I. Mid-Semester Advisory Review
An examination of the IRB summary showed the following: a reduction in the number of students who received D,F,W; there were higher GPAs in post-MSA as compared to pre-MSA; a large number of students who were not identified originally as at-risk actually received a grade of D,F or W at the end of the semester (we may want to look into the timing of the MSA).

Other findings that were discussed were the need for professors to actively submit the MSA to recognize those at-risk students and to more closely examine how professors identify students. We thought it was also important to examine whether students themselves actively seek the results of the MSAs. It was suggested that professors have conversations with students regarding the MSAs and that students actively seek support from professors as well. A question raised was what percentage of the teaching population is taking action on the MSA? It was also asked whether definitions and demographics/population could be clarified and if Ws could be separated from the Ds and Fs.

An update would be presented at the next meeting.

II. FPS 11
The main concern at this point centers around the duration of a student’s right to appeal a finding of academic dishonesty. The wording of the UG document would mirror the Graduate document.

III. Writing Proficiency Requirement
Brief discussion was had on whether the writing proficiency requirement should remain for all students. The discussion will be coordinated with HCLAS.
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