

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Scholastic Committee

Campus Governance

3-9-2017

Scholastic minutes 03/09/2017

Scholastic Committee

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 03/09/2017" (2017). *Scholastic Committee*. 235.
https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/235

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.

**Scholastic Committee
2016-17 Academic Year
March 9, 2017
Meeting Seventeen Minutes**

Present: Roland Guyotte (chair), Brenda Boever, Jennifer Goodnough, Judy Korn, Steve Gross, Leslie Meek, Dan Magner, Joe Beaver, Emma Kloos, Merc Chasman, Emily Trieu, and Parker Smith

Absent: Ray Schultz, Josiah Gregg, and Ruby DeBellis

1. Approve minutes of February 23, 2017, meeting

Minutes approved as amended.

2. Chair's Report

The Scholastic Committee (SC) was granted 15 minutes at the next Campus Assembly to discuss the Makeup policy. Roland Guyotte and Judy Korn attended the brown bag lunch gathering held by the International Student Program office where they discussed ESL course content and WLA preparation for international students.

3. SCEP Report

Twin Cities students are advocating for a fall break similar to the Morris campus, however SCEP did not appear receptive to the idea. The Twin Cities fall semester begins later than Morris, after Labor Day, due to the Minnesota State Fair. Jennifer Goodnough proposed SCEP speak with Morris for suggestions on how to deal with labs if the Twin Cities wishes to pursue a fall break.

There is more ongoing conversation regarding the transition from Moodle to Canvas, but there doesn't appear to be much room for input.

4. Multi-I policy for Morris

The Multi-Institutional (Multi-I) program allows students from a U of M campus to register and attend classes at another U of M campus for one semester per academic year. A Universitywide policy regarding Multi-I does not exist and the procedure associated with the process does not cover how to handle different situations. For instance, last year the Admissions office admitted a student who was eligible for the American Indian tuition waiver. The student asked if they could register and attend classes at the Twin Cities for their first semester and apply the waiver. The student made it clear they wanted to attend and graduate from the Twin Cities campus and they wanted to use the Morris American Indian tuition waiver to pay for tuition. Procedure would limit this student to use Multi-I for one semester per academic year, but it does not address whether an incoming student can use Multi-I for their first semester of college before attending classes at the college the student was admitted to. Admissions denied the request stating the student had to attend their first semester at Morris.

Judy Korn, Registrar, would like to have a policy in place at Morris that would help address the various situations that may arise. Having a policy to refer to would provide Korn more support when addressing petitions. If the SC is interested in an official academic policy Korn has offered to draft a policy including a FAQ section to present to the committee for review. It was noted that the Twin Cities (TC) campus is not interested in creating a policy which could be due to the fact

that they are usually the receiving institution. More students from the system campuses attend classes at the TC campus than TC students attend classes at other system campuses.

The committee agreed for Korn to create a policy draft for SC to review. It was suggested that the policy be short and simple because the more problems the policy tries to address the more confusing it can get. The previously suggested FAQ section would be a great place to address nuances.

5. Name information on syllabus - post Queer Issues Committee meeting

In February, the proposed amendment to the syllabus policy regarding preferred name was discussed at a Queer Issues Committee meeting. Merc Chasman who attended the meeting reported that the students appeared receptive to the amendment to the policy and many students believed the new policy would be helpful in understanding when/where preferred name would/could be used. Students agreed that not all students read the entire syllabus, but they said it helps when a professor takes time to address specific policies on the syllabus. Many students became aware of the Disability Resource Center because it was included in the syllabus. If a professor takes the time to address the preferred name policy students might feel like they have an ally.

A statement regarding the use of preferred name vs legal name was created for the Morris campus and is currently available online. Students expressed that being aware of when preferred name vs legal name is used could help them make decisions regarding FERPA and communications that could reach parents. The Morris campus is trying to get the topic of preferred names lifted higher to a Universitywide discussion.

The System Registrars Council has discussed preferred name and believed the Title IX office would pick it up, however they expressed no interest in working on the topic. A new Title IX director was recently hired and has shown interest in the topic and wants to move forward to create policy instead of just having a statement.

Members agreed having the preferred name statement on the syllabus would be a good thing because it would make students aware of when/how preferred name/legal name is used. Members agreed that Morris did not have to wait for a Universitywide policy regarding preferred name before requesting the preferred name statement be added to the course syllabus policy.

The motion to recommend the preferred name statement be included in the course syllabus was approved unanimously.

6. Discussion regarding Advising holds for ALL students

Brenda Boever stated the last time advising holds were reviewed was in 1998 when the Morris campus switched from quarters to semesters. Beginning fall 1999, students are required to meet with advisers for their first two years now that there were fewer opportunities to register and greater opportunities to make errors.

Members are concerned about providing proper advising for students with transfer credits (PSEO, CIS, true transfer) and making sure they have adequate contact with a faculty member. If a

student comes in with 30 credits then they only need to meet with their adviser until they reach the 60 credit threshold. This means they could potentially only have to meet with an adviser for one year. There is an elaborate advising system for new high school students, but there is nothing equivalent for transfer students.

Many students who come in with an associate of arts are just starting work on their major and most of those students are not required to meet with an adviser.

There are two advising registration holds currently being used: JV and RS. The JV hold is placed on all students with less than 60 credits by Jeri Squire, Office of the Registrar, prior to the start of registration. Once advisers have met with students they send an email to the holds list and the advising hold is manually removed by Office of the Registrar staff. The RS hold is placed on new students after they have been matriculated. No new student can register without meeting with an adviser on new student registration days or by speaking with Boever in the Office of Academic Success. The Office of the Registrar removes the RS hold before registration begins that day.

Does the committee feel the way holds are managed for students with transfer credits is adequate given the number of students who are coming in with credits? All students have an advising hold for at least one semester.

Could Advising require all transfer students meet with their advisers for a full year by adding a hold for an additional semester after they were admitted? Advising would have to work with the Office of the Registrar to discuss adding a hold based on a student's admit term, student group, or student status.

There is also concern about undecided students accumulating credits and not having to meet with advisers after earning 60 credits. The Timely Graduation policy only allows students to remain undecided for a certain number of semesters depending on the number of credits they transferred in.

Student members offered that they still continue to work with their advisers to make sure they're meeting major requirements even though they are past the 60 credit threshold and are no longer required to meet. Students said they still receive emails about planning meetings from their advisers even though they're no longer required to meet. Boever shared that advisers typically reach out to all of their advisees regardless of their credits.

Students also suggested that requiring students such as those with an associate of arts to meet with their advisers could be stepping on toes. Some of these students know what they need to do to complete their major and their degree. It may also be perceived as unfair to require transfer students with more than 60 credits to meet with their advisers when it would not be required from new high school students.

Some members believe there is a larger problem in dealing with advising for transfer students which could stem from the lack of an orientation program for transfer students. Korn and Boever mentioned that Advising and Student Activities are currently working on a program for transfer students. Based on research, transfer students have better success when they find other transfer students who share similar transfer experiences. Advising and Student Activities are implementing a revised plan for working with transfer students during orientation. Transfer

students will participate in a special program on Monday and Tuesday during orientation. The Orientation Group Leaders escorting the transfer students will themselves be transfer students.

It was noted that the profile of transfer students has changed from the '90s. In the past, transfer students were mostly nontraditional students with a greater variety in age and maturity. Now many of the transfer students are 18-19 years old and probably need more advising than transfer students from the past. The committee requested more information on the breakdown of transfer students. Angie Senger, Office of the Registrar, will gather more information from the probation/suspension report.

Respectfully submitted,

Angie Senger
Office of the Registrar