

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

S. 83-80

To..... SENATE.

From..... N. HEATH, SECRETARY,
SENATE UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS BOARD.

Subject STANDING REQUIRED FOR CONTINUANCE -
ACADEMIC WARNING & ACADEMIC PROBATION -
CHANGE TO REMOVE INCONSISTENCIES

Date..... 21 OCTOBER 1983.

Action undertaken by the Senate Undergraduate Admissions Board at its meeting of 17 October 1983 gives rise to the following motion:

MOTION: "That Senate approve the deletion of paragraph 4. of the regulations governing standing required for continuance, given on pp. 25 & 26 of the 1983-84 Calendar."

The paragraph states:

Students who are on ACADEMIC WARNING or on ACADEMIC PROBATION will be required to maintain a Grade Point Average of 2.00, or higher, on all courses taken during the warning or probation period in order to be allowed to continue until the CGPA reaches 2.00, at which time they will be in good academic standing (reference items 2. and 3. above).

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

MEMORANDUM

To.....SENATE.....

From.....N. HEATH, SECRETARY,.....
SENATE UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS BOARD.

Subject.....ACADEMIC WARNING.....

Date.....21 OCTOBER 1983.....

The regulations governing standing for continuance were established in their present form in 1979. Earlier this year, Senate reduced the assessment periods governing Academic Warning and Academic Probation without otherwise changing the regulations. For several years students on Academic Warning were returned to good academic standing on one condition - i.e. that the c.g.p.a. was 2.00 or higher. About two years ago it was noticed that this led to anomalous decisions in a small minority of cases where students had duplicated courses but had performed relatively poorly. The reason this happened was that only one of the two conditions in paragraph 4. was being checked

4. Students who are on ACADEMIC WARNING or on ACADEMIC PROBATION will be required to maintain a Grade Point Average of 2.00, or higher, on all courses taken during the warning or probation period in order to be allowed to continue until the CGPA reaches 2.00, at which time they will be in good academic standing (reference items 2. and 3. above).

Corrective measures were taken to make both conditions operative.

However, subsequent experience has brought to light

- 1) para 4 is inconsistent with para 12 which states that

... During the warning period, the student must complete a minimum of 9 SFU semester hours of assigned grades before reassessment will occur. A student on ACADEMIC WARNING may not repeat a course for which a grade of C, or higher, has been assigned. If, at the end of the warning period, the CGPA is 2.00 or higher, the student will be considered to be in good academic standing. Otherwise, the student will be placed on ACADEMIC PROBATION."

- 2) some students were being treated more harshly under Academic Warning than they would have been under Academic Probation.

To remedy this, SUAB determined that only one condition should apply to students on Academic Warning, i.e.

"If at the end of the warning period the CGPA is 2.00 or higher the student will be considered in good academic standing. Otherwise, the student will be placed on Academic Probation."

This change has the advantage of being much more readily understood by students and for the following reasons is not expected to result in any lowering

of academic standards

- i) since Fall 1982 restrictions have been placed on the duplication of courses
- ii) since Fall 1983, the assessment period for Academic Warning has been reduced from 15 sem. hours to 9 sem. hours
- iii) very few students on Academic Warning were in the position of having a review period gpa below 2.00 but a cgpa above 2.00 (Figures for Spring 1983 are 5 out of approx. 80 students reviewed). This proportion is expected to drop further given the shorter review period.

Deletion of paragraph 4 will not give rise to further inconsistencies since the full details of Academic Warning and Academic Probation will be specified accurately in existing paragraphs 12 and 13.