

2-8-2005

Scholastic minutes 02/08/2005

Scholastic Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 02/08/2005" (2005). *Scholastic Committee*. 254.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/254

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 #11, February 8, 2005

The Scholastic Committee met in the Behmler Conference Room on Tuesday, February 8th, at 3:45 p.m. The next meeting will be from 3:45-4:20 on February 22, prior to the Campus Assembly.

Members Present: S. Aronson, B. Burke, B. Fisher, J. Goodnough, W. Hunt, J-M Kim, P. Lawrence, N. McPhee (chair), G. Sheagley, D. De Jager, S. Haugen, K. Klinger (coordinator), L. Meek, R. Thielke
Guest: C. Strand

1. The February 8, 2005 Minutes were approved.

2. Petitions

#1143--Waive the Science Lab requirement of the GER because of confusion over a course with a lab component as well as for hardship. **Denied**

#1144--Waive the Artistic Performance (ArtP) requirement based on completion of a directed study in Play Writing. **Approved**

3. Authority of the Scholastic Committee Coordinator: K.Klinger will retire this year from the role as Scholastic Committee coordinator. As part of the transition, and particularly because only she and Steve Granger have held this position, she asked the Committee to review a summary of the authority exercised by the coordinator. Some is long standing, and some has developed in the last decade with Committee support. Since each statement had been approved either by the Campus Assembly or by earlier Scholastic Committees, no action was required.

The summary addresses academic progress, early and mid-term alerts, credit limits, exemptions, placement exams and interpretations of policy, among other topics that involve the coordinator. The complete list citing the coordinator's authority, the date that it was given, and the finer points of policy with which the coordinator is involved is attached.

Members reviewed two documents, one that had been pulled together for the agenda and a second that involved a thorough review of the minutes for the past ten years. Members asked questions about how certain rules work. For example, what restrictions are placed on retaking language placement exams? (Students take the exam for the first time during summer registration and may try again in fall, if they score at the second semester placement. We have found that students who place at the first semester level don't pass the proficiency exam when it is given a second time.) How are petitions approved over the summer? (Each spring, the Committee empowers the chair and coordinator to act on summer petitions. However, in practice the chair, Registrar and coordinator consult. If the three agree that this is a petition consistently approved by the full committee, the petition is approved. If one of the three dissents, the petition is held over till fall.) Why don't we typically allow students to register late? (All students, but particularly students on probation or conditions, reduce their chances of success, if they aren't able to attend the first weeks of class.)

4. Designations for Directed Study: In the January 25th meeting, the Committee was concerned about the increased numbers of petitions received to allow a student to meet a gen ed requirement based on a completed directed study. In this meeting, we considered recommending to the Curriculum Committee that a process be put in place to approve the use of a directed study to meet the spirit of a gen ed requirement before a student undertakes it. We did not reach a consensus about whether to move forward. McPhee will draft a memo to the Curriculum Committee for our review. On the positive side, we thought

that a simple process could be designed. A check-off box could be added to the directed study form, indicating whether the directed study would be used to address a criterion, and, if so, which one. This would allow the student and faculty mentor to focus the directed study more clearly on appropriate gen ed criteria. The authority to determine where study fits in the gen ed belongs with the faculty and the divisions. Checks are built into the system so that the directed study is sometimes reviewed by other members of the discipline and always reviewed by either the division chair or dean. However, on the negative side, it was apparent from the discussion that division chairs interpret their responsibility for review in different ways. We have no other checks to determine whether a directed study mentor is qualified in the student's study area. What problems can we anticipate if the Curriculum Committee allows individual directed studies to be assigned a designation? We agreed that it is inappropriate to offer a class through a directed study. The more appropriate method is to offer the course out-of-sequence. We will check the catalog carefully to determine whether there are any policy statements excluding directed studies from carrying designations.

5.Reconsidering the degree limit of 12 credits of D: Clare Strand will join us on February 22 for a discussion of dropping the D limit.

The meeting was adjourned.