1. Welcome and adoption of the agenda
   Minutes from the last meeting have been approved electronically and are posted on the Senate website.

2. Consent Agenda – As of this date, there are no items on the consent agenda.

3. Committee reports
   Senator Cobb will provide a list of Committee reports that are currently available on the Senate website.

4. Informational and Action Items
   Retention & Graduation Study Recommendations (approximately 40 minutes)
   The Retention & Graduation Study working groups have been working on recommendations with the goal of increasing the retention and graduation rate of UR undergraduates. There are four working groups: Academic Working Group (Provost Fetrow and Dr. April Hill, co-chairs); Student Engagement Working Group (VP Bisese, chair – Tom Roberts will attend in his place); Admission & Financial Aid Working Group (VP Dupaul, chair); and Data Collection and Monitoring Working Group (VP Schuyler, chair).
   Three of these working group chairs will be discussing their recommendations at this meeting (the fourth will be available at the next Senate meeting). Fact sheets on the background information, together with the recommendations will be posted along with the agenda in advance of the meeting to maximize time for discussion. Two of the working groups will present their recommendations for informational purposes – Student Engagement and Data Collection.
   The Academic Working Group recommendations will be discussed at this meeting for informational purposes, but will also require action by the Senate at future meetings. There will be a discussion of the schedule and forms of future action required.

5. Old Business

6. New Business
   a. The Senate will be inviting VP and General Counsel Sinclair, Dean Fankhauser, and Dan Fabian to attend a future meeting to discuss issues surrounding Title IX.
   b. President Crutcher will be invited to update the Senate on the Strategic Planning Task Force.

7. Executive Session
Academic Retention Working Group – Summary of Discussion and Recommendations

Academic Retention Working Group members:
April Hill and Jacque Fetrow, co-chairs
Boehman, Joe  Matthews, Bruce
Breeden, Susan  Nicholson, Bob
Cable, Jennifer  Price, Terry
Cobb, Stephanie  Schuyler, Lori
Gill, Keith  Snaza, Nathan
Gruner, Libby  Spies, Stephanie
Hoke, Kathy  Walton, Hope
Logan, Matt

Overview: The Academic Retention Working Group met approximately every 2-3 weeks from April 2015 to July 2015. The group also met regularly in September and October 2015. Our work involved reviewing and evaluating in detail, the academic-related data provided as part of the Retention Study by external consultants. When necessary, we asked for additional analysis of data, and discussed (intensely at times) multiple academic options for improving retention. This document provides a very briefly summary of the group’s reasoning for recommendations along with the proposals. We present these recommendations to the faculty for review and ask that the Senate lead the process for discussion and possible approval (or modification).

Why is it important to increase retention and how should we do it?
We are dedicated to providing excellent educational opportunities for all of our students, and ensuring that we have sound academic policies that will enable student success is part of our mission. We are also committed to the highest quality education—a robust and comprehensive liberal arts education that combines the best of the liberal arts and the professions. The data we reviewed indicate a significant relationship between bad grades (D or lower) and retention (see below). This data helped guide our recommendations aimed at retaining more students. None of our recommendations focus on lessening requirements, or ask faculty to change how we teach, or question the level of challenge in our courses. Instead, our recommendations focus on encouraging students to rise up to the level of the challenge we offer in our courses and degree requirements by giving them some safety nets in the first two years.

Data observations
- Compared to peer institutions, the University of Richmond’s retention and graduation rates are low.
- Students with one or two bad grades (D or lower) in their first 1-3 semesters are more likely to leave than are those who do not earn a bad grade.
- The data suggests that students with GPAs in the 2.0-2.5 range in their first 1-3 semesters are more likely to leave than are those who do not earn a bad grade but may not have a red flag soon enough.
- The data did not indicate a strong bias towards specific courses or pairs of courses as particularly problematic in student retention.
**Recommendations:** These recommendations are guided by the data, which suggests to us that giving students an opportunity to “recover” from a bad grade could provide them a pathway to succeed at UR. We acknowledge that a very small number of students may try to “game the system.” The recommendations here have been developed to try to guard against this.

