Academic Disqualification of Undergraduate Students
Report to the Academic Senate
College of Engineering
University of California, Davis

November 2003, Revised April 2004

The College of Engineering Undergraduate Study Committee (now the Undergraduate Educational Policy Committee) reviewed the issue of undergraduate academic disqualification during the 1998-99 academic year. This led to the establishment of guidelines for dismissal and readmission published in the *Engineering Bulletin* and provided in Appendix A. The most important provision of these guidelines is the recommendation for the prompt dismissal of students who are in poor academic standing (probation or subject to disqualification) for three consecutive quarters. Definitions of probation and subject to disqualification are given in Appendix B.

These guidelines represented a more strict enforcement of dismissal policies than had previously been applied in the College of Engineering. The College had a long-standing policy of allowing upper division students to continue to enroll despite being in poor academic standing.

The guidelines originally required the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies to submit a report on dismissals to the College of Engineering Executive Committee each quarter. The Executive Committee later directed this report to be submitted to the Undergraduate Educational Policy Committee. The report originally included the names of students dismissed, but the Educational Policy Committee later asked that the names be removed from the report. The dismissal reports for the Spring Quarters of 2001, 2002, and 2003 are given in Appendix C. It can be observed from these reports that the percentage of students dismissed increased in 1999-2000, the year that the new guidelines went into effect. While the guidelines continue to be followed, the dismissal percentages have returned to previous levels. It is believed that this is due to students dropping out or transferring to majors outside of the College, knowing that dismissal policies will be strictly enforced.

The table below provides the numbers of students on probation or subject to disqualification for each quarter of the 2002-2003 academic year. The number of students who are subject to disqualification in any quarter is much greater than the number of students dismissed, as many of these students have been in this status for fewer than three quarters, which is the guideline for dismissal.

Quarter	Enrollment	Academic Probation	Probation Continued	Subject to Disqualification	Dismissed
Fall 2002	2919	210	19	303	30
Winter 2003	2854	136	38	258	28
Spring 2003	2722	147	29	246	56

The College of Engineering guidelines for dismissal and readmission provide discretion to the Associate Dean in making decisions. Leniency is given in several situations: when the student's cumulative GPA is above 2.0, when a student has shown recent academic improvement, and when the student has decided to leave engineering study and to change to a major in another college.

It occurs often that a student will be in poor academic standing for three quarters, but still have a cumulative GPA well above 2.0. In these situations, if the student appeals the dismissal with reasonable justification, the dismissal will be rescinded under specified conditions for course enrollments and academic performance in the next quarter.

Freshmen often perform poorly in their first two quarters but begin to improve by their third quarter of enrollment. In many cases, the improvement is not sufficient to bring their cumulative GPA above 2.0. In this situation, an appealed dismissal can lead to specified conditions for continuation the following quarter.

Nearly 25% of freshmen admitted to engineering majors change to a major in another college and receive a UC Davis degree from that college. Many of these students are in poor academic standing when they conclude that they aren't suited for engineering study and begin to consider alternatives. As a result, a process has been established to define conditions for course enrollment and academic performance that will allow the student up to three quarters to return to good academic standing to permit approval of a change of major to another college. This process involves about 25 students each quarter, and many of these are subject to dismissal for three consecutive quarters of poor academic performance.

The report for Spring 2001 in Appendix C provides a typical example of the dismissal decisions for one quarter. There were 230 students who were subject to disqualification following Spring 2001, with 87 of these in poor academic standing for three quarters, and 41 of these were dismissed. Of the 46 students not dismissed, 26 were allowed to pursue a change of major, and 20 were allowed to continue after appeal to the Associate Dean, often in consultation with the departmental advisor.

The management of probation and dismissal is extremely resource-intensive. Over the past two years, a database application has been developed for this purpose, drawing from BANNER data. For at least three weeks early in Winter, Spring, and Summer, the Associate Dean and all available Undergraduate Office advisers are fully occupied with the process. Virtually all dismissed students appeal in person and many of the students receiving warning notices make appointments to meet with advisers. There are many conversations with concerned parents during this period as well. Undergraduate enrollment in Engineering has increased by about 25% since the last increase in staff, so resources are stretched about as thin as is possible.

