

10-20-2004

Scholastic minutes 10/20/2004

Scholastic Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 10/20/2004" (2004). *Scholastic Committee*. 256.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/256

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.

University of Minnesota, Morris
Scholastic Committee
Minutes #05, October 20, 2004

The Scholastic Committee met at 4 p.m. on Wednesday, October 20th, in Science 3500.
The next meeting will be at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, November 3, in the same location.

Members present: B. Burke, J. Hass, W. Hunt, J. Kim, N. McPhee (chair), L. Meek, J. Ropp, G. Sheagley, D. De Jager, S. Haugen, K. Klinger (coordinator), R. Thielke

1. The Minutes from October 6th and 13th were approved.

2. Grade Replacement: The Committee rescinded the motion passed on September 22nd to follow the all-University policy to allow all students to repeat a course once. Based on the October 13th discussion, the Committee reviewed the wording of a proposed new motion: *Students may repeat a course once. However, students who receive a grade of S, C or higher may repeat a course once, space permitting.* At issue was the apparent contradiction between the two sentences as well as the word “however.”

Approved policy: The Committee unanimously passed the following motion to take to the Executive Committee for action by the Campus Assembly: *Students may repeat a course once. However, students who receive a grade of S, C or higher may repeat a course only if space permits.*

(Unchanged) *When a student repeats a course, (a) both grades for the course shall appear on the official transcript, (b) the course credits may not be counted more than once toward degree and program requirements, and (c) only the last enrollment for the course shall count in the student's grade point average*

3. Transfer practice clarification: The 2003-2005 UMM catalog states:
Transfer courses are not allowed for grade replacement of a University of Minnesota, Morris, course, but may, with appropriate prior approval, satisfy degree program requirements. This statement characterizes a practice followed by the Registrar rather than a policy. The following change in practice was proposed by the Registrar and approved unanimously. It will be sent to the Executive Committee for information for the Assembly:

Transfer courses from other U of MN campuses that are the same or essentially equivalent courses may be considered repeat courses for purposes of grade replacement. Introductory courses from within the University system will be reviewed by the Registrar with faculty consultation. Advanced courses must be approved by the faculty in the discipline of the course.

Discussion in support of this change centered on questions of quality and student service:

Because the transcript is an all-University transcript, courses taken or repeated at other colleges of the University will appear on the transcript..

Quality will be protected by faculty review of courses that are chosen as repeats as well as by the residency requirement.

Since UMM practice has not been consistent with that of other UM colleges, UMM students receive information from UM advisors that is not accurate.

Students who don't want to stay additional time need access to the possibility of repeat courses.

UMM often rotates courses on a two year cycle. Repeats are available in summer on a limited basis.

Students will not be tempted to earn grades below a C in order to be allowed to retake a course.

Credit will no longer be given twice for courses whose content is essentially the same.

4. Petition

#1136-- Waive the College Writing requirement of the GER based on portfolio evaluation. . . ” **Denied.**

The Committee reviewed the 9/27 memo from R.Heyman, Coordinator of College Writing, asking that "in the future, petitions to waive College Writing should be assessed solely on *whether a student provides evidence that demonstrates competence in the conventions of academic writing at the level of a successful college writing student earning a C or higher*. The result would be to ask students to submit analytical, argumentative, academic papers, not reflective pieces, creative writing, or simple 'reports.'" Heyman attached a detailed summary of goals and policies approved by the discipline in spring 2002. Petition 1136 was written using earlier criteria.

McPhee identified three groups that are concerned with this change: the Curriculum Committee, the Scholastic Committee, and the English discipline. We compared the descriptions in the catalog that refer to college writing and found them out of sync with one another.

The Skills for the Liberal Arts description (catalog, p. 59) states that *[t]hese requirements emphasize the development of the intellectual skills, the communication skills, and the framework for learning needed for successful advanced work.*

The Goals for College Writing (60) are *To understand the writing process through invention, organization, drafting, revising, and editing, and develop writers who can write about a range of ideas for a variety of readers.*

The description of College Writing (91) is *Practice in expressive and analytical writing, with special emphasis on the multi-source essay.*

The coordinator will write to the English discipline through Heyman to ask them to work with the Curriculum Committee to bring these three statements into greater harmony.

The meeting was adjourned.

Karla Klinger