**Academic Policy.** The Academic Retention Working Group proposes three academic policy changes:

1. **Revise withdrawal period.** Change the course withdrawal deadline from 7 to 10 weeks with permission of instructor, advisor, and Dean of relevant College or School. After week 10, the advisor and Dean’s office would need to sign off on withdrawals in cases of extenuating circumstances.
   a. **Rationale:** Currently, the deadline for withdrawing from a class is at seven weeks, quite early in the semester and before midterms. Students who are worried about their GPA and/or their ability to perform in a course are often forced to make a decision with insufficient information on grades or other feedback on how they might do in a class or how their work might improve with effort. A withdrawal deadline of 10 weeks would allow students sufficient time to learn if they might improve their work over the course of the semester and to have significant assessment of their work.
   b. **Note:** This would result in an “M” (failing at time of withdrawal) or a “W” (passing at time of withdrawal) on their transcript.
   c. Need to check on how week 10 would relate to financial aid status.

2. **Revise pass/fail policy.** Allow up to two units in the first two years to be graded pass/fail, with permission of instructor, advisor, and Dean, with a decision deadline concomitant with the withdrawal deadline (10 weeks). A total of four courses may be graded pass/fail during a student’s career at UR. (First Year Seminars and two-unit language courses are explicitly excluded from this option.)
   a. **Rationale:** Allows a student to continue taking a course without fear of “wrecking” their GPA. It also levels the playing field for all students, both those on aid and those not on aid (currently, students who are not on financial aid can more easily drop a course, without fear of dropping below the federally mandated minimum number of units required to receive financial aid). A low GPA in the first year keeps students from becoming involved in many activities (SSIR, Greek life, etc). Such a policy would also allow students to be “braver” in course selection and would provide advisors an opportunity for encouraging such “bravery” in students.
   b. **Note:** Currently, general education courses taken at the University of Richmond are excluded from the pass/fail policy (“The [pass/fail] resulting credit may only be used to count as total credit toward a degree, and cannot be used to satisfy any general education requirement or any major or minor requirement”). However, general education courses transferred in from other schools transfer in as a “pass,” as do all transfer courses. Thus we accept pass/fail (with a C as minimum grade) from other schools, but not from UR.
c. Note: Current policy allows up to four pass/fail courses, but only for juniors and seniors. We are not proposing increasing this maximum, but rather allowing first- and second-year students to take up to two courses pass/fail.

d. Note: This policy is not meant to supersede existing policies in various departments and schools. For example, any school or department can exclude major or minor courses from this policy.

e. Note: The Academic Retention Working Group would encourage faculty to include in their syllabi language that states that, if the course is taken pass/fail, completion of all course requirements is required to pass the course. Some faculty members currently have this in their syllabi and we would recommend it for all.

3. **Revise grade replacement policy.** Allow up to one grade replacement for a D or F grade earned during the first two years. In the case of a re-take, the original course will remain permanently on the transcript with the grade marked as “E” (exclude, not counted in GPA and units not counted towards graduation requirement). The grade for the second “take” of the course will be recorded and counted in the GPA.

   a. **Rationale.** This policy allows a student the opportunity to “try and fail”. There is sound evidence that a re-take allows a student to better learn the material, as well as learn that they can succeed in any given course. This policy also supports advisors encouraging more “brave” choices for course selection.

   b. Note: Students are required to petition the Registrar (filling out a form) for the grade replacement by the end of week 10 of the semester (same deadline as P/F and withdrawal). Form would require signature of advisor. This option is subject to course availability.

**Policy Wording:** Please see recommended wording changes to current policy, attached.

**Policy and non-policy changes that were considered but not recommended** include:

1. Encourage development of half unit classes, where pedagogically advantageous or appropriate. The development of mid-term academic courses may assist students who need to drop courses mid-term and remain at full-time status. This does raise the problem that you currently can’t add a course at mid-term.

2. Change the number of units required for full-time status or for graduation.

**Additional non-academic policy recommendations that were strongly supported by the Academic Retention Working Group.**

1. Data gathering and analysis every year, reported to a university-wide faculty “academic affairs” committee and including data that assesses the outcome of any policy change (including assessing the implementation of these recommendations to see if they change retention).

