

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Scholastic Committee

Campus Governance

---

3-12-2013

### Scholastic minutes 03/12/2013

Scholastic Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol\\_com](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 03/12/2013" (2013). *Scholastic Committee*. 36.  
[https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol\\_com/36](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/36)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Campus Governance at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Scholastic Committee by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact [skulann@morris.umn.edu](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

**Scholastic Committee**  
**2012-13 Academic Year**  
**March 12, 2013**  
**Meeting Seventeen Minutes Approved**

**In attendance:** Jennifer Goodnough (chair), Hilda Ladner, Chad Braegelmann, Jen Zych Herrmann, Judy Korn, Nic McPhee, Steve Gross, Brenda Boever, Pete Wyckoff, Luciana Ranelli

**Not in attendance:** Melissa Hernandez, Zach Kroells, Clare Dingley, Kent Blansett, Ellery Wealot, Jess Larson

**1. Minutes For Review**

March 5, 2013 minutes approved with revision re: petition information. Brief discussion re: minutes, annual Scholastic Committee summary report, and student privacy.

**2. Chair's Report**

The Chair shared a discrepancy noted in a meeting during which an English faculty member stated that college writing from another college would fulfill the new Writing for the Liberal Arts (WLA) requirement, and the English Discipline's intent for WLA was to discontinue accepting ACT exemptions and College in the Schools writing courses. Per the assembly discussion regarding WLA, it has been understood that all students would take WLA even if they had taken a college writing course at another institution. The Chair will investigate the discrepancy.

**3. SCEP Report**

SCEP discussed allocating credit for service learning. At the Twin Cities campus, students are receiving credit for service learning with very little faculty oversight and very little tracking of service learning credit. The TC Service Learning coordinator is concerned about directed studies and internships that are too similar to volunteering rather than credit-bearing opportunities. He asked SCEP to support his interest in better recording. SCEP agreed. The role for the newly formed TC curriculum committee did not come up during the Service Learning conversation. McPhee notes that this topic intersects with the larger SCEP conversation on the meaning of a credit.

SCEP is being introduced to a new assessment system for graduate programs. While the topic doesn't directly apply to Morris, the project could inform an assessment of undergraduate programs.

**4. Prior learning Campus Assembly presentation**

The Chair will provide an update for information to Campus Assembly members. The committee discussed topics that should be included in the presentation.

- What is Prior Learning? Use slides as needed from Korn's presentation; Include data regarding prior learning success.
- Prior Learning Directed Studies and Internships process, IS 3893, IS 3896; Credit for noncurricular experience outside of the University that can be tied to current curricular experience, conducted under the supervision of a faculty. For the internships, the experience must occur before matriculation. These prior learning opportunities are used most commonly by nontraditional students. The Scholastic Committee has recommended that the Curriculum Committee review these two courses. Korn will investigate the "next step" if a student wanted a Morris evaluation of a prior learning portfolio created for the student by a for-profit company.

- AP process and information on AP stats from Korn's presentation; Encourage disciplines to review courses and alert Scholastic Committee to concerns; note the percent of students who score 3 or higher...64 percent. The committee discussed the pros and cons of using the actual AP chart during the presentation. Suggested that it would be good to show how quick and easy it is to find the AP table rather than using the actual table, which might lead the presentation into a discussion of scores instead of an update on prior learning opportunities
- IB update: While few IB students actually get many credits, it is possible that Morris is likely to see more in the future due to emphasis of IB program in Minnesota Legislature.
- CLEP update: We receive few exam scores, but Morris could possibly receive more in the future from home-schooled students. Encourage disciplines to review courses and alert Scholastic Committee to concerns.
- Special Exams for Credit/Proficiency purpose and process.
- Foreign language proficiency and placement update, including languages not offered at Morris.

#### **4. Disciplinary Summary**

The Twin Cities campus Office for Student Conduct (OSC) and Academic Integrity and Housing and Residential Life confidentially shared its 2011-12 Disciplinary Summary with the Scholastic Committee as an outline for reviewing Morris practices as well as a means of comparing and contrasting with TC practices.

The document included number of incidents, both on and off campus; behavioral consultations; comparisons to previous years; types of violations and numbers; academic dishonesty versus nonacademic misconduct cases forwarded for further review by the Campus Committee on Student Behavior and/or the Committee on Student Scholastic Conduct; student attributes: gender, class, GPA, and college.

The number of scholastic dishonesty cases on the TC campus grows each year, but assessment attributes the growth to an increase in reporting per policy requirements. Relative to the size of the TC campus, the numbers are quite small.

The TC process differs from the Morris process in that the faculty impose a sanction with a first violation, and the Office for Student Conduct can impose an additional sanction, reflecting both the formal and informal process. While a faculty member cannot put a student on probation, the OSC can add probation.

The committee discussed Function and Awards (FA) in relationship to academic sanctions. If a faculty member does not report an incident, the FA committee would not know of the student's history. In addition, it is not a practice of FA to check with Student Affairs before awards are given. Also, a student's incident may be deemed a "closed case" by virtue of no further incidents. Should Morris's Academic Committee apply a sanction at the time of the incident beyond the faculty? It was noted during the conversation that Scholar of the College is an academic research award, and behavior is not one of the factors in choosing recipients.

Morris does not have a culture of everything being reported or of consistency in sanctions. Faculty worry about the consequences of reporting, especially if the incident could be an innocent mistake or is a low level offense. A faculty member may award an F for the class for plagiarism but may not report the plagiarism. More seniors are reported that first-year students, perhaps an artifact of faculty being more likely to report a senior who should "know better" than an inexperienced first-year student. Students who are reported are not necessarily academically failing.

The Chair will send the academic integrity grid to SC members before the next meeting. The committee may wish to modify the TC grid for Morris use. The grid could include sanctions that would make students ineligible for some types of awards.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy R. Korn, Executive Staff