

Georgia Institute of Technology
Student Academic and Financial Affairs Committee
Minutes
October 31, 2016

Name	Members: Term	Affiliation
Conte, Tom	[14-17]	CoC-CS
Mulford, Charles	[13-16]	Business
Healy, Nancy	[16-17]	MIRC
Perez, Ruperto M. #		Counseling
Pikowsky, Reta †		Registrar
Pollock, Anne	[14-17]	LMC
Poproski, Ruth*	[15-18]	CTL
Onken, Decker	[16-17]	U Student
Bradley, Marguerite	[15-17]	U Student
Balachander, Sathya	[15-16]	G Student
Parker, (Walter) Ennis #		Faculty Executive Board Liaison
Kohn, Paul ##		Standing Guest, Non-voting member, Vice Provost, Enrollment Services
Rodriguez, Omar †		Registrar's Office

10 Voting members/5 required for a quorum.

- # - Non-voting member
- ## - Non-voting standing guest member
- † - Secretary
- * Chair

Attending: Ruth Poproski, Reta Pikowsky, Tom Conte, Nancy Healy, (Walter) Ennis Parker, Omar Rodriguez, Marguerite Bradley, Decker Onken, and Sathya Balachander.

1. The Chair raised a question on learning environments and asked the Committee to consider whether there are policy gaps that contribute to poor learning environments in courses. This could potentially be a focus for SAFAC.
2. The Registrar discussed the class schedule change that will be effective for fall 2017. The new schedule grid provides students fifteen minutes between classes which was a priority for the task force. There was discussion about the importance of enforcing the class schedule grid so that students would be able to register for classes in a more efficient manner. It was noted that some classes, for pedagogical or programmatic reasons might need to request an exception to the grid. There will be an approval process in place for those academic units to make a case for scheduling a class or classes off the grid.

Some of the exceptions to the grid would be one-time if the reason for the request was of limited duration. For some programs, such as the MBA program, there might be a standing exception to the grid approved. There was some discussion about late classes and dealing with safety concerns.

3. The Registrar mentioned the document distributed in the meeting is still a working draft and she said she would send it around in electronic format after the meeting. Committee members were asked to consider how the proposed policy document could function as a guide for departments and faculty. There was also discussion about a subcommittee of the curriculum committee to oversee implementation of the new scheduling grid. The Registrar also mentioned that there is some discussion that classroom scheduling is moving from Capital Planning and Space Management to the Registrar's Office.
4. Committee members discussed the unit of credit definition. There appears to be ongoing confusion about how much effort students are expected to put forth for classes in relation to the number of hours for which the courses are offered. There was some discussion about whether the course syllabus should be clear about this so that students would know how much time they would be expected to spend on class-related material. The Registrar said that she would raise the question to the curriculum committee to determine if some clearer language could be added to the course scheduling policy.
5. Committee members also discussed creating a question or two to be added to existing assessment tools, e.g., student experience survey, undergraduate survey, career services online survey. This topic is a continuation of previous conversation in past meetings and ideas that would help identify factors that contribute to students taking more time than usual to complete their degrees, including possible institutional and systemic barriers. The Chair added whether losing the Zell Miller or HOPE Scholarship prolongs a student's undergraduate path by having to find other means to pay for tuition. There is interest in identifying existing tools to help answer questions on this topic. The Registrar mentioned that a Registrar's Office staff member is reviewing degree candidates from August 2016 to identify courses that were used and not used for degree programs. This could help provide some insight in identifying factors that contribute to students taking more time than usual to complete their degrees.

The following potential factors for students not completing their programs in 4 years were discussed:

- Taking courses not contributing to degree
- Internship & Co-op participation
- Doing research
- Part/full time employment
- Extracurricular activities
- Physical/mental health issues

- Personal choice
- Athletic involvement
- Losing scholarship/financial aid

The Chair will develop a question to discuss at the next meeting that might be put forth to flesh out some of this information. This would allow us to learn something more directly from students about what things are going on in their lives that may affect their academic pursuits.

6. Action items for the next meeting:
 - a. Everyone: Please review the Course & Room Scheduling Policy document (sent out by the Registrar) and come to the next meeting prepared to discuss feedback. The Registrar will be out that week, but would gather the comments and be prepared to discuss them at the next meeting.
 - b. The Chair will draft a (set of) potential questions to target the barriers-to-timely-completion issue and will bring them to our next meeting for discussion.
 - c. The Registrar will share the results of the August 2016 degree list review once it is completed.
7. The next meeting will be on Monday, November 21 at 9:00 AM in the Clough Building room 466B.

Submitted by,

Dr. Ruth Poproski, CETL
Chair