2. Deans and department chairs strongly encourage midterm grade assessments and reports in all classes. This supports retention by allowing students and advisors to make sound decisions, based on evidence, regarding continuation in any course.
3. Development of a transparent and robust process for flagging struggling students quickly, so that college deans and advisors can reach out directly. This supports student retention by allowing these individuals to reach out to the student and guide them in utilizing multiple support systems (e.g., Academic Skills Center, Writing Center, Speech Center, CAPS, etc.). Schools and departments should work with the Academic Advising Resource Center to develop a process for flagging struggling students and supporting them.

4. Departments and schools consider developing and implementing strategies to restrict course registration or to hold seats to help prevent over-registration. (The Registrar should publish best practices around this and those should be widely disseminated.)

5. Encourage support of faculty development programs around issues and best practices related to retaining students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working Group</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Next Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expand living/learning residential communities with particular attention to first-year communities (possibly connected to FYS)</td>
<td>Develop a proposal to expand the Office of Living/Learning and Roadmap Programs by one staff member in order to support expanded number of LLCs. (This was also one of the main recommendations of the Roadmap/LLC/SSIR Review Committee commissioned by Steve Bisese which included a number of faculty members.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continue to expand alternative programming options with a focus on early new student bonding and school spirit.</td>
<td>Campus Activities Board (CAB) has been rebranded under the name Spider Board. CA Alternatives has been rebranded under the name Spider Nights. Both organizations are devoting more resources to non-alcohol, large-scale alternative programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Define and embed the University’s core values across the Student Experience and the messages that students receive in order to support student thriving.</td>
<td>Steve Bisese has asked Glyn Hughes to chair a working group to examine these issues with the task of developing recommendations. The group started meeting in July 2015; first draft recommendations are due March 2016.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Engagement</td>
<td>Continue to expand transition program opportunities for new students (e.g. expand existing programs and/or encourage the development of new programs).</td>
<td>Continue to monitor the Student Development Division budget and add sections of Roadmap (or other programs) as funds become available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work with Dan Fabian and Kerry Fankhauser to reivew working group suggestions and consider changes to the OA selection and training process (e.g. offer a wellness class training program for new OA’s, include training with staff from Center for Student Involvement (Greek life), and expand OA opportunities with new students into the fall semester). Gradual implementation of recommendations during the Orientation 2016 planning process and beyond.</td>
<td>As mentioned above, Steve Bisese is developing a P &amp; P proposal to add a staff member to the Office of Living/Learning and Roadmap Programs who also would focus on the development of new transition programs (e.g. a possible civic engagement transition program opportunity).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase the training and expand the role of the Orientation Advisor (OA).</td>
<td>Work with Dan Fabian and Kerry Fankhauser to reivew working group suggestions and consider changes to the OA selection and training process (e.g. offer a wellness class training program for new OA’s, include training with staff from Center for Student Involvement (Greek life), and expand OA opportunities with new students into the fall semester). Gradual implementation of recommendations during the Orientation 2016 planning process and beyond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students better navigate the pathways to student engagement. Develop a mechanism, other than SpiderBytes for students to learn about the many opportunities available to them.</td>
<td>The Center for Student Involvement (CSI) adopted a phone application that has become popular at colleges/universities focused on allowing students to advertise their events, list opportunities, and calendar the various events/programs. The Campus Quad phone application became available to students in August 2015.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to revise, adjust, and improve transportation opportunities for students.</td>
<td>Develop a transportation advisory board that involves students from various campus involvements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change of Registration

Students are able to register for classes through BannerWeb, a secured website that may be accessed over the Internet at bannerweb.richmond.edu or through the University's website. Through BannerWeb, students can register for classes, add and drop classes through the end of add/drop period, view their class schedules, view grades for a specific term, and view their unofficial University of Richmond transcript. Students are responsible for all activity on their BannerWeb account including PIN maintenance, registration, and security. If a student has questions or needs assistance with any aspect of BannerWeb, he or she should contact the Office of the University Registrar at (804) 289-8639 or registrar@richmond.edu.

Once registered, students may change their registration (add/drop) according to the published schedule. For a regular term, adds and withdrawals without academic record may generally be made during the first two weeks of classes. Summer terms have abbreviated add/drop and withdrawal periods, so please consult the summer academic calendar for those dates. After the end of the first 10 days of classes, but before the end of the seventh tenth week, a withdrawal-with-record period is in effect where students may withdraw from courses provided that they receive the permission of the appropriate course instructor, academic advisor, and dean. Students will receive an M grade if failing at the time of withdrawal or a W grade if passing at the time of withdrawal. Ordinarily, a student may not withdraw from a course after the end of the seventh tenth week of classes except for medical reasons. The student's dean may, under special circumstances, make an exception to this policy.

