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Present: Leslie Meek, Merc Chasman, Megan Jacobson, Chad Braegelmann, Steve Gross, Hilda Ladner, Judy Korn, Brenda Boever, Marcy Prince, Jennifer Rothchild, Jess Larson Guest: Dean Bart Finzel

Absent: Roland Guyotte, Laddie Arnold, Tisha Turk, Yee Thao

1. Agenda review Jess Larson, vice-chair, conducted the meeting.

2. November 18, 2014, minutes Approved

3. Chair’s Report No chair’s report

4. SCEP Report No report.

5. New Advising Model
   Brenda Boever presented a PowerPoint presentation on the new, proposed advising model (See Addendum One). A few concerns arose during the presentation. Steve Gross worried that faculty would see this new proposal as a disincentive to teach first-year courses due to the added workload. Dean Bart Finzel assured him that the workload would be spread out throughout the faculty; and the instructor’s discipline would be taken into consideration when assigning new advisees. Jennifer Rothchild asked if there would be resources to assist advisers advising outside of their majors. Boever replied that Advising was coming up with an online resource that would be found on the Advising website.

   Regarding the change to not allow students to declare a major until the end of the first term, Jess Larson questioned how this would affect biology students given that biology requires a four-year commitment. Boever replied that students would still be guided down the biology path, but majors would not be recorded until the end of the first term. With this new change, Larson pointed out that new high school students (NHS) would have a chance to explore what their major should be. NHS could also use this as an opportunity to shed the pressures placed on them by friends and family and think about where their own interests lie. Finzel concluded the presentation by stating that it was a good proposal intended to ensure continuous contact between the student and their advisers.

6. Multi-institutional enrollment continued discussion
   Korn reviewed the Multi-institutional policy statement in question and asked for the committee’s thoughts regarding what Multi-institutional means. Gross questioned how many students were participating in multi-institutional enrollment and whether allowing them more than one semester was a serious issue. Senger shared fall 2014 semester approximate numbers: 20-30 students. Korn then provided financial aid implications regarding multi-institutional enrollment as shared by the Office of Financial Aid. The Morris campus could lose up to a full semester’s tuition because a student’s financial aid package follows them wherever he/she studies. This could include a loss of institutional scholarship dollars. Korn proposed strictly enforcing the fall or spring semester enrollment per academic year, but taking a “student friendly” approach to petitions. For example, approving petitions for students who need a second Multi I semester to complete a course not available at Morris. A debate about how a Multi I semester should be counted followed. Boever considered a policy change from one academic semester to 20 credits. Chad Braegelmann voiced his preference for 20 credits. Gross proposed looking at a percentage of credits completed at another campus instead of a credit count.

   With no conclusion to the discussion, the policy will remain as is. Students will petition for a second semester of multi-institutional enrollment for one or all classes. Korn was tasked with:
   - looking into how Superior (WI) and Crookston approach multi-institutional enrollment;
• finding out if an institutional limit of credits can be placed; and
• creating a list of legitimate uses of multi-institutional enrollment.

Respectfully submitted,

Angie Senger
Office of the Registrar