



CAMPUS ADMINISTRATIVE POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Policy Title: Academic Standing for Undergraduates
Policy Number: 7016 **Functional Area:** Student Success

Date Submitted: August 26, 2019
Proposed Action: **Approve Update**
Brief Description: This policy pertains to academic standing for undergraduate students. It specifically refers to when a student’s cumulative CU GPA falls below a 2.0, at which point they are no longer considered to be in academic good standing. It details the three levels that these Students can be placed into and more importantly, describes the resources and processes to help these students get back into good academic standing.

Desired Effective Date: January 1, 2020
Responsible University Officer: Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs
Vice Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Student Success
Responsible Office: Executive Director | Academic Advising
Policy Contact: Nimol Hen
Last Reviewed/Updated: January 1, 2012
Applies to: Denver Campus

Reason for Policy: The University of Colorado Denver has a long-standing practice of working with students who go on academic probation (CU GPA < 2.0). This policy outlines four levels of probation and consequences to students who fall into poor academic standing. More importantly, it identifies the resources and processes that are designed to help a student get back into good academic standing.

I. REASON FOR PROPOSED ACTION

In a review of the fall 2014, of the 1,363 first-time students (full and part time), 337 (25%) posted GPAs below 2.0 in their first term. Of these students, 101 (30%) never returned to CU Denver. A study of the fall 2015 through fall 2017 cohorts first-time students yielded similar findings. Additional research analysis of data from 11 of CU Denver’s peer institutions, and 4 “non-peer” institutions was also conducted. This extensive Institutional research and analysis of cohort data informed the decisions to 1) increase the attempted semester credit limit to 13 credit hours; 2)

implement a change to make a semester GPA of 2.00 as the best practice/standard for achieving a requirement to be in good academic standing; 3) confirmed the need for an improved academic support module. As this policy is up for review, there is agreement that the current resources and processes could be improved. Thus, this policy review proposes many updates for our students going forward.

The proposed revisions to this policy aim to 1) improve the overall student experience with academic standing, specifically academic probation, by changing the intervention from an antiquated and cumbersome paper format to an online, streamlined, Academic Support Module; 2) allow full-time and/or international students on Academic Monitoring to enroll up to 13 credit hours per semester allowing them to maintain their full-time status; 3) renamed levels of academic standing to better communicate the supportive intent of this policy; 4) lowered the required 2.3 semester GPA to 2.0 semester GPA. These improvements were made to improve the retention, persistence, success, and graduation of these students.

II. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT IN THE POLICY REVIEW

Provost (R. Nairn, 8-18-20)

Vice Provost and Senior Vice Chancellor for Student Success (L. Bowman, 6-26-20)

AVC for Academic Achievement (M. Wood, 6-25-20)

Legal (K. Hardy, 5-29-20)

Executive Director | Academic Advising (N. Hen, ongoing involvement)

Associate Deans/Deans (5-8-20)

Registrar (A. Diekhoff, 2-25-20)

Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Operations (N. Viveiros, 5-8-20)

Dean of Students (B. Bohl, 4-17-20)

Undergraduate Advising Leads Council (5-1-20)

Faculty Assembly CU Denver (4-20-20)

School of Public Affairs Advising (N. Scanlon, 2-21-20)

Center for Undergraduate Exploration & Advising (J. Patsey, 2-24-20)

Policy Coordination Manager (M. Heredia, ongoing involvement)

III. LEGAL REVIEW

Do you think legal review would be required for these proposed changes? **Yes - Completed**

IV. FISCAL REVIEW: Are there any financial (human resources, technology, operations, training, etc.) or other resource impacts of implementing this policy (e.g., cost savings, start-up costs, additional time for faculty or staff, new systems, or software)? **No**