

SADA Members:

Sine Anahita, Sociology, CLA (18)
 Cindy Hardy, DEV English, CRCD - SADA Liaison to CAC
 Ben Kuntz, DEV English, Kuskokwim (KUC) Campus
 Jennifer Tilbury, DEV English, Community and Technical College (CTC) - Co-chair
 Sandra Wildfeuer, DEV Math, CRCD - Chair
 Jill Faudree, Math, CNSM (17)
 Jennifer Schell, English, CLA (18)
 Bill Howard, Science, CNSM (17)
 Stacey Howdeshell, Academic Advising Center
 Colleen Angaiak, Rural Student Services (RSS)
 Robin Brooks, Student Success Coordinator, Interior Alaska Campus (IAC)
 Dean's Council Rep: Alex Fitts
 OAR: Mike Earnest

1. Approve SADA minutes from October meeting. ([SADA Meeting Notes 10/6/16 9-10:30am](#))
2. Committee meeting schedule 2016-2017 Thursdays 9 - 10:30 am

Held: #1 September 8, 2016, #2 October 6, 2016, #3 November 17, 2016

Scheduled: #4 December 8, 2016

Provide feedback on proposed dates for Spring:

#5 January 26, 2017, #6 February 16, 2017, #7 March 23, 2017, # 8 April 20, 2017

3. Placement Updates: [UAF English and Math Placement in the catalog](#)
 - a. English placement -
 - b. Math placement -
4. DRAFT Motions for review: Please consider the purpose and the actual language of the DRAFT motions, including what evidence should or should not be stated in the rationale to justify each motion.
 - a. Please comment on shared google docs by following the links below. We will work on the google docs during the meeting. I will display the doc on the screen, but you may want to bring a laptop to the meeting.
 - b. History of motions about Academic Progress Reports are at the end of this agenda for your review (p. 4).
 - c. View from the registrar is that it is not feasible to offer both a midterm grade as pass / fail and a semester letter based grade because students because of confusion in registering for the right section of the course. It is feasible to open the window for grades to be entered for a longer period of time and to only enter grades for low performing students.
5. DRAFT Motions
 - a. Motion on [Academic Progress Reports](#) regarding the timeline for submission. Current catalogue language: *Early progress reports help students gauge their class performance and, if necessary, seek assistance early in the term. Instructors are responsible for ensuring that students are aware of the grading policy for a course and that homework, exams and other assignments are returned to students in a timely manner. Instructors are asked to submit early progress reports within the first six weeks of the semester.*
 - i. Clarify Early progress reports vs Academic progress reports. Let's define this more clearly.

- ii. Review and comment DRAFT Motion on Academic Progress Reports regarding timeline. ([SADA Draft MOTION--academic progress reports timeline](#))
- iii. Rationale to change the timeline from one due date to a window of dates to submit a midterm grade for students.
- b. Motion on Academic Progress Reports regarding submission for students with low grades rather than for all students.
 - i. Review and comment ([SADA Draft MOTION--reduce to stds with low grades](#))
 - ii. Rationale to change submission from grades for all students to students with low grades.
- c. Motion on the [Repeating Courses Policy](#) recognizing highest grade earned rather than most recent grade. Current catalogue language: *All grades (original and retakes) for a course completed at UAF are included on your academic record, but only the last grade earned for a course is computed in your GPA unless the course is one that can be repeated for credit. For purposes of calculating honors for graduation, all courses (even those repeated) are included in the GPA.*
 - i. Review and comment on ([SADA Draft MOTION--repeating courses](#))
 - ii. Rationale to change the repeating courses policy from the most recent grade to the highest grade.
 - iii. Other considerations:
 1. Create a policy requiring a DEVS study skills course when repeating a DEV course?
 2. Require instructor permission to retake a course?
 3. Do not allow retakes for a course where the student earned a C- or better?
 4. The UAA faculty senate [changed their policy in 2013 to allow courses to be retaken only once](#), at the instructor's discretion.

New Business

- 6. Discussion: [UAF Pre-major status policy](#)
 - a. Current catalogue language:

Students admitted in pre-major standing have not met the admission requirements for bachelor's degrees but are intending to major in a bachelor's degree. As a bachelor's-intended student, you will generally work with advisors in the Academic Advising Center, Rural Student Services or a community campus, but it is helpful to also contact the department of your intended major. Because not all requirements for immediate admittance to a bachelor's degree will have been met, pre-major students will work with an academic advisor to determine the best selection of courses to pursue.

Students who are in good standing and have completed 14 credits at the 100 level or above with a C grade average (2.0) or better, of which 9 credits must satisfy baccalaureate general education requirements, will be changed to major status.

The vice provost will notify students of their change of status and inform the registrar. Pre-major students do not use the change of major form to move from pre-major to major status but may use the form to change from pre-major status in one program to another program. Academic assistance and actions are processed the same as for general studies students.
 - b. Review the following comments and questions regarding Pre-Major status, submitted by Faculty Senate President Orion Lawlor:

Most of our schools and colleges have [minimum admission requirements](#) for new bachelor's degree students--for example, CEM, CNSM, SFOS, and SNRE require geometry and trigonometry.

