

July 6, 2011

From: Todd D. Sikora, Chairperson, Academic Standards Committee

To: Ana Borger-Greco, Chairperson, Faculty Senate

Re: Annual Report of Academic Standards Committee for Academic Year 2010-2011

1. The Academic Standards Committee (ASC) held dismissal appeal hearings 12-13 January 2011 and 8-9 June 2011. Results from the hearings are summarized in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively.

Table 1. January 2011 Dismissal Appeal Hearing Statistics

	Dismissed	Appealed	Approved	% of Dismissals Appealed	% of Appeals Approved
1st Dismissal	122	52(12)	38(8)	43	73(67)
2nd Dismissal	17	12(12)	7(7)	71	58(58)
≥3rd Dismissal	6	5(5)	3(3)	83	60(60)
Total	145	69(29)	48(18)	48	70(62)

Table 2. June 2011 Dismissal Appeal Hearing Statistics

	Dismissed	Appealed	Approved	% of Dismissals Appealed	% of Appeals Approved
1st Dismissal	138	38(14)	22(7)	28	58(50)
2nd Dismissal	34	15(14)	5(4)	44	33(29)
≥3rd Dismissal	9	6(6)	2(2)	67	33(33)
Total	181	59(34)	29(13)	33	49(38)

Parenthetical data represent the portion of total hearings that were resolved via letter-only as opposed to via a letter and an in-person appeal. Beginning with the 2010-2011 academic year, in-person appeals are not permitted for 2nd and higher dismissals.

Three first dismissal letter-only appeals and one fourth dismissal letter-only appeal were received after the June hearings but before the 30 June deadline for late appeals. They were handled by a special subcommittee of the ASC. That special subcommittee also considered one petition for readmission to MU after a 3rd dismissal. The special subcommittee recommended readmission.

2. During the June 2011 hearings, ASC subcommittees considered six eligible petitions for academic amnesty, all of which were approved.

3. During the January 2011 hearings, an ASC subcommittee considered three petitions for academic amnesty, all of which were approved.

4. During the January 2011 hearings, an ASC subcommittee considered one petition for readmission to MU after a 3rd dismissal. The subcommittee recommended denying readmission because the three-year dismissal period was not served.

5. During the fall 2010 semester, an ASC subcommittee considered one petition for readmission to MU after a 3rd dismissal. The subcommittee recommended readmission. In addition, two ASC subcommittees considered six academic amnesty petitions. Three were approved, and three were denied. Two of the three that were denied were because of non-eligibility.

6. The ASC has formed a subcommittee, chaired by Prof. Richard Kerper, to explore revising the Governance Manual policy on academic amnesty. This action was motivated by the academic amnesty petitions the ASC considered during the fall 2010 semester. Their work is ongoing.

7. The MU policy governing academic standards, probation, dismissal, and appeal was recently revised by the ASC and the current language was implemented beginning fall 2010. After the January 2011 hearings, the Associate Provost for Academic Administration (APAA), Dr. Phillips, approached Dr. Sikora with concern about the following paragraph from that policy:

“After the ASC’s decision, if an appellant believes the appeal process was not administered as prescribed herein, the appellant may pursue an appeal of the process, but not the academic decision, in writing, to the Associate Provost for Academic Administration. Such an appeal must be made within ten business days from the date of the decision letter from the Chairperson of the ASC. The appellant is advised to provide as much written documentation as possible, describing why the process was not administered as prescribed herein, and any supporting materials. The decision of the Associate Provost for Academic Administration regarding the process appeal is final and not subject to further review.”

That paragraph was drafted by Dr. Sikora and the former APAA, Dr. Burns. Dr. Phillips’s concern is that policy leaves little basis for any appeal to the APAA. Dr. Sikora solicited input / advice from the ASC about Dr. Phillips’s concern. A small group of ASC members devoted considerable time and effort addressing the APAA’s concern. Consensus was not achieved.