

2-7-2011

Scholastic minutes 02/07/2011

Scholastic Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 02/07/2011" (2011). *Scholastic Committee*. 175.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/175

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
Meeting #13, February 7, 2011

The Scholastic Committee met at 9:00 on Monday, February 7, in Imholte 217.

Present: T Berberi, C Braegelmann, C Cole, J Goodnough (Chair), S Gross, S Haugen, A Helgerson, H Ladner, J Ratliff-Crain, L Ranelli, C Stemper, D Stewart
Guest: M Page

1. The Minutes of January 31 were approved.
2. Report from the chair
 - At the February 14 meeting, Jess Larson will report on Academic Alert.
 - At an upcoming meeting, Jenn Zych will demonstrate software to manage Academic Alert.
 - Sandy Olson-Loy will be a guest when we have identified the questions about Academic Integrity that we want her to answer.
3. Academic Integrity Documents

PROPOSED HEARING PROCEDURES

F. Pre-hearing Conference

“Up to the start of a hearing, the accused student can accept a resolution proposed by the instructor.”

- The stated deadline creates a greater deterrent to moving to the hearing process.
- It is designed to promote conversation about resolution between student/instructor.
- Should the instructor be asked to provide a copy of the offer of resolution to the hearing panel?
- “The student may, if they wish, submit a written statement regarding their position on the matter. The statement does not have bearing on the finding but provides a means for students to document their perspective.” (2.0 RESOLUTIONS, Section 2.1 of the AI document)
- In the Twin Cities, the potential or actual sanction is known to SAIC.
- A sentence will be added to Morris procedures stating who will know the sanctions.
- The stated deadline puts more responsibility on the pre-hearing group to communicate clearly.
- It allows negotiation between student and the hearing panel, but not the instructor.

Unresolved questions:

- What are other schools doing?
- What are the grading options? Can we insert a statement into the procedures that for students with unresolved cases the corresponding course will be considered still in progress, and eligible for a K grade? [Dorothy has contacted Tina Falkner about this.]
- Is the presumption of innocence part of this process?
- Does any part of the alleged violation and resolution become a part of the student’s academic record? [Dorothy has contacted Tina Falkner about this.]

The committee again discussed the need to educate students about academic integrity and the need to use multiple venues: orientation with OGL’s leading a discussion, First Year Experience programming, residence hall programming, the yet-to-be-created general education “navigation” course. Programming during orientation may reach all new students, but it may not be the tone we wish to set at the beginning of new student careers. Student-to-student delivery is probably the most effective.

4. Scheduling events during the Study Day/Finals Week period

2009-2011 catalog statement of the policy. The sentence highlighted in Point #3 is not included in the new catalog, which makes the policy less clear. The other issue is the sentence in red, granting authority to approve exceptions only to SCEP.

1. No classes will be permitted after the last scheduled day of instruction for that term/semester for any course that normally includes undergraduate students. Instructors may not schedule classes on Study Day.
2. Instructors may not hold a regular class during examination week (which can interfere with students' other exams) and may not hold a class during the first hour of the examination period and then conduct the final examination during the remaining hour(s).
3. No University-sponsored extra-curricular events, **which require the participation of students**, may be scheduled from the beginning of Study Day to the end of Finals Week. **Exceptions to this policy may be granted ONLY by the Senate Committee on Educational Policy.** Instructors must provide an alternative and timely opportunity for students to complete course requirements they were unable to complete because of an absence permitted by this policy.

2011-13 Catalog statement: It is University policy to prohibit classes, University sponsored trips, or extracurricular events on study day and during the final examination period. Under certain rare circumstances, exceptions to the prohibition on trips or events are possible. An exemption granted pursuant to this policy shall be honored and students who are unable to complete course requirements during final examination period as a result of the exemption shall be provided an alternative and timely means to do so. For more information on the process of requesting an exemption refer to the policy link below or contact the Scholastic Committee at x6011. [Note that the highlighted phrase from the 2009 catalog has been deleted.]

<http://www.policy.umn.edu/Policies/Education/Education/EXAM.html>

Questions

- Are search committees covered by this policy?
- Students report assignments being given that are due during finals week, but were not in the original syllabus. Is this covered?

Historically, UMM granted exceptions to the policy. However, a search of Scholastic Committee minutes and SCEP minutes produced no record of an approval for local authority. Requests were submitted to the Scholastic Committee, which then recommended approval. The Chancellor had administrative responsibility to notify the campus community of the approved exception. Because the authority issue was not resolved before the catalog deadline, the statement for 2011-13 catalog was deliberately phrased to accommodate either outcome. In order to be in compliance with the university policy, the Committee has two options to consider:

- 1) Follow policy as is and let SCEP make the decisions on exceptions. We could set up a procedure or form to facilitate making a request to SCEP. Have this procedure noted on the policy page.
- 2) Approve a motion to request that SCEP delegate authority for granting exceptions to SC. SC could report all exceptions to SCEP. Inform Campus Assembly regarding this issue. Make request and cross fingers. We'd then want to create a procedure or form for requests to SC. Have this formally incorporated into policy so it's on the web site we link to in the catalog.

- Rationale for 2) is that the ramifications from an exception are unique at Morris. For example, a basketball game scheduled on study day at UMTC not only requires the attendance of the players, but affects the 2000 season ticket holders, the students who work concessions, other student workers, the band members and cheerleaders. At UMM, only the basketball players are required to attend. UMM is small enough, and the faculty willing enough, to work with students both to complete required work and to participate in extracurricular events.
- A concern was expressed that the exception because UMM is unique avoids the intent of the policy, which is to protect students, avoid coercion, and accomplish the academic endeavor.

Discussion of the options will continue.

Respectfully submitted,
Dorothy De Jager