

9-19-2017

Scholastic minutes 09/19/2017

Scholastic Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 09/19/2017" (2017). *Scholastic Committee*. 291.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/291

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.

Scholastic Committee
2017-18 Academic Year
September 19, 2017
Meeting Three Approved Minutes

Present: Roland Guyotte (Chair), Judy Korn, Michelle Schamp, Alyssa Pirinelli, Jennifer Goodnough, Merc Chasman, Brenda Boever, Leslie Meek, Dan Magner, Ray Schultz, Parker Smith, Emily Trieu, Emma Kloos, Elsie Wilson

Absent: Jessica Gardner

1. Approve minutes of September 5, 2017, meeting

Minutes approved as amended.

2. Chair's Report

Meek attended the Steering Committee's Chairs meeting in place of Guyotte and shared some of the topics discussed. The meeting focused on seven major projects currently underway. The first three projects pertain to the campus' assessment by the Higher Learning Commission (HLC). Another three projects are part of the strategic visioning and planning initiatives. Finally, the campus is continuing its work on the system-wide strategic planning effort.

The HLC is a regional accrediting body that assesses the quality of higher learning and student success at higher education institutions. About every ten years, the HLC sends a team of representatives to assess an institution and provide recommendations for improvement. The HLC projects for the Morris campus are:

- HLC assurance agreement consisting of a compliance exercise due summer 2019
- Quality initiative focusing on retention, mental health, and high impact practices

It was noted that after the HLC's recent visit to Morris, Morris was reported to be delinquent in some assessment areas. The Chancellor is seeking input from committees with vested responsibilities on initiatives addressing the assessment. Meek noted that the HLC quality initiative involves an assessment of retention initiatives and suggested the Scholastic Committee (SC) might want to provide some input as retention is part to the committee's purview. Another initiative where SC could provide input is the intellectual disability study and the feasibility of its implementation.

Committees are not being asked to take on any initiatives, but are being asked to provide input.

There will also be a series of readings and conversations as a prelude to strategic planning discussions. The Chancellor will provide readings relevant to our strategic planning efforts to be used in small group discussions.

3. SCEP Report

Goodnough shared that the Twin Cities Enrollment Management Plan may include the idea that students not admitted to programs on the Twin Cities campus are passed on to system campuses. It was expressed that Morris was not interested in students rejected by the Twin Cities campus as they would pose a retention issue. Students may not be qualified for the rigorous curriculum at Morris or students would not be interested in remaining at Morris as the Twin Cities campus would be their final goal.

It was noted that the Twin Cities campus is getting pressure from the regents about why some students are not being admitted. The Twin Cities is being questioned about how they are serving the average student.

SCEP also discussed Latin honors which bears no impact on the Morris campus.

SCEP also discussed the preferred name syllabus blurb. The topic was only up for discussion and members were equally split on including the statement in the course syllabus. There was some pushback because there's already so much information on the syllabus. There was some discussion on whether preferred name was similar to disability and mental health. Some members worried adding preferred name to the syllabus would open the door to more items.

SCEP will continue the discussion on the preferred name syllabus blurb and possibly work on the language. The committee likes the idea of having more information on preferred name, but it is unsure if it will go in the appendix.

Goodnough shared Morris' preferred name webpage which was well received and even elicited some calls for a similar webpage to be created for the Twin Cities campus.

SCEP is asking system campuses for the number and percentage of students graduating with distinction, with high distinction, and with honors.

4. Spring 2017 suspension report

Korn provided a recap of the suspension report (see Addendum One) and reported 68 students returning to good academic standing after spring semester. It was noted that Hilda Ladner, Equity, Diversity, and Intercultural Programs, should be informed about the higher number of domestic students of colored suspended compared to domestic white students.

5. Summer appeals report

Meek shared the results of 2017 summer appeals. Nine appeals were received. Five appeals were denied and four appeals were conditionally approved. The committee tends to lean toward denying appeals because many of the reasons behind the suspension need at least a year to be addressed.

