



Introduction

University Standing Committees

Policy

Descriptions

Alphabetical List

Reporting List

Members

Annual Reports

Undergraduate Grades and Academic Standing Committee

Annual Report for 2004 - 2005

Members

Susan M. Vladika, Coordinator of Retention (Chair)
 Dr. Helen Bittel, English Department College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
 Dr. Mary Ann Wagner, Science Department, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
 Mr. Edward Rushton, Art Department, College of Creative Arts and Management
 Dr. Linda Partridge, Art Department, College of Creative Arts and Management (Fall meeting only—resigned due to other University committee obligations)
 Sr. Gail Cabral, Psychology Department, College of Education and Human Development
 Dr. Brad Janey, Counseling/Psychology Department, College of Education and Human Development
 Mr. Mike Freund, School of Social Work, College of Health and Human Services
 Dr. Alan Levine, Nutrition and Dietetics Department, College of Health and Human Services
 Ann Boland-Chase, Registrar
 Bob Reese, Director of Undergraduate Admissions
 Andrea Morrison, Director of Residence Life
 Meghan Cruciani, Coordinator of Undergraduate Academic Advising
 Dr. Jaclyn Leitzel, Director of Counseling and Student Development Center
 Sr. Mary Agnes Devitt, Director of ACT 101 Program
 Dennis M. Kelly, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management
 Sr. Jane Snyder, Asst. Director of Financial Aid (by invitation of Chair to Second Spring 2005 Grades and Academic Standing Committee Meeting on Grants and Scholarships)
 Mr. Stanley Skrutski, Director of Financial Aid (by invitation of Chair to Second Spring 2005 Grades and Academic Standing Committee Meeting on Grants and Scholarships)

Meetings

This Committee meets twice yearly at the end of the fall and spring semesters to make decisions on student academic performance for the given semester. The committee also meets one other time, at the end of the spring semester, to make decisions on student grant and scholarship awards in relation to quality point average.

Accomplishments

I. Fall Meeting—2004-2005: January 3, 2005

A. Proposals

(1) It was proposed that we do a special letter to students with a q.p.a. below 1.00. The Committee approved this proposal.

(2) It was proposed that when students have “I and “X” grades when the Grades and Academic Standing Committee meets and a q.p.a. at that time that dictates sending an academic warning letter, that we send the letter out to the student instead of waiting for the “I” or the “X” grade to be resolved. The Committee approved this proposal.

(3) It was proposed that future meetings of the Grades and Academic Standing Committee be held in a Technology Ready Room. The Committee approved this proposal.

B. Decisions

(1) The Grades and Academic Standing Committee will continue to recommend dismissal decisions to the deans. This Chair will put together a list for each dean, of the students from the respective colleges, who are candidates for dismissal. The deans will send a letter to each student asking them if they have any mitigating circumstances that would preclude them from being dismissed. The student would then need to get in touch with the dean by a pre-determined date set in the letter, or be dismissed. The deans would then send another letter to the student formalizing the dismissal.

(2) University wide major warning continues to be q.p.a. of less than 2.33.

(3) Education majors are required to have a 3.00 q.p.a. in their major and overall.

(4) Nursing majors are required to have a 2.50 q.p.a. in their major.

(5) QPA Warning letters are sent to “Undeclared with Interest in Education” majors because they are tracking for an Education major and currently are not at the required q.p.a. for major or overall.

C. Catalog Guidelines*—(applies to both Fall and Spring Meetings)

(1) Semester Warning—Whenever the quality point average for a semester is less than 2.00, but the cumulative quality point average is 2.00 or better, the student will be warned.

(2) Major Warning—Whenever the major quality point average falls below 2.33, a student will be placed on major warning. Some major programs require a higher QPA. Individual program descriptions provide specific information.

(3) Probation— A student will be placed on probation if a QPA of 1.00 is not achieved in any given semester or whenever his/her quality point average falls below 2.00. Probation is temporary; it is, therefore not included in the student's academic record.

(4) Repeated Probation—If a student's cumulative quality point average increases and, though still below 2.00, indicates possibility to attain the standards required for graduation, the student may be continued on probation for another semester.

(5) Dismissal—

- A student who fails to improve her/his cumulative quality point average at the end of a semester or more on probation.
- A student whose cumulative quality point average increases, though still remaining below 2.00, if the student's academic record indicates little potential for attaining the academic standards required for graduation. (Academic dismissal is recorded on the student's academic record).
- A student who has had previous but nonconsecutive semesters on probation.
- A student who fails to achieve a 1.00 in any two semesters.