Pass/Fail Option

School of Arts and Sciences and Jepson School of Leadership Studies (excluding leadership studies courses)
(Not available to business students)

An arts and sciences or leadership studies student who has completed at least 18 units of academic work may opt for one normally standard-graded unit course per semester to be graded on a pass/fail basis, or if more than one course not more than one unit of total credit. The resulting credit may only be used to count as total credit toward a degree, and cannot be used to satisfy any general education requirement the First-Year seminar or any major or minor requirement. No Jepson School of Leadership Studies or Robins School of Business courses may be taken for pass/fail grading except those in the Department of Economics. No more than two student-opted pass/fail units may
be taken during the student’s first two-years and no more than four student-opted pass/fail units

courses are acceptable for degree credit.

Note: Some courses are only available as pass/fail courses, such as internships, student teaching,
and some research courses. The restrictions stated above do not apply to such courses.

The level of performance necessary to earn a pass grade in a student-opted pass/fail course is D- or
better. A passing grade will be recorded as P on the permanent record. The credit will be added into
credit earned toward graduation and will not affect the grade point average. A failing grade will be
recorded as F on the permanent record. The credit will affect the grade point average.

To opt for pass/fail grading, a permission form must be obtained from and returned with appropriate
signatures to the Office of the University Registrar by the end of the 10th week day of classes. The
student must first register for the course and then file the permission form. Once the form is
submitted to the University Registrar, the decision may not be reversed.

Repeated Courses

Coursework may not generally be repeated for credit toward graduation except as sanctioned by the
University; however, particular coursework may meet more than one requirement for graduation. An
example of a sanctioned repeat-for-credit is the subsequent registration for a course in which the
content changes from term to term, such as special topics or independent studies. Also, certain
courses in a major or program may have to be repeated if the grade earned the first time does not
meet requirements; in such a case, the credit will be counted only once but both grades will be
calculated in the cumulative grade point average.

If a student earns a “D,” “D-” or “F” in a course during his/her first or second year and subsequently
successfully retakes the course earning a higher grade, the student may petition the University
Registrar to exclude the previous “D,” “D-” or “F” grade from his/her cumulative grade point average.
The lower grade would still appear on the student’s transcript, but would not count in the cumulative
grade point average. This option can only be used once.

The student’s advisor must be consulted before registration to discuss if a proposed repeat is appropriate sanctioned for credit, or if sanction is possible.
All courses taken at the University of Richmond become a part of the permanent academic record. The grade for a course repeated at the University of Richmond becomes a part of the grade point average if the grade otherwise would be included in the computation.

Courses taken on an audit basis cannot be repeated for credit unless approved by the appropriate dean.
Principles:
Recommend changes if they are likely to make a difference in student persistence OR otherwise be wise process improvements.

Consider carefully the ROI for additional data collection / monitoring burdens that are proposed. Data collection processes need to be part of business process to ensure effective and standardized collection.

Data for Monitoring Institutional Retention and Graduation Efforts

Objective: Institution-wide data collection, reporting, and analysis that advances University efforts to improve retention and graduation rates among traditional undergraduate students

1. Recommend regular collection and reporting of institutional persistence data. To the extent appropriate, this data should be developed in ROADS and used to create a retention dashboard in MicroStrategy
   a. Include variables that were statistically significant in study and those that are typically significant nationally. (see Appendix A)

   b. In addition to 1-year retention, and 4-year, 5-year and 6-year graduation rates, include in annual monitoring metric that measures persistence of the cohort. (see Recommendation #3)

   c. Student withdrawal application aggregate data should be included in annual monitoring report. (see Recommendation #4)

   d. ACES aggregate data should be included in regular monitoring report. (see Recommendation #6)

   e. BCSSE aggregate data should be included in regular monitoring report. (see Recommendation #7)

   f. Clearinghouse data on where students transferred should be collected annually and included in the monitoring report.

