

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Scholastic Committee

Campus Governance

---

10-25-2016

### Scholastic minutes 10/25/2016

Scholastic Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol\\_com](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com)

---

#### Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 10/25/2016" (2016). *Scholastic Committee*. 114.  
[https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol\\_com/114](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/114)

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](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

**Scholastic Committee  
2016-17 Academic Year  
October 25, 2016  
Meeting Seven Approved Minutes**

**Present:** Roland Guyotte (chair), Brenda Boever, Merc Chasman, Jennifer Goodnough, Leslie Meek, Steve Gross, Ruby DeBellis, Colin Wray, Emma Kloos, Ray Schultz, Michelle Brownlee, and Dan Magner

**Absent:** Joe Beaver and Elsie Wilson

**1. Approve minutes of September 27, 2016, meeting**

Minutes approved as amended.

The committee agreed that further discussion about adviser assignments may be better suited at a later meeting.

**Approve minutes of October 11, 2016, meeting**

Minutes approved.

**2. Chair's Report**

No report.

**3. SCEP Report**

Jennifer Goodnough was interviewed and featured in the *Minnesota Daily* to discuss the Makeup Work policy under review by SCEP. The interview is seen as a positive for the system campuses as it could be viewed as an indicator that the chair of SCEP, Sue Wick, is aware that the Universitywide Makeup policy should not be Twin Cities centric.

SCEP briefly discussed mental health and were informed that there would be a substantial mental health discussion at the November 3rd Senate Committee meeting and all SCEP members are invited.

Goodnough has not been provided with an agenda for the next SCEP meeting.

**4. Spring probation student information review**

Judy Korn provided a brief review of the probation report discussed at an earlier Scholastic Committee (SC) meeting. Students are placed on probation when either their term or cumulative GPA are below 2.000. Korn provided a report on the potential risks identified by Retention during their visit with the SC in previous years.

The breakdown showed that out of the 136 students placed on probation after the spring 2016 semester, 130 of those students were on their first semester of probation. The other 36 students were on their second semester of probation, but still have a cumulative GPA about 2.000.

A total of 47 students of the 136 probated students are no longer enrolled at Morris.

The Office of the Registrar did an extensive and careful review of the student records for the 136 probated students looking at the potential retention risks identified by Retention. One of the risks

identified by the Office of the Registrar were student applications marked “extra advising.” The “extra advising” stamp was not mentioned during Retention presentations.

Members recall a “Conditional Admit” student group that was utilized at least five years ago and questioned whether the “extra advising” stamp replaced the conditional admit student group. The conditional admit student group was placed by the Admissions Office along with conditions such as a credit limit and enrollment in a Fundamentals of English course. The student group indicated the student could be successful at Morris, but required a few conditions to assure their success.

The conditional admit student group was requested by Admissions and approved by the SC so that Admissions could change the Admissions admit letter to not include the conditions placed on students considered conditional admits.

Advising was made aware of conditionally admitted students by Admissions and these students had a separate process during their registration session which involved the discussion of their conditions. The separate registration process has also been eliminated.

It is unknown if Admissions met with SC after the conditional admit student group was discontinued. The SC and the Office of Academic Success were not aware of the “extra advising” stamp on student applications.

Members questioned who placed the “extra advising” stamp and why no one is aware of it. The stamp is placed by the group who reviews difficult admissions.

Members noted that students are being identified as needing extra advising, but no one in a position to help the students is being made aware.

Members want to know how long the “extra advising” stamp has been utilized. How many students per year are flagged?

Members would like a list of these students sent to someone to determine what happened to them. Are they still at Morris?

What was the intent of marking students with the “extra advising” stamp? It was assumed that the stamp was used to notify Advising of these students.

What does the stamp mean? Does the stamp mean the student requires extra advising from Admissions or Advising? Members agreed it would be beneficial for the alert team and success coaches to be aware of students flagged as needing extra advising. It was noted that the “extra advising” stamp was placed on students who have some combination of the following:

- Low grades on a high school or transfer transcript
- ACT/GPA good enough for admittance
- Self-disclosed a special extenuating circumstance such as family trauma

It was questioned whether the extra advising flag should only be considered by Advising when the flag is due to academic circumstances. Members argued that while the reasons for the stamp may not be academic the effects are on academics.

Members expressed deep concern that such a critical component in providing specialized support/advising to students is being missed. The Morris campus prides itself on being a small campus where students are not treated as a number, but an individual. Advisers should know about students who need extra advising to better assist the student during new student registration.

It was noted that the new Director of Admissions may not be aware of the issue. Members agreed the issue should be discussed at the next meeting.

The “extra advising” stamp is placed on a student’s application if the student has self-disclosed a special extenuating circumstance. Admissions does not check the validity of the circumstances reported.

It was noted that advisers don’t want to know what the student disclosed to receive the “extra advising” stamp. Advisers simply want to be aware there may be a reason a student should register for less credits or should receive additional advising.

Are students aware of the “extra advising” stamp on their application?

Korn also reviewed other risk factors identified by Retention such as lower ACT scores, late deposits, waitlists, and incomplete contracts.

The committee would like to know if Morris waitlists a lot students. It would like this information presented during their next visit. The committee would also like to know how many students come off the waitlist on a positive and negative way.

It was noted that students are waitlisted if they have disclosed something that needs clarification or if they had a bad junior year and Admissions is waiting on an update transcript with fall/final grades.

There could be a number of students with a combination of possible risk factors which could be the result of some risk factors being more closely associated. It was noted that while looking at these risk factors they do not provide a complete view of what could be affecting retention. Other factors such as chemical dependency, trauma, and family issues may affect retention, but these factors are difficult to assess.

**5. Discuss next steps for A Level**

Tabled

**6. Students dropping study abroad courses procedure**

Tabled

**7. Preparation for Admissions presentation on November 1**

The committee would like more information about the “extra advising stamp”, waitlisting, ACT scores, and the male/female breakdown. The committee does not want to hear the same information already shared during the Chancellor’s convocation and Campus Assembly. The committee would like to hear more about how the University is meeting the challenges of the difficult and changing landscape.

Members requested to have both last year's and this year's Admissions presentations emailed to them before next week's meeting so they may review the information and have time for questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Angie Senger  
Office of the Registrar