

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Functions and Awards Committee (Inactive)

Campus Governance

2-28-2018

Functions and Awards minutes 02/23/2018

Functions and Awards

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fawards>

Recommended Citation

Functions and Awards, "Functions and Awards minutes 02/23/2018" (2018). *Functions and Awards Committee (Inactive)*. 14.

<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/fawards/14>

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 Functions and Awards Committee (Inactive) by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

Minutes from Feb 23rd 2018 Functions and Awards committee meeting

Friday Feb 23rd at 10:30am, Moccasin Flower room.

Present: Lisa Bevevino, Andrew Brichacek, Bonnie Gulbrandson, Karen Ellis, Michael Lackey, Tiernan Lenius, Elena Machkasova (chair, minutes), Michelle Schamp, Parker Smith.

1. Introduction of new committee members: Andrew and Tiernan are joining the committee, replacing Autumn Johnson and Steven Tetrick.
2. For information: a Distinguished Faculty Research Award 2018 is awarded to Dr. Julie Eckerle, English.
3. Approval of the minutes from Nov 17 2017 meeting and from Feb 9 2018 - minutes approved. In favor: 5, abstained: 2.
4. A petition to be included into the Fall 2017 Dean's list. The student qualifies by the Dean's list criteria 1-3, but not by the criterion 4: completing all of the credits for which they were registered by the end of the term. They took a directed study class in Fall 2017. Their grade entered at the end of the semester was not that of a successful completion. The student finished the work by the beginning of the Spring semester and their grade was then changed to a grade that would've qualified them had it been entered at the end of the term. The student mentions reasons why the extension made sense for the kind of work they needed to complete and that this was a mutual decision between them and the instructor.
 - a. There was discussion of the difference between an I and K grades and their effect on the Dean's list eligibility.
 - b. The timing of submitting the petition was not as required in the appeal procedure, but since the student may've not been aware of the grade change or that they haven't been included into the Dean's list, it was decided to consider the petition.
 - c. There was a discussion of whether the responsibility for extending the course timeline lies on the student or on the instructor. The instructor may've not been aware that this extension had an effect on student's eligibility for the Dean's list, and would've given the student the K grade (and would've amended the directed study agreement accordingly) had they realized this effect.
 - d. Since the submitted materials haven't provided enough information for the instructor's reasons to handle the grade as they did, it was moved (and seconded) to table the petition and ask the instructor whether they suggested the extension to improve the student's learning experience, or they were just trying to do "damage control" after the timeline wasn't followed by the student.
 - e. The motion was unanimously approved.
 - f. Elena will follow up with the instructor and provide an update by email.

5. Scholar of the College nominations. Prior to the meeting, the committee members have marked the submitted nominations electronically with Recommend, Discuss, and Not recommend. There were 29 nominations total.
 - a. It's been moved and seconded to recommend for approval all the nominations for which all the marks were "Recommend" (26 nominations). The motion unanimously passed.
 - b. There was a discussion of a nomination for which the decision on the student's presentation submission was still pending. The student didn't have any other achievements that would've qualified them. It was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved that Elena will contact the nominator, and if the submission is accepted before the final list of the Scholar of the College awardees is compiled for the assembly, the nomination would be approved.
 - c. There was a discussion of a nomination from Dance. The acceptance criteria for the student's American College Dance Association Regional Conference weren't clear from the submission. Elena will follow up with the nominator and will share the response with the committee by email for the decision (moved, seconded, unanimously approved).
 - d. There was a discussion of a nomination of a student who has graduated in the Fall 2017. It was pointed out that students who graduated in the Fall are eligible for the following spring. The reasons to nominate a student for the spring after the graduation, even if they qualified before, could be to have a more impressive nomination that included the work that was done over the summer or in the fall. With that clarification, it was moved, seconded, and unanimously approved to recommend the nomination for approval.

Meeting adjourned at 11:20am.