Students may also be dismissed for other academic reasons, such as academic dishonesty.

*From the 2003-2005 Marywood University Undergraduate Catalog.

D. The committee recommended five (5) dismissals. Of those, the students' deans allowed the students to present any mitigating circumstances by a January 12, 2005, after which the students' dismissals were confirmed with a letter by the dean to the students. Two (2) students were actually dismissed. This is a breakdown of the dismissals by college:

	CLAS	CCAM	CHHS	CEHD
Recommended Dismissals	0	3	1	1
Actual Dismissals	0	1	1	0

E. The following breakdown of students put on probation, continued probation, major warning (q.p.a. of 2.33) and semester warning, is presented below. A separate major warning is prepared for Education majors due to the 3.00 q.p.a. requirement in major and overall and Nursing majors for the 2.50 q.p.a. in major. A QPA Warning for "Undeclared with interest in Education" majors was believed to be needed due to the Education standards for major. Grant warning and scholarship warning letters for the 2004-2005 academic year were also sent out based on student q.p.a. The Committee also chose to send a "Grant Warning Making Progress" letter this semester.

Probation	Cont'd Probation	Major Warning	Semester Warning	Education Major Warning	Nursing Major Warning	QPA Warning	Grant Warning	Grant Warning Making Progress	Scholarship Warning
51	5	20	29	62	6	20	77	3	44

E. There were also students coming off probation, major warning, semester warning, grant warning and scholarship warning that the committee recommended sending a congratulatory letter to, as follows:

Congratulations off Probation	Congratulations off Major Warning	Congratulations off Semester Warning	Congratulations off Grant Warning	Congratulations off Scholarship Warning
10	21	26	19	9

F. Unclassified students will be reported on separately, by Ann Boland-Chase, Registrar.

II. Spring Meeting—2004-2005: May 16, 2005

A. Proposals and Updates

(1) This Chair along with Frank Falcone (Manager of Enrollment Data and Systems) met over the Spring 2005 semester with the Education, Nursing and Nutrition and Dietetics Departments to discuss the special major warning notices that the Retention Office had been doing for those departments due to the different warning benchmark for those majors. The University's major warning of 2.33 is the standard at Marywood. Our goal was to assist the departments in sending out their own warnings if they were different from the University's standard. The rationale behind our meetings was that students should not get two different letters from Marywood University regarding the same matter. In addition, the special queries that are required for the Education, Nursing and Nutrition and Dietetics Departments is something that is best done in those departments. The Retention Office can assist and monitor when needed. The Committee was in favor of this work.

With Frank Falcone's help, we were willing to help them develop queries so they could do letters themselves. However, Education and Nursing are already doing the queries and sending out their own letters. We agreed that they would continue to do their own queries and letters and that if a student in that major was on major warning, they would continue to notify them. The Grades and Academic Standing Committee would not have to spend time on doing major warnings for Education or Nursing majors. As far as the Nutrition and Dietetics majors go, starting with the class of 2009, there will be a new major policy. All students in other classes will still go by the

University major warning of 2.33. Frank Falcone has developed a query for those students in the class of 2009 and above. Marlene Lapinski will run it at the end of each semester and bring it into Excel, sending it to Nancy Angeloni so that she can send the letters out for students in Nutrition and Dietetics. The Nutrition and Dietetics Department have seen the query and believe it will work for them. The Committee was in favor of this work.

(2) This Chair met with Dennis Kelly (Associate Vice-President for Enrollment Management), Stanley Skrutski (Director of Financial Aid), Ann Boland Chase (Registrar) and Frank Falcone (Manager of Enrollment Data and Systems), throughout the semester to discuss how we can stream line our communications with students regarding the various conditions they are put under as a result of Grades and Academic Standing Committee decisions. This Chair has combined the grant warning and scholarship warnings within the context of the academic warnings. These are the revised various student warning letters:

1. Probation (automatic warning regarding any institutional aid).
2. Probation/Grant Reduction
3. Probation/Lose Need-Based Grant
4. Probation/Need-Based Grant Reduction
5. Probation/Scholarship Reduction
6. Continued Probation (automatic warning regarding any institutional aid).
7. Continued Probation/Grant Reduction
8. Continued Probation/Need-Based Grant Reduction
9. Major Warning (no other warnings).
10. Major Warning/Scholarship Warning.
11. Major Warning/Grant Reduction
12. Major Warning/Need-Based Grant Reduction
13. Major Warning/Scholarship Reduction
14. Major Warning/Grant Warning.
15. Lose Grant
16. Lose Scholarship
17. Lose Need-Based Grant
18. Need-Based Grant Reduction
19. Scholarship Warning (no other warnings).
20. Scholarship Reduction
21. Grant Warning (no other warnings).
22. Grant Reduction
23. Semester Warning (no other warnings).
24. Semester Warning/Grant Warning.
25. Semester Warning/Scholarship Warning
26. Semester Warning/Major Warning.
27. Semester Warning/Major Warning/Grant Warning.
28. Semester Warning/Major Warning/Scholarship Warning.
29. Semester Warning/Major Warning/Grant Warning/Scholarship Warning.
30. Semester Warning/Grant Reduction.
31. Semester Warning/Major Warning/Grant Reduction.
32. Semester Warning/Major Warning/Lose Scholarship
33. Semester Warning/Major Warning/Need-Based Grant Reduction.
34. Semester Warning/Need-Based Grant Reduction
35. Semester Warning/Scholarship Reduction.

While the Committee and this Chair recognize that this is not an all encompassing list and that other possible combinations of letters will arise, these are the letters that were needed, at least for this Spring 2005 semester.

(3) It was proposed that Grant Warning and Scholarship Warnings last for a period of two years but to not go beyond that. The rationale behind this proposal was to avoid the necessity of sending letters out every semester to students who are continually on Grant Warning and/or Scholarship Warning. The Committee suggested that this would need to be put in bold and italics if it were going to have an impact.

(4) It was proposed that probation students be notified that their financial aid be repackaged at the need-based level. The rationale was explained by Dennis Kelly, Associate Vice-President for Enrollment Management. The Committee approved the proposal.

(5) It was proposed that congratulatory letters to students be eliminated. The rationale behind this proposal was to avoid sending numerous letters with messages that were many times conflicting, to students. For example, a student may be off probation but on major warning or grant warning in the same semester. In addition, in streamlining our communications to students, it was the belief that one central message should be made to the student per semester. These are the letters that propose be eliminated:

Congratulations off Grant Warning
 Congratulations off Scholarship Warning
 Congratulations off Major Warning
 Congratulations off Semester Warning
 Congratulations off Probation
 Congratulations off Continued Probation

The Committee decided that as long as the student would **only** be getting one letter or be on one of these conditions in a given semester, then it would be agreeable to send one of these letters. When another condition is also present in a semester, then the congratulatory letter would not be sent.

(6) It was proposed that when there was a change in institutional financial aid as decided on by the Grades and Academic Standing Committee, those amounts and reductions would go into one of the (35) letters listed above as a modification to the letter. Therefore all letters will go out only after the second Grades and Academic Standing Committee meeting. The rationale behind this proposal was to avoid sending numerous letters with messages that were many times conflicting, to students. All messages from the Grades and Academic Standing Committee will be combined into one letter. The Committee believed that inherent in the letter would be the invitation to appeal and approved the proposal.

(7) It was proposed that with regard to student dismissals that the Grades and Academic Standing Committee discuss the possibility of whether it should have the final approval for dismissal. The motion, if passed could be presented to Academic Council. The rationale for the proposal was the possibility of an appeal of a dismissal. The Committee, after much discussion, came to no final decision or recommendation and felt that we may be changing the nature of the Committee if we had the power of final dismissal.

(8) All three Query sheets were fine tuned by MIS to show the students' class. This has helped with identification and sorting.

(9) Two of the Query sheets were fine tuned by MIS to show students' major and degree path. This has helped with identification and sorting.

B. Decisions—

The committee recommended eleven (11) dismissals. Of those, the students' deans allowed the students to present any mitigating circumstances by varying dates at the end of May and the beginning of June, after which the students' dismissals were confirmed with a letter by the dean to the students. Nine (9) students were actually dismissed. This is a breakdown of the dismissals by college:

	CLAS	CCAM	CHHS	CEHD
Recommended Dismissals	6	3	1	1
Actual Dismissals	5	2	1	1

C. The following breakdown of students put on probation, continued probation, major

warning (q.p.a. of 2.33) and semester warning, is presented below:

Probation	Continued Probation	Major Warning	Semester Warning
33	8	20	37

D. There were also students coming off probation, major warning and semester warning that the committee recommended sending a congratulatory letter to, as follows:

Congratulations off Probation	Congratulations off Major Warning	Congratulations off Semester Warning
2	3	6

E. Unclassified Students will be reported on separately, by Ann Boland Chase, Registrar.

III. Spring Financial Meeting—2004-2005: May 19, 2005

A. Proposals and Updates

(1) It was proposed that students with need-based grants not have the grant reduced even if a drop in q.p.a. occurred. The rationale was that those grants are based on need. Stanley Skrutski, Director of Financial Aid, clarified that the need-based grants are partly need-based, not always solely based on need. The Committee was then able to move on other proposals based on this information.