Students whose appeals are approved receive contracts with certain conditions that must be met before they can return to Morris. Most contracts require students to earn good grades (usually a GPA of 2.5 or above) at another college during their semester away. Since the committee reviews all appeals for an academic year during the summer, some students who were suspended in the fall and have taken spring courses at a community college and met the usual conditions can return to Morris without a contract.

There was some uncertainty on whether the committee was actually helping students by allowing them to appeal and return early. A member noted no objection to abolishing the suspension appeal process.

It was noted that half of the students who returned after fulfilling the full year of their suspension went on to do well and the other half did not. It was suggested that SC review data on the academic progress/standing for students whose appeals were approved.

6. Summer 2017 suspension and probation report

Korn provided a review of the summer suspension/probation data (see Addendum Two). The suspension and probation process was a manual process that involved adding a service indicator on student records. After the PeopleSoft upgrade a student's academic standing is automatically calculated and placed by the system. The Scholastic Committee decided not to place students on probation/suspension after summer which means students who were placed on probation/suspension by the system after summer grades had to have their academic standing manually updated to be back in good academic standing.

Since the SC approved a credit limit for summer term in 2016, this summer there was only one student who took 14 credits with approval.

Advisers were notified of advisees who had poor academic performance during summer term.

Ten students still have incompletes from summer 2017 and some of these students are taking 20 credits fall semester.

It was suggested that students who perform poorly during summer term should receive a letter recommending they speak with their adviser or a success coach regarding the difficulties experienced in summer courses. It was also suggested that the committee follow up on the 23 students that would have been placed on probation/suspension to determine if the SC wants to intervene after summer term.

Is there a difference in performance in students taking on-campus courses versus online courses?

7. Review Admissions letter draft

The committee suggested softening the language of the letter to be less admonishing and more supportive of collaboration. The committee would like to review the draft after changes have been made.

8. Update from Advising and Office of the Registrar regarding new fall 2017 Morris students on probation at other campuses - tabled

