

AAA – Committee  
November 19, 2002  
Minutes

Present: Markus Pomper, chair,  
Lynn Hufford,  
Cheryl Stolle,  
Joanne Passet,  
Debra May.

Guests: Vandana Rao,  
Lynnette Young.

Absent: George Mathew.

The committee met at 11:00 in the DAR

1. **Extended X (EX) policy.**

The committee was informed about the possibility of implementing the EX-policy the faculty senate passed several years ago. The implementation is possible under the current UITS system, but may or may not be possible under the future PeopleSoft system. It was therefore agreed to begin implementation of the policy only if we are certain that it can be continued once PeopleSoft is in place. The chair of the committee was charged to contact Dennis Hicks and determine the feasibility of the implementation under PeopleSoft.

2. **Academic probation.**

Vandana and Lynnette informed the committee about an apparent ambiguity in the Academic Handbook, Sec. X-3, dated 12/95. In this version, the provision about probation reads

“Any student who earns less than a 2.0 GPA for any *semester*’s work which causes the cumulative GPA (CGPA) to fall below 2.0 will be placed on academic probation until the CGPA is 2.0 or above. Students will be notified by letter when on probation. Students will not be evaluated for suspension until they have completed 12 credit hours.”

It was discussed that the word “semester” is interpreted as “Fall or Spring Semester”, but not “Summer term”. This allowed students’ GPA to drop below the 2.0 mark without being put on probation. In order for Student Services and Academic Advising to intervene more efficiently and before a student is suspended, the committee agreed to change the paragraph as follows:

“Any student who earns less than a 2.0 GPA for any ~~semester~~’s enrollment period’s work which causes the cumulative GPA (CGPA) to fall below 2.0 will be placed on academic probation until the CGPA is 2.0 or above. An enrollment period is the length of time designated to complete a course. Students will be notified by letter when on probation. Students will not be evaluated for suspension until they have completed 12 credit hours.”

The suggested change will be forwarded to Lynnette Young, Ben Young and Diane Roberts for comments. The committee agreed to the changes as above and will motion and second the change in faculty senate.

**3. Referral policy for CCI.**

The committee continues discussion of the referral policy to the community college. The discussion is based on the suggestion below.

- a. IU East keeps its open admissions policy; the choice between CCI and IUE remains essentially with the students.
- b. Students should be advised of the consequences of enrolling at IU East versus the Community College. Such implications are
  - i. Financial aid. In order obtain financial aid, students must enroll full-time. Students who are eligible for financial aid should be encouraged to apply at the institution where they can take a full load of courses.
  - ii. Degree objective. Students should consider enrolling at the institution where they can complete the degree they wish to earn. Even though it is possible to transfer credit from one institution to another, prospective students should be advised that this transfer is not guaranteed.
  - iii. Prospective students should be advised of the opportunities that IU East has to offer. For example, IU East offers a broad variety of academic disciplines. Full-time faculty with terminal degrees oversee the instruction. The community college system does not have this luxury.

The committee decided that part (b) is not part of a referral policy and should therefore not be part of the policy. Part (a) does not reflect any changes to the existing policy. Therefore, there is no need to bring forward any motion in faculty senate. The committee agreed to inform the faculty senate that no change in policy is suggested.

The committee discussed the necessity to evaluate or implement a policy for transfer credit. Because the committee has not been specifically changed with this, it was decided that no action should be taken at this time.

**4. Information:**

- a. Response from Shelly Gast's husband, Keith Gast. Mr. Gast expressed his disappointment to the wording of the letter of the committee dated October 11, 2002. Mr. Gast felt that the quotation-marks that were used to emphasize quotations from Ms. Gast's documentation ridiculed her situation. The committee agreed that there was no need to reply to the letter.
- b. Next meetings:
  - Wednesday, January 8, 9:00 am (possibly all day) for hearing of student appeals
  - Tuesday, January 21, 11:00 am – 12:00 noon for regular meeting.
  - Tentative agenda: Testing for Computer Literacy requirement.

The committee adjourned at 12:10 pm.