Engineering faculty did not provide guidance regarding dismissal of students who fail to make minimum progress. The process that has been followed is to consider failure to make minimum progress only for those students who are also in poor academic standing. Leniency in a dismissal decision is much less likely to be considered for a student who has failed to make minimum progress. The conditions under which a dismissal will be rescinded always include the requirement that minimum progress be achieved.

There are two reasons that it would be difficult to administer the dismissal of all students not making minimum progress. The increase in students receiving dismissal notices under this requirement would stretch the already thin advising resources of the Engineering Undergraduate Office. Second, it isn't possible to provide students with advance warning that they could be dismissed for failure to make minimum progress. They could satisfactorily meet the requirement for several quarters, so that no warning would be appropriate, then drop to below minimum progress the next quarter and be subject to dismissal. For dismissals due to poor academic performance, students are sent warnings for two quarters before being dismissed in their third quarter of poor performance. Even with this process, it is necessary to deal with many complaints from students and their parents that adequate warning was not given. While we are firm in dealing with these complaints, they require a considerable amount of staff time.

In the spirit of improving access to undergraduate education, the College of Engineering Undergraduate Office has no objection to complying with all regulations regarding academic dismissals, provided that adequate staff resources are provided to administer these regulations.

Appendix A: Guidelines for Dismissal and Readmission
College of Engineering
University of California, Davis

2003-2004 Engineering Bulletin:

The academic probation and dismissal policies outlined in the *General Catalog* will be rigorously enforced according to the following guidelines.

Dismissal

(1) A student who is placed on academic probation (AP) or becomes subject to academic disqualification (STD) at the end of a given quarter will be promptly dismissed if he/she is STD at the end of the second quarter following the quarter first resulting in AP or STD status. (See the General Catalog for STD and AP definitions.)

Readmission

(2) Dismissed students will not be readmitted prior to one year from the end of the most recently completed quarter. Students who were dismissed while in lower-division standing will be encouraged to complete all remaining lower-division requirements at a community college or other institution.

Second & Final Dismissal

(3) A student readmitted following dismissal will be promptly dismissed for a second and final time if after one quarter he/she is STD and has not established a clear trajectory toward regaining good academic standing and completing his/her major, as determined by the Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies. A student may also be dismissed if he/she is STD at the end of the second quarter following readmission.

(4) A previously dismissed student who has been readmitted will be promptly dismissed for a second and final time if he/she is STD after completion of the third quarter following readmission. If the student is no longer subject to academic disqualification at the end of the third quarter following readmission, second and final dismissal could occur later according to the guideline for dismissal stated in item (1) above.

Dean's Authority

(5) Dismissal and readmission of students according to the guidelines outlined above shall be ultimately at the discretion of the Associate Dean of the College of Engineering for Undergraduate Studies.

(6) The Associate Dean shall each quarter submit a letter to the Undergraduate Committee on Educational Policy of the College of Engineering, to be made accessible to the Faculty, listing all students who were dismissed during the previous quarter.

Appendix B: Probation and Dismissal Policies
University of California, Davis

2002-2004 General Catalog:

Probation and Dismissal

The following provisions apply to all undergraduates. Graduate and professional students with scholarship deficiencies are subject to action at the discretion of their respective deans.

Scholastic Deficiencies

A student will be placed on probation or subject to disqualification for failure to meet qualitative or quantitative standards of scholarship.

The qualitative standards of scholarship require that a student maintain a C average (2.0) or better for all work undertaken in the university and for the work undertaken in any one quarter.

A student will be placed on probation for qualitative reasons if, at the end of any quarter, the student's grade point average (GPA):

- is less than 2.0, but not less than 1.5, for the quarter,
  or
- is less than 2.0 for all courses taken within the University of California

A student will be subject to disqualification for qualitative reasons if, at the end of any quarter,

- the student's grade point average is less than 1.5 for the quarter,
  or
- the student's grade point average is less than 1.5 for all courses taken within the University of California.
  or
- the student has attempted more than 16 units graded I (Incomplete),
  or
- the student has spent two consecutive quarters on academic probation.

In the case of probation or disqualification, the official transcript will state "not in good standing." Once a student has met qualitative standards for scholarship, the notation will be removed from the transcript.