Respectfully submitted,

Angie Senger,
Office of the Registrar

Suspension Overview	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Class										
Total number of students suspended	17	37	23	47	23	32	10	43	19	35
Total Enrollment	1893	1782	1940	1784	1900	1713	1854	1692	1768	1595
Percentage of total enrollment	0.9%	2.08%	1.19%	2.63%	1.21%	1.87%	0.54%	2.54%	1.07%	2.19%
Number of freshmen suspended	4	18	7	26	6	18	5	23	5	22
Percentage of total suspended	23.53%	48.65%	30.43%	55.32%	26.09%	56.25%	50.00%	53.49%	26.32%	62.86%
Percentage of total freshmen	0.77%	5.44%	1.28%	8.2%	1.22%	5.81%	1.02%	7.62%	1.08%	8.66%
Number of sophomores suspended	5	10	8	13	6	7	1	11	6	5
Percentage of total suspended	29.41%	27.03%	34.78%	27.66%	26.09%	21.88%	10.00%	25.58%	31.58%	14.29%
Percentage of total sophomores	1.06%	2.33%	1.69%	2.88%	1.4%	1.92%	0.25%	2.99%	1.58%	1.38%
Number of juniors suspended	4	6	5	5	6	4	2	4	4	5
Percentage of total suspended	23.53%	16.22%	21.74%	10.64%	26.09%	12.50%	20.00%	9.30%	21.05%	14.29%
Percentage of total juniors	1.08%	1.53%	1.25%	1.24%	1.35%	0.95%	0.52%	1.03%	1.04%	1.32%
Number of seniors suspended	3	2	2	3	4	2	2	5	3	3
Percentage of total suspended	17.65%	5.41%	8.7%	6.38%	17.39%	6.25%	20.00%	11.63%	15.79%	8.57%
Percentage of total seniors	0.62%	0.33%	0.42%	0.5%	0.83%	0.33%	0.39%	0.84%	0.61%	0.52%
Class not reported	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
Transfer(NAS/IUT) students suspended										2
Percentage of total suspended										5.71%
Percentage of total transfer students										0.65%
Residency	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Domestic students suspended	14	31	17	44	21	30	8	33	18	31
Total enrollment of domestic students	1678	1584	1733	1604	1688	1537	1626	1510	1536	1409
Percentage of total domestic enrollment	0.83%	1.96%	0.98%	2.74%	1.24%	1.95%	0.49%	2.19%	1.17%	2.20%
International students suspended	3	6	5	3	2	2	2	10	1	4
Total enrollment of international students	185	186	178	176	176	167	193	164	203	177
Percentage of total international enrollment	1.62%	3.23%	2.81%	1.7%	1.14%	1.20%	1.04%	6.10%	0.49%	2.26%
Residency not reported	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Race/ethnicity all students	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Total white students suspended	10	21	6	26	10	15	4	22	14	12
Total enrollment of white students	1270	1184	1298	1190	1233	1095	1174	1068	1076	966
Percentage of total enrollment of white students	0.79%	1.77%	0.46%	2.18%	0.81%	1.37%	0.34%	2.06%	1.30%	1.24%
Total students of color suspended	7	16	17	21	13	17	6	21	5	22
Total enrollment of students of color	593	577	630	582	651	604	661	601	668	610
Percentage of total enrollment of students of color	1.18%	2.77%	2.7%	3.61%	2%	2.81%	0.91%	3.49%	0.75%	3.61%
American Indian or Alaska Native students suspended	3	6	9	14	9	12	2	9	3	14
American Indian or Alaska Native total enrollment	282	274	302	275	327	299	317	300	314	292
Asian students suspended	3	8	6	5	1	4	3	10	2	5
Asian total enrollment	232	227	225	218	232	216	242	204	249	219
Black or African American students suspended	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	0	2
Black or African American total enrollment	44	41	55	48	41	41	45	47	49	44
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students suspended	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander total enrollment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hispanic or Latino students suspended	0	2	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	1
Hispanic or Latino total enrollment	35	35	48	41	51	48	57	50	56	55
Race/ethnicity not reported	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Race/ethnicity domestic students	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
Total domestic white students suspended						15	4	22	14	12
Total enrollment of domestic white students						1095	1174	1068	1076	966
Percentage of total enrollment of domestic white students						1.37%	0.34%	2.06%	1.30%	1.24%
Total domestic students of color suspended						15	4	11	4	18
Total enrollment of domestic students of color						604	661	601	668	610
Percentage of total enrollment of domestic students of color						2.48%	0.61%	1.83%	0.60%	2.95%
Domestic American Indian or Alaska Native students suspended						12	2	9	3	14
Domestic American Indian or Alaska Native total enrollment						298	316	298	314	291
Domestic Asian students suspended						2	1	1	1	2
Domestic Asian total enrollment						59	64	60	66	58
Domestic Black or African American students suspended						0	0	1	0	1
Domestic Black or African American total enrollment						37	41	41	43	37
Domestic Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander students suspended						0	0	0	0	0
Domestic Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander total enrollment						0	0	0	0	0
Domestic Hispanic or Latino students suspended						1	1	0	0	1
Domestic Hispanic or Latino total enrollment						45	56	48	52	51
Domestic students race/ethnicity not reported						0	0	0	0	1
ACT Compiled Score	Fall 2012	Spring 2013	Fall 2013	Spring 2014	Fall 2014	Spring 2015	Fall 2015	Spring 2016	Fall 2016	Spring 2017
>30 ACT number of suspended students	1	2	0	6	2	0	1	2	3	2
>30 ACT total enrollment	236	217	224	212	220	199	204	195	206	193

Addendum Two: Summer Suspension and Probation Report

Summer Suspension/Probation update

395 Morris students completed U of M classes during the summer (includes STELLAR program)

10 students improved their GPA and returned to good Academic Standing

10 students remained on probation

21 students would have been placed on probation

2 students would have been suspended

Advisers whose advisees had a not-so-good summer were notified.

Students who would have been placed on probation or suspension credit totals:

11 credits one student

10 credits one student

8 credits seven students

6 credits two students

4 credits sixteen students

3 credits one student

2 credits four students

Plus 10 students still have incompletes from summer 2017.