   g. Develop regular reporting schedule for this data.
2. Recommend that groups meet annually to review institutional persistence data and consider need for any further action:
   a. Share findings with senior leadership body assembled annually for this purpose:
      - **Members:** Provost, VP Enrollment Management, VP Student Development, VP Planning and Policy, Dean of A&S, Dean of Jepson, Dean of RSB, Dean of Westhampton College, Dean of Richmond College, Athletic Director, Director of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, members of the Retention Intervention Team
      - **Role:** This group should interrogate data, identify any need for action, and propose next steps when data suggests need for response. This group will also prioritize need for any additional variables/subcategories of analysis of graduation and retention data (e.g. retention data by program affiliation), so as to manage the institutional data collection and analysis burden of requests from various programs and offices.
   
   b. Share findings with Faculty Senate (through Undergraduate Admission Committee or some other committee or body of the whole at Senate’s recommendation)
      - **Role:** The Faculty Senate should review the data and suggest areas in need of response and work with the senior leadership team as appropriate when the data suggests need for a response.
   
   c. Share relevant findings with advisors to encourage advisor interventions that support persistence
      - Significant findings should be incorporated into a standard report for advisors that is shared annually.
      - Advisor workshops and professional development activities should promote practices that support student persistence and should be intentional about addressing areas where University data shows opportunities for enhanced retention or success among our students.
   
   d. Share relevant findings with professionals in other key offices, especially academic support units
      - Significant findings should be shared with key offices, and those offices should be engaged in discussions about how to address any identified areas of weakness.

3. Recommend development of annual monitoring metric that measures persistence of the cohort each year (e.g. SCHEV student success measurement).
   - Ideally this metric will be developed in ROADS and incorporated into the retention dashboard. (see Recommendation #1)
4. Recommend appointment of a working group to revise online applications for withdrawal, which are administered to students who withdraw from the University and stored in Maxient. Recommended revisions:
   a. Form should utilize best practices in question development
   b. Form should force students to rank the importance of factors, including selection of a primary factor
   c. Form should attempt to distinguish among students who were prevented from participating in an activity (e.g. cut from varsity sport, unable to or unsuccessful in Greek rush, etc.) vs. those who never attempted to engage or whose engagement is not captured by membership in student organizations.
   d. Forms should continue to include data that can be analyzed quantitatively, as well as soliciting open-ended responses
   e. Form should be administered to students remotely / independently (e.g. not in the presence of a University faculty/staff member)
   f. Information from the form should be able to be connected to unit record data on individual students in a way that permits analysis (and confirmation of self-reported information, such as GPA upon departure, financial aid status, etc.)

5. Recommend the University conduct NSSE every third year

Moving survey from every other to every third year will allow us to survey first-year students when they are seniors; this cohort model will provide us a longitudinal assessment with nationally normed instrument. In years when NSSE is administered, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness should align with unit record data to look for patterns in combination of NSSE data and persistence. The combined NSSE / persistence data should be included in report to senior leadership group in years in which NSSE is undertaken. Consider prioritizing this survey and mechanisms to increase student response rates.

6. Recommend the University participate in ACES annually

The University should participate in ACES annually and align that information with unit record data to look for patterns in combination of anticipated academic performance, actual academic performance, and persistence. ACES analysis will enable the University to better understand patterns in underperformance and persistence (including among subpopulations), which the current study and the snapshot ACES analysis identified as significant. If patterns become clear in future years, consider using ACES to identify individual students for interventions by Retention Intervention Team.

Draft
October 20, 2015
7. Recommend administering BCSSE (Beginning College Survey of Student Engagement) annually

This pre-matriculation assessment captures nationally normed information on entering students’ “high school academic and co-curricular experiences, as well as their expectations for participating in educationally purposeful activities during the first college year.” This information should be gathered and aligned with persistence information at the unit record level. This data should be analyzed for Richmond-specific patterns that would assist in identifying at-risk students upon matriculation. Consider integrating BCSSE administration into Orientation or some other appropriate mechanism to encourage increased response rate.

Data for Monitoring Individual Student Persistence

Objective: Data collection, reporting, and analysis to support intervention efforts that encourage individual student persistence.

