College of Education Student Affairs Committee Meeting  
Monday, March 3, 2008, 3:30-4:45 p.m.  
Minutes

Present: Christine Christle, Panayiotis Doutis, Diane Harwell, Kenneth Vogler (committee members), Rob Dedmon, and Irma Van Scoy.

Three topics were discussed.  
1) A student’s appeal  
2) The student appeal process in the College of Education  
3) The scholarship application process

1. Mr. Rob Dedmon distributed material related to the appeal and presented the case to the members of the committee. The case involved a student’s request to withdraw from three (3) courses taken in the Fall 2005, Spring 2006, and Spring 2007. The appeal was heard, deliberated, and denied unanimously.

2. Dr. Irma Van Scoy presented the need for having a systematic process in place for dealing with student appeals in the College of Education. According to the By-Laws of the College, it is the responsibility of the Student Affairs Committee to hear student-initiated appeals including academic appeals.

Rob presented the Committee with an example of an undergraduate petition form in which various options were included. Depending on the nature of the appeal (i.e., suspension from USC, withdrawal from coursework, internship admission and so on) the process of the appeal/petition might vary.

The committee examined the petition form with all the steps and institutional levels that an appeal might entail. No votes were taken on the approval of the petition form since it was a draft. This may happen during the next committee meeting.

An open discussion took place as to how the SA Committee should handle the student appeals during the year. One of the suggestions was to have the committee meet once a month to go over student appeals provided there are appeals to be heard. The possibility of having few committee members (as opposed to all of them) meet was also brought up with the consideration that there will be adequate program representation and committee members. It was not clear how many committee members must be present in order to hear and vote on an appeal. Dr. Irma Van Scoy volunteered to let the committee know about the question of how many committee members should be present.

3. An open discussion took place about the scholarship process. Several topics were discussed.
   a. This year all applications were to be evaluated in November as opposed to past years when only the Peabody scholarships were to be evaluated.
during that month. Additionally, the number of scholarships assigned to the committee was increased from last year. This resulted in significant time pressure placed upon the committee members and administrative personnel since the evaluation had to be conducted in a very short period of time. Some adjustments will benefit the process. Two options were proposed; (a) to have the students submit their applications earlier, and visit with Gloria Price to see if the College can receive the committee’s nominations a little later; (b) to have the applications and the committee divided in two so that the applications will be processed more efficiently and with no undue stress.

b. Students should be informed of the scholarships available to them. The question of when and how students should be prompted to apply was brought up. E-mailing and public posting were two of the suggestions offered.

c. Some uncertainty existed this last Fall as to whether graduate students not yet admitted to their program of studies by the scholarship application deadline can apply for scholarships awarded in the Spring. The issue should be clarified during the next meeting so there is no confusion.

d. The highly demanding task of organizing the large number of scholarship applications in such a short period of time by Constance Issac was acknowledged.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

The new meeting has been scheduled for Friday, April 18 10:00 AM.