

**Student Regulations Committee**  
**Minutes**  
**July 8, 2015**

**Membership 2014-2015:**

Kingsley, Gordon	[14-17]	Public Policy	<a href="mailto:gkingsley@gatech.edu">gkingsley@gatech.edu</a>
Montoya, Joe	[14-17]	Biology	<a href="mailto:montoya@gatech.edu">montoya@gatech.edu</a>
Barke, Richard	[10-16]	Public Policy	<a href="mailto:richard.barke@pubpolicy.gatech.edu">richard.barke@pubpolicy.gatech.edu</a>
Ferri, Al *	[13-16]	ME	<a href="mailto:al.ferri@me.gatech.edu">al.ferri@me.gatech.edu</a>
Choi, Jung	[09-15]	Biology	<a href="mailto:jung.choi@biology.gatech.edu">jung.choi@biology.gatech.edu</a>
Parsons, Chuck **	[09-15]	Business	<a href="mailto:chuck.parsons@scheller.gatech.edu">chuck.parsons@scheller.gatech.edu</a>
Pikowsky, Reta † #		Registrar	<a href="mailto:reta.pikowsky@registrar.gatech.edu">reta.pikowsky@registrar.gatech.edu</a>
Stein, John #		VPSL-ODOS	<a href="mailto:john.stein@vpss.gatech.edu">john.stein@vpss.gatech.edu</a>
Burbach, Laura Margaret	[14-15]	Student	<a href="mailto:lauramargaret@gatech.edu">lauramargaret@gatech.edu</a>
Lupuloff, Jason	[14-15]	U Student	<a href="mailto:jlupuloff@gmail.com">jlupuloff@gmail.com</a>
Canellas, Marc	[14-15]	G Student	<a href="mailto:marc.c.canellas@gatech.edu">marc.c.canellas@gatech.edu</a>
Butera, Rob - EB Liaison#		EB Liaison	<a href="mailto:rbutera@gatech.edu">rbutera@gatech.edu</a>

\*Committee Chair for 2014-2015

\*\*Vice Chair

† Secretary

#Without Vote

U = Undergraduate

G = Graduate

[xx-yy] service period

9 Voting members/5 required for a quorum.

**Present:** Ferri (ME), Stein (ODOS), Barke (PUBP), Parsons (Scheller CoB), Butera (ECE), Canellas (AE-GRSGA), Burbach (PUBP-USGA), Montoya (BIOL), Pikowsky (REG),

**Guests:** Zachary Hayes (Registrar's Office), Girardot (AVP-Undergraduate Education), Pearson (UG-EDU & RO)

The meeting was opened at approximately 12:04 PM.

1. There were no Minutes pending approval.

2. Draft two of the Leave of Absence Policy was discussed. Several questions and comments arose which included the following.
  - a. Should we widen the audience for this to address, for example, students who need to take time off to work?
  - b. Is there a line between students engaging in public service *versus* self-advancement? Does that matter?
  - c. It was reiterated that Tech has no Medical Leave of Absence policy.
  - d. One stipulation on page 3 of the policy states that “students with a total withdrawal for the semester are eligible to apply for LOA during the following semester, if all other requirements are met.” Committee members are not sure why this is necessary. Typically, when students withdraw from a term, they need a petition to the faculty to return. Would this still apply, even if they are approved for a Leave of Absence?
  - e. There was ongoing concern about the language used to address “church” and “mission.” Would it be addressing an “official church” or an “official mission of a church?”
  - f. The question was raised again about the need for this, what problem are we trying to solve?
    - i. It would help us keep track of students who are intending to return. We could keep them connected and facilitate their re-entry.
    - ii. It would also help our retention numbers because we could count them differently.
    - iii. It was noted that this can be an insurance issue for parents. In some instances, the student will be covered if on a Leave of Absence, but not covered if the student has chosen to not re-enroll.
    - iv. Could this be handled by a petition to the faculty? The student would petition or a leave of absence, request a specified time out period, and the response, if approved, could lay out the stipulations.
    - v. The question remained whether this would make enough of a difference to warrant a new policy. There is nothing to stop us, for example, from reaching out to non-returning students without a policy in place.
  - g. There was a question about the time-line. When we say “two years” would be the maximum span of time, do we mean 2-6 semesters? Is that too long?
  - h. Would this interact with the 36-hour rule? Would the student be allowed to take a class or classes while on a Leave of Absence? If yes, would the 36-hour rule still apply?
  - i. If this policy is put into place, who would make the decision on the request. Would it be a petition to the faculty so that the IUCC or IGCC would make the decision?
  - j. Things change, including curriculum, over time. In some instances we might not be able to accommodate a student who was out for an extended period to step back in and pick up where he/she left off. We would need to make that clear.

- k. Would it make more sense, rather than having it exist as a stand-alone policy, as a new section of the Readmission policy? If so, should it then be limited to one year, and students could request longer as needed or request an extension?

After the discussion, the Registrar's Office was asked to draft the policy as a new section of the readmission policy to see how that might play out. The Registrar's Office will do so and have it ready for the next meeting.

3. The draft of the make-up classes due to Institute cancellation of classes was discussed. The following points were raised.

- a. In Section 5.1, it was recommended that the following item be edited.

Institute-wide Cancellations of three (3) or more days.

Change to: Institute-wide cancellations of three (3) or more days, or the equivalent.

Note: Since classes meet on different schedules, adding "or the equivalent" gives the instructor some guidance as to whether his/her class would fall under this stipulation.

- b. In Section 5.1, it was also recommended that the following item be edited.

Cancellations late in the term

If classes are cancelled during or after the 11<sup>th</sup> week, make-up scheduling may not be implemented and would be determined by the administration based on circumstances.

Change to: If classes are cancelled during or after the 11<sup>th</sup> week, in a regular term, make-up scheduling may not be implemented and would be determined by the administration based on circumstances.

Note: It was also suggested that it might be a better idea to replace "11<sup>th</sup> week" with a set percentage of the term.

- c. In Section 5.2 Make-up Class Schedule, the following comment was offered.

Student Participation

Student attendance at make-up periods is strongly recommended, but students cannot be penalized for missing a virtual or rescheduled class. In planning make-up work and classes, faculty members should recognize

and be sensitive to students' work, family, and other obligations.  
Comment: Examples of *not* penalizing students might be suspending the use of clickers for the make-up classes and not giving quizzes or test during the make-up classes.

The general feeling of the Committee is that these guidelines are a good idea, but would warn against any sense that all possible scenarios can be predicted or accounted for in any given emergency. In other words, as long as faculty members have some flexibility for how they might deal effectively with this kind of situation, and would be allowed to exercise it, we should be able to function as needed. It was also noted that during the winter storm two years ago, some faculty used their websites and social media to stay in touch with students and continue the work of the course. Classes that are "flipped" would also have some options and more leeway since part of their work is already not face-to-face.

4. The Registrar asked the Committee to think about mid-term grade reports during the full and short Summer sessions. At present, there is no requirement for mid-term progress reports in the 11-week summer session, but perhaps there should be. Progress reports in the two 5-week sessions may be problematic. The Committee was given a draft policy and asked to discuss at the next meeting
5. The next meeting will likely be in August, after the first week of the term.
6. The current Chair will call the meeting in August so that the new members can be seated and a Chair can be elected.

Adjourned,

Al Ferri, ME