

Ed Pol Minutes 12/04/2019

UC 409, 3:00-4:20 PM

Attendees: Ed Webb (Chair); Frank Gunter (COB); Katrina Zalatan (COB); Ginny McSwain (CAS); Hal Skinner (COH); Susan Szczepanski (CAS); Greg Tonkay (RCEAS); Ed Lotto (CAS); Tong Soon Lee (CAS); Lori McClaind (DOS); Al Bodzin (COE); Kadia Hylton-Fraser (student, COE); Natasha Vermaak (RCEAS); Evan Chansky (student, RCEAS); Julia Adamson (student, CAS); Jennifer Jensen (Provost's office); Steven Wilson (secretary).

1. Approve minutes from 11/13/19

Approved without amendment.

2. Review proposed changes to R&P 3.10.1: Scholastic probation. (Gunter)

Summary of proposal by Gunter.

Members from SOS described rationale for recent change in the minimum GPA for good academic standing, and some discussion of experience since the change. Should distinctions exist between first-year vs. first-semester (and what are definitions?). Discussion of the status quo, and the potential impact on the proposal.

Mixed opinions from EdPol members regarding intended vs. received signals to students (esp. first-generation or other groups) from experiencing probation early in their Lehigh careers. Discussion of possible benefits of new forms of academic alerts to students, with necessary impact but short of probation.

Discussion of past patterns of retention, and whether academic, athletic, financial effects are observed. Data was reviewed recently, and shows mixed results. Student Affairs rep shared language of letter informing students of probationary status.

Student reps stated that Scholastic Probation is viewed seriously by most students, but note that effect and meaning of Disciplinary Probation is probably better understood. With regard to early Lehigh career, general consensus was that first year (or semester) experience was not as academically challenging (or difficult) as the second.

General discussion by EdPol members. Current probation system's intentions and effects. Discussion of current availability but perhaps future expansion of focused advising, i.e., for first-gen students in particular. Other academic and social supports for first-gen population. Student Affairs rep noted that many other elements of Lehigh policy (e.g., financial aid eligibility) require even higher standard than current probation rule.

No consensus emerged from discussion. Student Affairs rep will gather benchmarks from peers. Gunter will review comments and revisit proposal at a future meeting.

3. Update on Lehigh Launch. (Jensen)

Review of previous Lehigh Launch, which received general support from EdPol. Jensen presented data showing that January-admit students (by college) are generally able to graduate on-time (e.g., in 7 or 8 semesters at Lehigh, some with summer enrollment as well) at rates that are not substantially lower than time-to-degree for regular admit students. The difference is more marked in the Rossin College. Conclusion is that Lehigh Launch is not expected to lead to delayed time-to-graduation.

4. Update on the following items (all carried forward from prior meetings). (Webb)
 - Webb is testing mechanism for (anonymous, optional) formative student assessment
 - Combined “clear written policy” regarding excuses from exams due to athletic competitions, and the Student Senate proposal to, “allow a minimum of a week’s worth of classes to be excused from every class (for example, a MW class would allow a student to miss 2 total classes without penalty); any absence beyond this would be at the professor’s discretion.”

These items will be carried forward for future meetings.

5. Brief updates: common hour exams, requirements for good academic standing. (Webb, Jensen)

Time did not permit discussion. These items will be carried forward for future meetings.