

## APSC Meeting Minutes

12/5/19

Present: Beth Macauley (filling in for Kristen Vu); Robert Beasecker; Lori Koste, Agnieszka Szarecka, Karl Brakora, Paul Fishbeck, Nagnon Diarrassouba, Raymond Higbea, Mikhila Wildey, Ex-officio member (from Provost's office): Suzeanne Benet

- I. Review of minutes from 11/7/19. Minutes were approved.
- II. Information from Office of Financial Aid – information was provided by Michelle and is available on Blackboard:
  - a. “Out of the 61 students, 47 of them receive some sort of financial aid. Out of those 47, ten students were positively impacted by the forgiveness.” [A follow-up email clarified that there was no negative impact of AF on any student's financial aid status.](#)
- III. Feedback from Inclusion & Equity Division – Concern is that students of color may not go to an advisor in the first place. Possible solution was broadening who can complete the forgiveness application (faculty), but this would make things too broad. Agnieszka and Nagnon both commented on how faculty will know about the policy when it becomes policy, so then faculty can advise students appropriately to make contact with their professional advisor. Suzeanne suggested that there are other several other support services on campus where students of color tend to seek out for advising, so as long as we inform the other advisors at these services to recommend this option to students, we should be okay.
  - a. There were also recommendations for wording changes in our policy and application. Most changes were minor (grammar, using gender neutral language). Some larger concerns were changing the wording of “Final Major” because it may sound too stressful. Committee could not think of a better word for “final,” so we will keep it as is for now. The other word they felt was problematic was “suitable” in the context of discussing that the student may not have picked a “suitable” major is judgmental. Committee could not think of a better alternative, so we chose to keep it the same. Agnieszka said she would post the suggestions online and we can provide feedback.
- IV. Review of most recent applications in pilot III:
  - a. Received 10 applications – Agnieszka and Robert reviewed the applications
  - b. Denied applications:
    - i. One was denied because the application had only one course (that was taken twice) that the student asked for forgiveness
    - ii. Another was denied because student had a GPA that was 2.737 and only 27 credits to go to graduation.
    - iii. One was denied because again there were too few credits left for graduation (below the 30 credit minimum).
  - c. Discussion of case of Madison Olach: She was denied in the summer but re-applied – she went to orientation and didn't declare a major but was interested in engineering so she took classes in that area. By the end of the semester, she declared therapeutic

recreation because she was doing so poorly in her engineering classes. Now is asking for forgiveness from the engineering classes even though the major was not declared.

- i. Mixed consensus on this one because the major she was taking classes for initially/was interested in didn't exist at the time. Also because the checkout sheet at orientation very clearly says she was interested in engineering but didn't yet declare it.
- ii. ARC and Registrar would have wanted us to consider approving this application and considering the orientation checkout forms for undeclared majors. They consider undeclared majors the most vulnerable group that would need forgiveness the most. They also didn't want us to have a policy with checkboxes but instead develop a policy that has some room for flexibility.
- iii. Voted for accepting/rejecting this application: Paul makes a motion to approve the application; Nagnon seconds the motion; Approve – 7; Opposed - 2 – this application was approved

d. General comments/concerns from applications:

- i. Lori had general concerns that the students whose GPAs will increase with forgiveness are not increasing enough for it to really matter. Students may need to leave for a period of time to increase chances of success upon return (and then have a policy in place for students who return, which is consistent with other university policies).
- ii. Lori also commented that many students retook other courses (not ones for which they applied for forgiveness) and their grades improved, suggesting retaking courses can help the student without forgiveness being necessary.
- iii. Pre-professional students – helpful to have the major requirement sheets in general across applications, but particularly in these cases
- iv. 30 credits left to go – should we keep this or not given some students had fewer credits left and were rejected?
- v. What about checkout forms from orientation – should they count if the student was undeclared but had some record of what track they were headed in? Should those classes in that “track” be eligible for forgiveness?

V. Continued data “mining” of pilot I-II

- a. Still need to add more info to make the spreadsheet complete before we can discuss it as a whole.

VI. Agnieszka plans to send a draft of the policy for groups 1-3 to the committee before the January meeting so that we can review it and move forward with presenting it to the ECS.

- a. Will only need to consider the orientation checkout form as a possible thing to add to the draft.