Meeting Minutes

Present: Polly Beals (chairing in place of Deb Weiss), John DaPonte, Joe Fields, Elliott Horch, Kim Laing, Armen Marsoobian, Wes O'Brien (recording), Elsie Okobi, Jim Tait

Meeting was called to order as exactly 3:25pm
Minutes 11/9/11 approved with minor changes.

Polly asked if members were available for a meeting on Tuesday 11/22 and inquired after general availability for a long meeting to take place on a Friday (date to be determined). Meetings TBA.

**LEP Exemptions Policy**

John would like to establish criteria for evaluating exemptions based on credit requirements out of concern for departments whose students cannot graduate in 4 years.

Wes recalled Jim’s suggestion from an earlier meeting that credit-heavy departments are organizing meetings to discuss a consistent exemption proposal. The meetings may have already begun.

Polly commented that one criteria/justification for exemption would be to consider how credits affect the graduation rate.

Armen noted that some programs (e.g., Elementary Education) have examined program requirements and subsequently dropped courses.

Wes recalled that Nicole had indicated at a previous meeting that credit issues are not always a result of the LEP program. This raises the question as to whether exceptions are appropriate for programs with credit-heavy issues that pre-date LEP.

John said that the Steering Committee was investigating the possibility of relieving some of the credit strain by examining the 12-credit free elective requirement.

Joe wondered if some of the difficulty could lie with the construction of programs rather than with the implementation of the LEP.

Kim pointed out that as a result of LEP, the BS in EXS, for example, increased from 42 to 48 credits and that an additional 6 credits had to be moved from the old AUR to the major.

Polly observed that in the past INQ was not included in the AUR and that it was included as part of AUR to avoid the appearance of a hidden requirement.

Regarding Nursing’s request for an exemption from T2 Mind and Body based upon the number of health-related science courses already required, Jim expressed concern that if different programs
were granted different exemptions the result could be an unequal and cumbersome patchwork of requirements.

Armen said that PHI is in direct talks with nursing program with the objective of developing a Mind and Body course to cross-list with PHI.

Elliott pointed out that there is some precedent for exemptions with regard to the AUR and suggested that EXS and NUR might visit LEP for discussion.

Polly would like to request that departments work to suggest their own ideas for creative solutions. She suggested that she and Jim initiate the discussion with an email in lieu of the LEPC imposing a policy without consultation or discussion.

John would like to have some clear criteria in place to guide such a discussion.

Liz would like the committee to keep in mind that exemptions may be only one of a number of possible solutions—that there may be other options to consider.

Polly suggested that this must remain ongoing discussion for now, and that we must move on to other concerns. So we did.

**Issues related to registration:**

Kim pointed out that T2 courses are not programmed into Banner to require prerequisites in CT and INQ because that would keep AUR students from taking those courses. She is particularly concerned that she does not know what to do with students who fail CT and/or INQ and needs direction. Should students who register for T2 courses but have not successfully passed INQ, CT or ENG requirements have the T2 courses dropped from their schedule, and if so, she wonders how/who will notify them and how can they be prevented from re-registering.

Nicole has volunteered that the INQ office could assume the task of notification as long as there are a manageable number of students.

Bruce Kalk has expressed concern regarding the numbers (approximately 89 at risk), having run an assessment to determine how many CT and INQ courses will be needed in the Spring.

Polly returned to the question of whether or not the students should students be dropped.

Liz suggested that INQ teachers could provide a mechanism to communicate with students regarding what to do before they leave the course.

Polly suggested that she email the INQ teachers to request that students who may fail follow up with their advisors, and John indicated that Nicole had already requested that INQ instructors appraise her of students who are at risk.
Polly asked again if Kim should drop students. She stressed the need for a plan, even an imperfect one.

Kim remains concerned that there is no stop in Banner to keep students from re-registering.

Liz suggested the possibility of a planned advisement meeting for affected students.

Joe wondered if it would be less difficult to set the prerequisite so students who failed INQ, CT or ENG requirements would be blocked/dropped from T2 courses and then provide overrides for upper-level students without the prerequisite requirements.

Kim recommended dropping students who do not meet the prerequisites from T2 and putting a hold on their schedule to prevent them from re-registering, but Jim said this would impact financial aid and housing. He said that a partial solution might be to ask instructors to grade the students they expect will fail first.

Kim noted that she cannot “roll” a partial roster.

John is not convinced that the problem is a big as we might think, because many will only be registering for one T2 course.

Joe’s suggestion that students might simply be re-registered for whatever course they fail received an optimistic response.

Other Issues Discussed

Armen recalled a concern expressed by Dean Fredeen in the Chairs/Directors/Dean’s meeting regarding how many credits transfer students had to have to come in under the AUR. A brief discussion followed confirming that students entering with 15 or more transfer credits are advised under the old program.

Polly indicated the need to clarify the status of T3 courses with regard to their status. Can they serve as a major capstone course as well as a T3 course? A brief discussion followed.

It was noted that Elena Schmitt is invited to attend the next LEPC meeting scheduled for November 30 to discuss concerns related to World Language including staffing and the STAMP exam.

Polly noted the need to address LEP course transfer issues and LEP waiver exams (for T1 courses) as well as the LEP bylaws.

Meeting adjourned at exactly 3:45 pm.