

4-15-2015

## Scholastic minutes 04/15/2015

Scholastic Committee

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 04/15/2015" (2015). *Scholastic Committee*. 81.  
[http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol\\_com/81](http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/81)

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**  
**2014-15 Academic Year**  
**Wednesday, April 15, 2015**  
**Meeting Sixteen Minutes Approved**

Present: Judy Korn, Megan Jacobson, Leslie Meek, Jess Larson, Brenda Boever, Jennifer Rothchild, H. Ladner, Steve Gross, Tisha Turk, Merc Chasman,

Absent: Roland Guyotee, Chad Braegelmann, Marcy Prince, Laddie Arnold, Yee Thao

1. **Agenda review** Jess Larson conducted the meeting

2. **Review and approve April 1, 2015, minutes** Minutes approved

3. **Chair's Report**

A response letter was sent to Chris Dallager in the Disability Resource Center with the Scholastic Committee's decision regarding modifications to the foreign language requirement for students with disabilities. (See Addendum One)

A letter with the subcommittee's recommendations was sent to Dean Bart Finzel for review. The Dean will determine if implementation of the recommendations will occur. (See Addendum Two)

4. **SCEP Report** No SCEP report

5. **Discussion: Peoplesoft Upgrade impact on suspension and probation**

Peoplesoft upgrade will impact probation/suspension processes. An academic standing field will auto-populate in each student's Student Center. The first run to populate this field will be two days after grades are posted for the semester, which allows the Office of the Registrar time to check for repeats. Without manual review of a student's academic status via the suspension/probation report, some students may be assigned an incorrect status via the automatic process. In the current system, Judy Korn reviews students on the probation/suspension report to confirm accuracy. Every semester there has been at least one student who requires a change from the suspension/probation report status.

It should be noted that the automatic academic standing field does not impact holds. Probation and suspension holds are determined via the probation and suspension report.

The academic standing field process will run frequently because it is part of the financial aid SAP calculation. The process will generate new academic standings for students throughout the semester and during summer session. Students will see their academic standing field populated with probation or suspension after summer grades are posted. Currently, Morris's practice is to not place students on probation/suspension after the summer session. Summer is considered a "grace period" during which students can work to improve their grade point averages (GPA).

With the new academic standing field process generating probation/suspension status for students, the Scholastic Committee must determine if Morris should implement suspension and probation after summer session or contact students in this situation to inform those who do not do well that they will not be placed on suspension or probation after summer session.

Debating the pros and cons of suspension/probation after summer session leads to many questions.

Why has SC never suspended or placed on probation after summer session? What is the history?

How would suspending after summer session affect the appeals process?

How would suspending after summer session affect the Office of the Registrar's workload?

How many students would be affected by suspension/probation after summer session?

Only courses from University of Minnesota campuses count towards a student's GPA and contribute to the academic standing field status. Transfer courses from other colleges/universities do not affect GPA.

SC has defined the policy of when and how students are put on suspension/probation, and now an automatic mechanism seems to be dictating the process. SC does not have to change the process, but if we don't, SC will have to develop an important communication piece.

Suspension/probation happens after students have registered for classes for the upcoming semester. Students who are suspended are administratively dropped unless the courses are already underway.

The new suspension/probation process could affect summer enrollment and faculty pay. If summer is no longer a "grace period" to raise GPAs and rather becomes a probation or suspension risk, enrollment could decrease. A decrease in summer enrollment could also lead to cancellations of classes and affect faculty pay.

It would be very difficult to determine if students who did poorly in the summer succeeded or failed during fall semester as a means of researching the issue. It is possible to query students who took summer courses, but they would have to be reviewed manually to determine if the student failed or succeeded the following semester.

Jennifer Rothchild believes the new process could be more work, but SC should be consistent with suspension and probation. She believes all students should encounter the same consequences after the summer as they would during the academic year.

The Advising Office advises students not to take more than 16 credits during the summer. Brenda Boever would like SC to discuss the possibility of restricting or limiting summer credits. She spoke with Clare Dingley about limiting summer credits, but because the May, Summer Session I, and Summer Session II are grouped together, there was no mechanism to restrict the credits.

Megan Jacobsen believes the suspension/probation process should be consistent. She has had experiences with students in both good academic standing and on probation/suspension. She believes students on probation know the risk of taking summer courses. The risk is less understood by students going from good academic standing to probation.

Leslie Meek feels there is no good reason not to change the suspension/probation process.

Hilda Ladner is concerned incoming students with a low GPA will be suspended after the fall semester. The concern is for PSEO students who take courses through a U of M campus.

OTR can override the academic standing status on a case-by-case basis, but the student may then have to be tracked manually. If SC finds that the automatic academic standing field is incorrect, students may have to wait until the process runs again to see the update. SC believes it is better to have the student wait than to manually change a student's status. The process runs weekly until students start registering for the following semester.

Meek is concerned the new process will produce numerous emails to SC after the winter, spring, and summer semesters. Korn explained that she can identify students automatically identified for probation or suspension for the academic standing field after summer semester using the same process she currently uses. Instead of notifying the student they are on probation/suspension, the student would receive communication explaining the academic standing field status.

How many students are going to look at academic standing? Students who are on probation may check their status obsessively, but there are few of these types of students.

The time between when grades are posted after summer session II and the beginning of the fall semester is a short timeframe to notify students they have been suspended for the fall semester. With less than 10 students suspend every semester the monetary impact is low.

Korn will look to confirm that mid-semester grades will impact academic standing status.

Ladner would like to give students all summer to increase their GPA without fear of suspension or probation.

Does SC count the summer as part of the academic year when referring to how many semesters a student is suspended? If so, the implications could be numerous. Switching to the new process might cause problems SC has not seen and cannot foresee.

SC agreed not to make a decision without further information. SC would like to know:

- How many students take summer classes?
- How many students will the new process affect?
- COPLAC Review- What do they do and why? What do they consider a year?
- What is the history of why suspension/probation is done the way it is?
- Consult Dorothy DeJager about the history.
- Review Steve Granger information for history.
- 

Without a decision, the process will remain the same and SC will devise a communication plan.

5. The CLEP discussion will be scheduled for another meeting.

Respectfully Submitted,

Angie Senger  
Office of the Registrar

Addendum One: [Response Letter to Disability Resource Center](#)

Addendum Two: [Subcommittee's Recommendation Letter to Dean Finzel](#)