(2) It was proposed that a formula be instituted that could be applied for future decisions regarding student institutional aid in relation to q.p.a. For example, if a student lost "x" in q.p.a., he/she would lose "y" in financial aid. The rationale for this proposal was equity and consistency of institutional standards across the board.

The Grades and Academic Standing Committee matrix produced at this second meeting is as follows:

	IHM	MUG	IHM/NBG	NBG Only	MUG/NBG
2.99-2.75	Warn	OK	Warn	N/A	OK
2.74-2.50	-\$500	OK	-\$500	N/A	OK
2.49-2.30	-\$1000	Warn	-\$1000	Warn	Warn
2.29-2.00	-\$2000	-\$500	-\$2000	-\$500	-\$500
Below 2.0	-\$3000	-\$1000	-\$3000	-\$1000	-\$1000

(3) Toward the end of the meeting, Sr. Jane Snyder (Asst. Director of Financial Aid for Student Services), suggested that transfer students might be adversely affected by the matrix. We agreed to look at the matrix at a later date and single out those students that would be affected and possibly reconfigure a second matrix for those students. Then this Chair would send it to the Committee for approval through an e-mail. After going through the students that would be affected by a second matrix, this Chair, Sr. Jane Snyder and Dennis Kelly, Associate Vice-President for Enrollment Management met briefly to look at a possible second matrix. With Stanley Skrutski's approval a second matrix was developed. After asking for any input from the Grades and Academic Standing Committee, this is the second matrix for transfer students that the Grades and Academic Standing Committee developed:

TRANSFER STUDENT GRID 40%

	IHM	MUG	IHM/NBG	NBG Only	MUG/NBG
2.99-2.75	Warn	OK	Warn	N/A	OK
2.74-2.50	-\$200	OK	-\$200	N/A	OK
2.49-2.30	-\$400	Warn	-\$400	Warn	Warn
2.29-2.00	-\$800	-\$200	-\$800	-\$200	-\$200
Below 2.0	-\$1200	-\$400	-\$1200	-\$400	-\$400

B. Decisions

(1) Students with a q.p.a. within a particular "cell", as indicated, got the corresponding letter. If the student's q.p.a. was in a "cell" marked with an "n/a" or an "ok", then no letter was sent.

(2) Financial and academic decisions were combined into one letter if a student was receiving both warnings. This was a new process this semester for streamlining our communications with students regarding the various conditions that they were being put under as a result of Grades and Academic Standing Committee decisions.

(3) Grant warning, grant reduction, lose grant, need-based grant reduction, need-based lose grant, scholarship warning, scholarship reduction, lose scholarship letters for the 2004-2005 academic year were sent out based on the matrices above.

Grant Warning	Grant Reduction	Lose Grant	Need-based Grant Reduction	Need-based Lose Grant	Scholarship Warning	Scholarship Reduction	Lose Scholarship
74	74	1	10	1	26	31	1

(4) In addition, there were students congratulated for coming off grant warning and scholarship warning.

Congratulations Off Grant Warning	Congratulations Off Scholarship Warning
10	4

Submitted by

Susan M. Vladika, Chair
Coordinator of Retention

Search for Search
[Site Search](#)

| [Academics](#) | [Admissions](#) | [Library](#) | [Student Services](#) | [Athletics & Recreation](#) | [News & Events](#) | [About Marywood](#) |

| [Prospective Students](#) | [Current Students](#) | [Alumni & Friends](#) | [Faculty, Staff, Administration](#) | [Media](#) |

| [Campus Services](#) | [Contact Information](#) | [E-Mail](#) | [Request Information](#) | [Index](#)

| [Campus Map/Tour](#) | [Marywood Cam](#) | [Positions Available](#) | [Webmaster's Corner](#) |

Apply Today! [Undergraduate](#) -- [Master's](#) -- [Ph.D.](#) -- [Psy.D.](#)



[Marywood's Home Page](#)

Last update July 15, 2005

Copyright © 2005 by Marywood University. All rights reserved.