8. Recommend Creation of Retention Intervention Team

Retention Intervention Team would extend current work of the WC/RC deans offices, meeting regularly (like Behavioral Intervention Team) to provide ongoing mechanism for triaging information about students at risk of transferring, particularly due to academic concerns. In particular, the Team would meet to triage progress reports and review individual student concerns arising from semesterly auditing.

a. Members: Dean of Richmond College (Chair), Dean of Westhampton College, Director of Academic Advising, Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs (Jepson School), Associate Dean for Undergraduate Business Programs (RSB), AVP & Director of Financial Aid, Asst. AD for Academics

b. Role: The role of the Team would be to review individual student reports and refer to a responsible party. Depending on the issue, the person responsible for follow-up could be a member of the WC/RC Dean’s offices, financial aid counselor, faculty advisor, etc. Outcomes of review could include: mandatory weekly meetings with Dean’s office staff, referral to writing center or Academic Skills Center, revised schedule, course withdrawal, etc. Following semesterly audit, outcomes could include deficiency letter, Academic Warning / Academic Probation, letter of concern, revisions to upcoming semester schedule, etc. Depending on the student circumstances, other colleagues will be brought into the conversation (e.g. Director of Richmond Scholars Program, CAPS, etc.)

c. Records should be kept in Maxient

9. Recommend that current semesterly audit be revised to include additional variables that were statistically significant in the study (see Appendix B)
10. Recommend revisions to form of academic progress reports and initiatives to support increased reporting from faculty.
   a. Revise questions to make them easier / quicker for faculty to complete (see Appendix C)
   b. Provost should encourage completion, especially for first-year students, in part by sharing information with faculty about why progress reports are useful and how they will be used – and to dispel concerns about possible uses of the reports (e.g. share with faculty that students won’t get in trouble, that information won’t go on students’ “permanent record” or damage potential for student involvement in honors or activities)
   c. Reports should be triaged by Retention Intervention Team and follow-up responsibilities assigned in Maxient

11. Recommend use of BCSESE information to help inform interventions (see Recommendation #7)
   a. Individual BCSESE reports should be shared with faculty advisors (see Appendix D)
   b. If a student is considered by the Retention Intervention Team, BCSESE information should be shared with Retention Intervention Team
Appendix A – Institutional Monitoring Variables

Cohort variables and retention/graduation:

- Students of Color (aggregated and disaggregated)
- First Generation
- Pell
- International
- Region (e.g. South, New England, Virginian, etc.)
- Non-native English speakers
- Athletes
- Academic Rating
- Richmond Scholars
- Intended major (duplicate count)
- Last declared major (duplicate count)
- Financial aid ranges
- UR First-term GPA ranges
- Cumulative GPA ranges
- SAT/ACT converted
- UR Converted HS GPA
- Tier 1 Courses
- Living learning communities
- Greek
- First-Year residence Hall
- Last residence hall
- If University develops mechanism for collecting self-reported student data on LGBTQ status, include as variable in annual reporting
- Academic Probation
- Academic Warning
- Failure to achieve SAP

Dashboard on Students who Left:

- Completed terms
- Bio/demographic/other variables (above)
- Student previously identified by Retention Intervention Team
- Banner Coded Reason for Withdraw (in aggregate):
  - Medical, academic honor, conduct, probation, suspension
- Incorporate Athletics data:
  - Professional athletics
  - Cut from team
Appendix B – Semesterly Audit Variables to Identify Individual Students

- Students who miss SAP
- Students who earn academic warning
- Students who earn academic probation
- Students who have previously missed SAP
- Students who have previously been on academic warning (monitor for 2 terms)
- Students who have previously been on academic probation (monitor for 2 terms)

In addition to above:
  - Below 2.3 term GPA
  - Below 2.3 cumulative GPA
  - Earned 1 or more “bad grades”
  - Earned 1 or more Withdraws
  - Low on units relative to # of terms completed (use SAP definition of low on units)
  - Failure to declare a major (after 5th semester)
Appendix C – Progress Reports

Recommend changing progress report format to support enhanced response rate and ease of use by faculty members. Proposed new format would include the names of each student on a faculty member’s class roster and ask following questions with click-box, Yes/No answers:

- Is the student at risk of earning grade C- or below in this course?
- Is student’s attendance satisfactory?
- Is student appropriately engaged during class time and with the course material?
- I am concerned about this student academically or otherwise [Clicking yes would open to free-response area]
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