Students not meeting the admission requirements for their major are admitted as premajors. But currently, students automatically exit premajor status upon successfully completing 14 credits, even

if they still do not meet admission requirements. Some students then spend years in developmental courses before they can start their major coursework.

The faculty senate last [updated this policy in 2007](#) to make the premajor to major transition automatic; is this the right policy?

Consider an alternative policy:

Students remain in premajor status until they meet the minimum admission requirements for their major.

This would have major implications for advising, sending most developmental students to the academic advising center instead of their major department. The advantage is the academic advising center is likely more familiar with the developmental courses students need. A disadvantage is premajor students could lose their connection to their major.

A department's performance metrics can be heavily influenced by the number of premajors. Simply being more selective about entrance improves degree completion rate, and time to degree, at the price of reducing the number of students enrolled, and turning away promising students.

Two questions:

- *Policy question, on consistently defining premajors*
- *Substantive question, how do we get these students the support they need?*
 - *Better connections between majors and premajors, e.g., invitation to colloquia*

7. FYI: Review UA College Readiness Definition and MEMORANDUM July 8, 2016

College Readiness definition:

The University of Alaska defines college readiness as a combination of skills and abilities that position students for success. These include strong academic preparation, effective work and learning habits, knowledge of college culture and expectations, well-defined goals, and the ability to engage in independent problem solving. A student who is college ready has the knowledge and skills needed to enroll in and succeed in first-year courses at the University of Alaska.

Discussion Item: History of UAF Faculty Senate Motions on Freshman Progress Reports

- A. A 2005 motion passed by Faculty Senate on February 7, 2005 (Meeting #127) is the most recent one concerning Freshman Progress Reports (attached).
- B. A 2003 motion changed the name from Low Grade Reports to Freshman Progress Reports (Meeting #113 on February 3, 2003, attached).
- C. Motion to modify the date of Freshman Low Grade notification. (Meeting #77, passed on Feb. 9, 1998).
- D. Motion to modify the deadline schedules for add/drop, withdrawal, credit/audit, and freshman low grade reports. (Meeting #59, passed on Nov. 13, 1995.)

MOTION The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #127 on February 7, 2005:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to enhance the Freshmen Progress Reports system to include the following:

- All faculty and instructors teaching 100- and 200-level classes must submit a progress report for all freshmen indicating the grade being earned by the fifth week of the semester.
- All new courses that permit freshmen enrollment must explicitly include the method(s) used to determine freshman mid-semester grades in the syllabus. The freshmen reporting requirement will be evaluated as part of the curriculum review process.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2005

RATIONALE: Freshmen Progress Reports are a crucial part of our student retention plan. UAF is committed to the success of its students by providing an environment conducive to teaching and learning. The Freshmen Progress Report system (formerly Low Grade Report) was intended to serve as a retention tool to improve students' persistence and promote survival skills. It is based on a model that the faculty will be proactive, supportive and involved in facilitating the academic components of student retention. Faculty awareness of potential student problems constitutes the foundation of this retention program by assisting with the early detection and intervention of students who are doing poorly in class, chronically absent from class (since attendance is an integral part of the learning process), or experiencing other kinds of problems that affect academic performance.

As L. Noel stated in *Increasing Student Retention* (1985), "It is the people who come face-to-face with students on a regular basis who provide the positive growth experiences for students that enable them to identify their goals and talents and learn how to put them to use. The caring attitude of college personnel is viewed as the most potent retention force on a campus (p. 17)."

To augment this important function, incorporating the grading policy and time frame in the syllabus will indicate to students the commitment faculty and instructors have to the success and persistence of UAF students.

MOTION The UAF Faculty Senate passed the following at its Meeting #113 on February 3, 2003:

=====

The UAF Faculty Senate moves to change the Low Grade Report system for freshmen students to Freshmen Progress Reports, in which all freshman grades would be reported.

EFFECTIVE: Fall 2003

RATIONALE: The eight faculty and other staff members of the Early Warning Program recommended this change as part of an overall effort to provide personal intervention in a more positive assistance approach rather than what might appear as punitive. Specific issues forwarded by this group include:

- All faculty and instructors teaching classes with freshmen enrolled should submit Freshmen Progress Reports for all freshmen, not just for those who are doing poorly

- This switch from Low Grade Reports to Freshmen Progress Reports will assist all freshmen with the transition into college and provide an additional connection between students and faculty
- To make the process expedient, timely, and user-friendly, Freshmen Progress Reports should be available for faculty and instructors to submit electronically
- Students should be able to access their individual progress report electronically, as well as continued mailings to students at their current local address
- Freshmen Progress Reports need to be formatted in a clear and concise manner to eliminate extraneous information.
- The report will be provided to students at all UAF campuses.