The quantitative standards, referred to as minimum progress requirements, define scholarship in terms of the number of units that you must satisfactorily complete. It is assumed that a student will earn the 180-unit minimum degree requirement within 12 quarters (four years). This means students must plan to complete, on average, 15 units per quarter. Because occasions arise which prevent students from achieving normal progress towards the degree, the campus has established minimum progress requirements, to which students must adhere. Minimum progress is defined as

a total of 39 units passed, calculated at the end of every quarter for the preceding three quarters of enrollment.

A student will be subject to disqualification for quantitative reasons if the total number of units passed at UC Davis is less than 39, calculated at the end of every quarter for the preceding three quarters of enrollment.

Quantitative standards are not reflected on the official transcript.

The following courses may be counted toward unit minimum progress:

- Required non-credit courses, e.g., Mathematics B, will be evaluated according to the "Carnegie unit'' rule and counted as units passed
- Repeated courses passed to improve D or F grades
- Courses passed in Summer Sessions at UC Davis or at another accredited school and transferred to UC Davis will be counted as units passed (applied to the quarter of registration just preceding the summer session)
- Courses passed by examination in accordance with policies established by the Divisional Committee on Courses (applied to quarter in which exam is taken)
- Courses that are IP (in progress) will be counted as units passed
- Courses graded I will be counted as units passed when replaced by a passing grade (applied to the quarter in which the I grade is received)

The dean of the student's college may grant a student a minimum progress variance of one or more quarters for an acceptable reason.
Minimum progress requirements do not apply to students who have part-time status or to students who have their dean's approval to carry less than the minimum progress load because of medical disability, employment, a serious personal problem, a recent death in the immediate family, or a serious accident involving the student.

Dismissal

Dismissal for either qualitative or quantitative reasons (defined above) is based on the decision of the dean of the college in which you are enrolled. Such dismissal is from the University of California system and not simply the college or the Davis campus. Should a former Davis student later wish to be readmitted on the Davis campus, the authority to do so rests with the dean of the college from which the student was dismissed. If you are dismissed from your college, you will automatically receive a full refund of registration fees paid.

See your faculty adviser or go to the dean's office of your college if you need academic advising about probation and dismissal.

Appendix C: Reports on Dismissals for Spring Quarter, 2001-2003

October 9, 2001

To: Executive Committee
Undergraduate Study Committee
College of Engineering

From: Gary Ford
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies

Re: Report on Dismissals and Readmissions for Spring Quarter 2001

In accordance with College of Engineering Guidelines Regarding Dismissal and Readmission, I provide this report for actions taken following Spring Quarter 2001.

The following tables provide summary information for dismissals following Spring Quarter and for combined dismissals for Fall through Spring Quarters for a four-year period ending in Spring Quarter 2001. These data tend to support the conjecture that the tightening of the dismissal guidelines that occured in 1999-2000 would lead to an increase in dismissals as the students under the "hands-off" policy were dismissed, followed by a return to previous dismissal rates. Attachment 1 provides a list by major department of the students dismissed.

	Freshmen dismissed		All students dismissed	
Quarter	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
S 01	19	5.0%	41	1.8%
S 00	31	8.5%	95	4.3%
S 99	12	4.2%	48	2.2%
S 98	4	1.2%	35	1.6%

	Freshmen dismissed		All students dismissed	
Quarters	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
F 00 – S 01	25	5.7%	87	3.6%
F 99 – S 00	37	9.5%	137	6.0%
F 98 – S 99	26	6.9%	86	3.8%
F 97 – S 98	6	1.6%	53	2.4%

Information on students dismissed by major department is given in the following table.

Department	Majors Dismissed Number	Percentage
Biological and Agricultural	3	2.2
Chemical and Materials Science	5	2.1
Civil and Environmental	4	1.3
Computer Science	6	1.4
Electrical and Computer	17	2.3
Mechanical and Aeronautical	6	1.2
Total	41	1.8

The following table provides summary information by department for students who were subject to dismissal according to guidelines (1) and (4) but were not dismissed, with an indication of the basis for waiving dismissal. Note that over half of the students who were allowed to continue are being given the opportunity return to good academic standing in order to change to a major in another college or to move to another institution. A recommendation for a formal policy for this "change of major" status will be presented to the Undergraduate Study Committee during the current academic year. Attachment 2 provides a list by major department of the students who qualified for dismissal but were not dismissed.

