program offered by the College of Continuing Education should request an adult learner application.

Applicants may request admission for the fall semester, which begins in mid-August; for the spring semester, which begins in early January; or for the summer session, which begins mid-May. Prospective students are encouraged to file during the priority application filing period as shown on the table below. The University reserves the right to curtail admission, adjust requirements, and limit enrollment in a program because of space or budget restrictions. The Admissions Office will process applications until enrollment capacities are met, so early application is advantageous.

Application Filing Periods

Term	Applications First Accepted	Priority Filing Period
Fall	September 1	September 1 through October 31
Spring	June 1	June 1 through July 31
Summer	April 1	April 1 through May 31

Applications are processed on a continuing basis but the University may, in some cases, defer a final decision pending receipt of a final transcript.

Oversubscribed Majors: Illinois State University designates areas of study as oversubscribed when more applications are received than can be accommodated. Applicants filing during the Priority Filing Period will

receive highest priority for admission, but may be subject to supplementary selection criteria (see below). If you are required to submit admissions test scores (ACT or SAT), you should take the test during your high school junior year or no later than early October of your high school senior year when applying for fall admission. Note that if you apply by mail, the postmark will be used to determine if you filed during the Priority Filing Period.

Restricted-Admission: Illinois State University may regulate admission to programs which require strong coursework or other preparation.

Supplementary Selection Criteria are based on scholastic achievement including prerequisite coursework, standardized admissions test scores and extra-curricular activities.

The University announces each fall the majors that are oversubscribed and restricted and the supplementary criteria required for admission. Announcements are published in appropriate newsletters and distributed to high school and community college counselors. Information about supplementary criteria is provided to applicants at time of application for admission or applicants can call the Office of Admissions and Records for information.

o The following statement incorporates new and revised copy to be inserted within the Academic Policies and

Opportunities section under Change of Primary or Secondary Major on page 27 of the 1991-1992 undergraduate catalog. The purpose of this entry is to advise enrolled students of oversubscribed majors and supplementary selection criteria.

Change of Primary or Secondary Major: A student wishing to enter a second major or change majors must consult the chairperson of the department offering the major and obtain signed approval on a Change of Undergraduate/Graduate Academic Program Form.

Oversubscribed majors: Illinois State University regulates admission to designated programs when the number of students seeking to transfer exceeds the available educational resources of the department or to raise the level of student preparation and qualification. Students may be required to meet supplementary selection criteria. Supplementary selection criteria may be based on scholastic achievement including prerequisite and University Studies coursework and may include auditions, portfolios, work experience, etc. The selection criteria can be obtained from the intended-major department advisor.

Item 3. The 2.00 grade point average as the undergraduate standard for minimum performance.

o The following statements replace or add new copy on the pages and within the identified sections of the 1991-1992 undergraduate catalog. The purpose of these changes is to eliminate reference to grade point average requirements other than the proposed 2.0 undergraduate standard for minimum performance.

Page 27.

o This change eliminates reference to students dismissed from the major for failing to maintain a department grade point average higher than the proposed 2.0.

Dismissal from Major: A student who is placed on academic probation for a second or subsequent time will be dropped automatically from his or her major. The student dropped from the major will be classified as a General Student and will receive academic advisement from the Academic Advisement Center. In order to become a major in a department after being dropped, a Change of Undergraduate/Graduate Academic Program Form must be completed and the student must be accepted by the department in which he or she desires to be a major.

o Insert between **Minor Field or Fields of Study** section and **Grade Point Average** section. This statement advises students enrolled in certification programs of the grade point average standard.

Certification Programs: Students who fail to maintain the specific grade average required by their teaching or other certification program may be dismissed from that program. At the option of the department, the student dropped from the program may pursue a degree in their major or be classified as a General Student and will receive academic advisement from the Academic Advisement Center. In order to become a candidate for a certification program after being dropped, the student must be accepted by the department in which he or she desires to pursue a certification program.

o To replace the first paragraph within the **Academic Good Standing** section. The purpose of the change is to raise the GPA from 1.8 for students with less than 30 hours to 2.0.

Academic Good Standing: To maintain academic good standing, a student must achieve a minimum cumulative GPA of 2.0. The number of semester hours completed includes all college work done by the student. However, only grades earned at ISU are used in computing the GPA.

Page 165.

o To insert the statement outlining certification programs within the **University-Wide Teacher Education Program Requirements** section. The purpose of this statement is to inform teaching certificate candidates of the

certification grade point average standards which are higher than 2.0.

Certification Programs: Students who fail to maintain the specific grade average required by their teaching or other certification program may be dismissed from that program. At the option of the department, students dropped from the program may pursue a degree in their major or be classified as General Students and will receive academic advisement from the Academic Advisement Center. In order to become candidates for a certification program after being dropped, students must be accepted by the department in which they desire to pursue a certification program.

o In addition to the above changes, we have identified catalog copy prepared by departments which will require modification to eliminate reference to grade point average performance above the 2.0 standard, Professional Practice or external certification excepted. Page reference is to the 1991-1992 undergraduate catalog:

Page 56: Applied Computer Science

Page 59: Criminal Justice Sciences

Page 72: Medical Record Administration

Page 95: Communication

Page 144: College of Business

The list is believed exhaustive, however, it is urged that all departments review their catalog copy to ensure

deletion of all higher-than-2.0 grade point average performance standards unless excepted by the proposed policy.