

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Scholastic Committee

Campus Governance

---

10-9-2018

### Scholastic minutes 10/09/2019

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 10/09/2019" (2018). *Scholastic Committee*. 314.  
[https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol\\_com/314](https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/314)

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**  
**2018-19 Academic Year**  
**October 9, 2018**  
**Meeting Three Approved Minutes**

**Present:** Roland Guyotte (chair), Brenda Boever, Judy Korn, Leslie Meek, Parker Smith, Mitchell Scanlan, Jennifer Goodnough, Michelle Schamp, Emma Kloos, Chris Atkinson, Elizabeth Abler, Heather Pennie, Bryan Nell, and Nancy Pederson

**Guest:** Melissa Bert

**Absent:** Esmira Alieva

**1. Approve minutes of September 25, 2018, meeting**

Approved as amended.

**2. Chair's Report**

No report.

**3. SCEP Report**

Jennifer Goodnough informed the committee that the comment period for the Grading and Transcript policy is over. There were no comments submitted about the changes. The policy will soon go to the Faculty Consultative Committee for review then to the University Senate for voting. Changes to the Grading and Transcript policy include slight changes to the grade definitions and changes to the timeline of when Incompletes need to be completed. There will be restricted use of X and K symbols so they are not used in place of Incompletes. Korn expressed that she is pleased with the changes, but is concerned about timing. She would like the changes to be reflected in the new catalog which is currently being reviewed.

SCEP will be discussing Using Email as the Official Student Communication policy. SCEP will also be looking at the Academic Calendar policy. Another topic Goodnough would like Scholastic Committee (SC) feedback is on the discussion about withholding diplomas and official transcripts from students with financial holds.

**4. Summer Appeals Report**

The summer appeals group consisting of Brenda Boever, Judy Korn, Leslie Meek, and Alyssa Pirinelli met on July 12, 2018 to review petitions from students who had been suspended during the 2017-18 academic year. Students who are suspended are required to be away for one full academic year. Students who are suspended receive an email and a letter notifying them of their suspension and information on how to appeal. Students can appeal to return after being away for one semester by completing the online Google form and submitting supporting documentation. The form asks student to provide an explanation of the circumstances leading to the suspension and a plan to improve academic performance. The appeal due date is always June 30 for all students suspended after fall or spring semester.

Since all appeals are due in June, is there a trend of appeals being from students suspended after spring semester? No, students who are notified after fall semester of their suspension and wish to appeal often do so right away. All the information on how to show they can be academically

successful is provided in the suspension letter. Students are encouraged to take courses at a community college and contact the transfer specialist for course evaluation.

Last summer, the committee received six appeals. From those six appeals only one was approved. In general, most appeals are denied because the committee strongly believes the students need time away to fix things. A member noted that at one point they thought about asking the SC to stop hearing suspension appeals because it was in the best interest of the student to be away for a year. However, that member has changed their mind about discontinuing the appeal process after seeing a recent appeal for a student who would still be able to graduate on time if they were allowed to return after only one semester away and having successfully completed courses at a community college during their semester away.

How many students were suspended last year? A total of 42 were suspended. Seeing that only a small number (14%) of students appeal and most are denied, does that mean that suspension is the end of student's careers at Morris? No, it is estimated that about 8 students plan to return to Morris after their full year away. Last year, about 50% of students suspended came back this fall semester. The Student Scholastic Standing Committee reviews the readmission applications for students who have been suspended. Readmission is not automatic, ultimately students must go through two committees to be readmitted.

Is a credit restriction added to students who have been suspended? Students who are readmitted after suspension are required to have a contract with conditions they must meet. Some of those conditions include: credit limits, GPA minimums, contact with different departments/campus resources, and limits on incompletes, withdrawals, and D and F grades.

