University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

10-26-2010

Scholastic minutes 10/26/2010

Scholastic Committee

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

University of Minnesota, Morris Scholastic Committee
Meeting #7, October 26, 2010

The Scholastic Committee met at 9:00 on Tuesday, October 26, in Behmler 130.

Present: J Goodnough (Chair), C Braegelmann, C Cole, E Christensen, C Dingley, A Earl, S Gross,
S Haugen, H Ladner, L Ranelli, J Ratliff-Crain, J Richards, D Stewart

1. The Minutes of 10/12//2010 were approved .

2. Report from the chair
    1. Campus Assembly meets today, the chair will give a committee report informing the campus of
       the motion approved that allows course information from international transcripts to serve
       as evidence that a student has met the spirit of a general education requirement. Courses
       designated as ARTH(FA), ARTS(ArtP), BIOL(Sci), CHEM(Sci), CSCI(MSR),
       MATH(MSR), STAT(MSR) will result in a waiver of the listed general education
       requirement. This will be administratively handled by the transfer specialist. Students
       retain the right to petition to have other general education categories waived but would be
       expected to provide additional information.
    2. Our discussion of electronic homework submission will be sent to the Campus Assembly
       listserve, and people will be directed there or to our minutes.
    3. Returning students will follow the requirements in force at the time they are readmitted. This
       includes current probation and suspension criteria.
    4. A note was sent to advisors to remind them of the change to a 12-16 credit range for students on
       probation. Students who wish to exceed 16 credits need to submit an academic planning form
       and a petition completed in consultation with their advisor.
    5. At this point, Clare shared for the record the primary rights of students and the definition of
       Education Records found in FERPA.
       Students have the right:
          a. to inspect and review education records
          b. to seek an amendment to education records
          c. to have some control over the disclosure of information from education records.
       Definition of Education Records:
          a. They contain information which is directly related to a student.
          b. They are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a party acting for the
             agency or institution.
          c. Storage media and location are irrelevant.
    6. The Regents have requested a review of the Student Conduct Code, to be completed Spring 2011.
       Our catalog will be accurate, since we link to the actual policy. The chair will bring to the
       committee the academic components in the policy following the review.
    7. The section in the catalog defining credit status for students was reviewed by Clare. No single
       statement can apply to all students, so the information will be incorporated into the degree
       requirement section using the policy on promoting timely graduation.

3. Committee members had been asked to informally survey their constituents on submitting
assignments for classes. There was wide variety on what was required or accepted, and on means of
notification. Consensus was faculty should include a basic statement concerning what format(s) of
assignments they will accept (electronic or hard copy or both), and specific details could be either part of
the syllabus or part of the individual assignments.
    • Summary statement of individual faculty preferences formally informs students of faculty
      expectations
    • Not all students get an individual written assignment
    • Detail is helpful to second-language learners
    • Upperclass students know what to do, first-year students are unsure about submitting assignments

- preference clarifies the semester for students
- Do not include, syllabi are too long already

Concerns
- Electronic communication must be on the official university email account.
- Name should be required in electronic communication; some faculty already state in syllabus that unsigned mail will not receive a reply.
- Moodle or webvista often require 10 minutes to access, upload/download is very slow. If electronic submission is required, the computing network infrastructure needs improvement.

Faculty responses
Q. How do you require your students to turn in their assignments for class?
A. It depends on the class and on the project.

Q. Can students email assignments to you?
A. It depends on the assignment—sometimes they need to bring hard copy to class discussion and peer review, sometimes I specifically request email attachments so I can comment and return (final papers)
A. Sometimes assignments are uploaded into Moodle or WebVista, electronic format required.
A. Sometimes both an electronic and paper version are required.
A. Not all faculty can print in their office
A. If faculty have printers, many pay for their printing supplies out of pocket.

Q. Does an electronic version count as being "on time?"
A. Yes, it's easy to see when it was posted.
A. Yes, but I still ask for the paper copy later.

Comments:
--I hope that instructors can continue to be flexible and will not be required to accept assignments in a particular format or have specific language in the syllabus—though I do think instructors should communicate clearly with students.
--No easy answer. If students are turning in assignments for feedback only, then I want it emailed. For final drafts of research, unit plans, and other items for a grade, I want paper copies. Also written in the syllabi that I use.
--None specifically written into my syllabus. However, when talking about assignments when going through our syllabus, that's when I tell students they can email assignments. As long as I receive the email prior to the date/time the class meets, they are on time.
--Paper only

Student Responses
--prefer [what instructor will accept] stated in syllabus and in detail
--like not having to pay to print things
--promotes green campus
--the impression is that a paper product receives greater scrutiny and feedback
--if assignment is on line, include the time due.

Jeff Ratliff-Crain reported on the forums scheduled last week to discuss the use of electronic translators.
- No best practices or policies, people are trying to decide.
- Not to be used during exams (with exceptions) because input is possible in some
- Some faculty allow paper dictionaries, which can be "cleared" by a quick inspection.
- Dedicated translators have been proposed, there is a security question as well as financial issue.
- Whatever practice is determined, it must be published in advance

Additional response from the committee included current practices in some divisions—for example, use of a standard calculator is allowed in science.

Perhaps the bookstore could stock translators, but would paper ones work? How many versions are necessary for various Chinese languages?

How are students using translators: are they looking up subject terms or looking up English language?

There is a university policy on the use of electronic devices that can allow or prevent all use. The Scholastic website will have a section that offers the information that is available.

There was a sense from committee that having available options of standard language for multiple issues would be useful. Work with the Dean on this. . . .

Submitted by Dorothy De Jager