Department	Consultation with Dept or MEP	Change of Major	Changing Institution	Assoc Dean Rescinded	Total
Biological and Agricultural	2				2
Chemical and Materials Science		1	1	1	3
Civil and Environmentsl	6	3		1	10
Computer Science	2	7	3		12
Electrical and Computer	2	9		5	16
Mechanical and Aeronautical	1	2			3
Totals	13	22	4	7	46

Three previously dismissed students were readmitted in Spring 2001 and one of these students was dismissed for a second and final time at the end of the quarter due to a failure to show progress toward a reversal of a grade point deficit. Attachment 3 provides a list of these students.

The letters sent to students who are on academic probation or subject to disqualification have been rewritten, in an attempt to be more explicit about what they must accomplish to avoid being dismissed. This was done in an attempt to make dismissal appeals less contentious.

Procedures are being developed to allow dismissal decisions to be made more quickly after quarter grades have been filed.

DAVIS: COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
DEAN'S OFFICE

September 17, 2002

To: Undergraduate Study Committee
College of Engineering

From: Gary Ford
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies

Re: Report on Dismissals and Readmissions for Spring Quarter 2002

In accordance with College of Engineering Guidelines Regarding Dismissal, I provide this report for actions taken following Spring Quarter 2002.

The following tables provide summary information for dismissals following Spring Quarter and for combined dismissals for Fall through Spring Quarters for a four-year period ending in Spring Quarter 2002. These data tend to support the conjecture that the tightening of the dismissal guidelines that occurred in 1999-2000 would lead to an increase in dismissals as the students under the "hands-off" policy were dismissed, followed by a return to previous dismissal rates. Attachment 1 provides a list by major department of the students dismissed.

	Freshman dismissed		All students dismissed	
Quarter	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
S 02	27	4.8%	57	2.1%
S 01	19	5.0%	42	1.8%
S 00	31	8.5%	95	4.3%
S 99	12	4.2%	48	2.2%

	Freshman dismissed		All students dismissed	
Quarters	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
F 01-S 02	40	6.1%	106	3.7%
F 00-S 01	25	5.7%	87	3.6%
F 99-S 00	37	9.5%	137	6.0%
F 98-S 99	26	6.9%	86	3.8%

Information on students dismissed by major department is given in the following table.

Department	Majors Dismissed Number	Percentage
Applied Science	2	3.1%
Biological & Agricultural	0	0.0%
Chemical & Materials Science	1	0.5%
Civil & Environmental	6	1.7%
Computer Science	21	4.2%
Electrical & Computer	15	2.0%
Mechanical & Aeronautical	12	2.0%
Total	57	2.1%

DAVIS: COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING
DEAN'S OFFICE

October 22, 2003

To: Committee on Educational Policy
College of Engineering

From: Gary Ford
Associate Dean for Undergraduate Studies

Re: Report on Dismissals for Spring Quarter 2003

In accordance with College of Engineering Guidelines Regarding Dismissal, I provide this report for actions taken following Spring Quarter 2003.

The following tables provide summary information for dismissals following Spring Quarter and for combined dismissals for Fall through Spring Quarters for a four-year period ending in Spring Quarter 2003.

	Freshman dismissed		All students dismissed	
Quarter	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
S 03	14	4.1%	56	2.0%
S 02	27	4.8%	57	2.1%
S 01	19	5.0%	42	1.8%
S 00	31	8.5%	95	4.3%

	Freshman dismissed		All students dismissed	
Quarters	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
F 02-S 03	30	6.3%	114	4.0%
F 01-S 02	40	6.1%	106	3.7%
F 00-S 01	25	5.8%	87	3.6%
F 99-S 00	37	9.5%	137	6.1%

Information on students dismissed by major department is given in the following table.

	Majors Dismissed	
Department	Number	Percentage
Applied Science	1	1.0%
Biological & Agricultural	3	2.1%
Chemical & Materials Science	7	3.2%
Civil & Environmental	10	2.7%
Computer Science	9	2.1%
Electrical & Computer	13	1.6%
Mechanical & Aeronautical	13	1.9%
Total	56	2.0%