## **5. IC Petitions**

There are a number of students needing to repeat an Intellectual Community (IC) course because they were unsuccessful on their first attempt. A major goal of IC courses is to have students actively engaging in discussion with their cohort. If they take the course after their first year they will not be engaging with their peers and fail to meet the spirit of the requirement. When IC was implemented, courses were offered in the fall and spring semester. If students failed in the fall they could take a different course in the spring. Then the Dean's Office decided to discontinue spring semester IC courses due to lack of resources. When students were allowed to retake an IC course the following year, instructors started having difficulty teaching the course. The dynamic in the room made it difficult to engage in discussion because the new students were eager about the new experience and the students repeating the course were unhappy to be there. Students are no longer allowed to register themselves for an IC course after their first year. Students must petition to complete the IC course.

The petition process has varied quite a bit. The initial petition process instructed students to meet with their adviser and find a course that might be a good fit to petition for waiving the IC requirement. Students then met with the Coordinator of Advising to discuss the petition process which took place after the student had completed the course. The Coordinator of Advising informed the instructor that a student would be using their course to petition to waive the IC requirement and they would be provided with a questionnaire at the end of the semester to report on the student's participation. After the student had completed the course they could then submit their petition to the Scholastic Committee. This process has proved difficult for students to understand and many on the Scholastic Committee did not agree with the process.

In order to help students there have been some variations of this process. A couple years ago, the Dean's Office decided to allow one seat in each IC course to be used for students who needed to repeat an IC course. The Coordinator of Advising tracks which sections repeaters are enrolled in to avoid putting more than one repeater in a section and changing the course dynamic. Again, this process is not ideal and requires extra work.

The SC procedure requires students to look for courses that could potentially meet the spirit of the IC requirement and discuss the course with faculty. The student is encouraged to submit the petition with the proposed course before registering so the committee has time to review the petition and make a decision. Members noted they do not like seeing petitions midway through a student's senior year because it feels like the committee is forced to approve the decision to avoid preventing the student from graduating.

Goodnough and Meek shared an idea for updating the SC IC petition process that would simplify the form and the process and would be reviewed by a SC delegate.

How many students are needing to repeat their IC course? There are between 6 - 9 students who need to petition to repeat their IC course. Some students discontinue their enrollment at Morris. If some students were not placed in the IC spots allowed by the Dean the number needing to petition would go up. Some students transfer to the Twin Cities, where they don't require an IC course.

Boever would like to know how the committee would like her to proceed with IC petitions. Students should have the same process when needing to repeat an IC course, but that is currently not what's happening.

A member noted that it was ridiculous to have a student research courses, take the course, and then petition to use the course afterwards. The student who needs to retake the course is probably in no position to make a decision on which courses would potentially satisfy the spirit of the IC requirement. Then there's the possibility of the petition not being approved and the student would have to take another course.

It was noted that a comprehensive review of general education requirements was to take place in the near future. There is a possibility that the IC requirement might be discontinued or at the very least changed.

Is it possible to have a predetermined list of courses that would meet the spirit of the requirement? The committee has discussed the idea, but it was noted that many faculty would not like having their courses considered first-year material. Also, Scholastic Committee petitions are not precedent setting. Students who petition to repeat an IC course are provided with samples of previous petitions to review the details of what makes a course a good candidate to satisfy the spirit of the requirement. Students are encouraged to find courses that are appealing to them.

The committee discussed using a third global village course to satisfy the requirement. The previous IC-like requirement, First-Year Seminar (FYS) had a theme of human diversity. Faculty would propose classes that would satisfy the human diversity theme. Guyotte offered a FYS course. After eight years, the FYS program was discontinued.

The committee agreed there needs to be a solution on the process for the next petition. The options are:

- The current process which is not efficient;
- The delegated process which has less obstacles for the student, but needs to have the criteria refined;
- The global village option which is more streamlined, but might be problematic for students who have already completed 3 out of the 4 global village categories. The option may also be advantages to some students over others depending on their major.

Guyotte called for volunteers to put together a proposal on IC petitions. Brenda Boever, Leslie Meek, and Parker Smith volunteered to work on a proposal.

**6. Multi-I Update - tabled**

Respectfully submitted,

Angie Senger  
Office of the Registrar