

11-1-2016

Scholastic minutes 11/01/2016

Scholastic Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Scholastic Committee, "Scholastic minutes 11/01/2016" (2016). *Scholastic Committee*. 155.
http://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/schol_com/155

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
2016-17 Academic Year
November 1, 2016
Meeting Eight Minutes**

Present: Roland Guyotte (chair), Judy Korn, Brenda Boever, Dan Magner, Joe Beaver, Colin Wray, Jennifer Goodnough, Emma Kloos, Steve Gross, Michelle Brownlee, Ruby DeBellis, Elsie Wilson, Ray Schultz, and Leslie Meek

Absent: Merc Chasman

1. Approve minutes of October 25, 2016, meeting

Approved

2. Chair's Report

No report

3. SCEP Report

Jennifer Goodnough shared the proposed language (Addendum One) for changes to the Makeup Work Policy in regards to Student Senate Committee meeting excuses. The proposed language is as follows: "participation in formal University governance structures, including the Student Senate and Board of Regents meetings, by those students who have been selected as representatives to those bodies;"

Goodnough asked the SCEP committee, "Do we need to add a 'formal University governance structures' official definition? Perhaps that includes meetings for which the time is fixed? It seems in the FAQ we do this a bit but is it enough? At UMM we have Campus Assembly which the students don't control the time of the meeting but it's not in the FAQ so perhaps its inclusion or exclusion could be argued."

It was noted that at Morris students with a weekly class conflict with committees would select to be on another committee. Faculty who teach also have the same problem of not being able to participate in certain committees due to class time conflicts.

Should "formal University governance structures" be meetings set out of the control of the committee members or should it only be the two listed? Should Campus Assembly be included?

If students are given excused absences for Campus Assembly, they could be getting different treatment than all other constituents such as faculty and staff who cannot attend because they are either teaching or attending to the office.

Members agreed the wording of the "formal University governance structures" was not a huge problem, but would like Goodnough to voice the committee's concern and request that "formal University governance structures" should be defined.

The proposed language for the request of verification for absences included the following: "..., with the exception of single episode medical absences that do not require medical services."

Goodnough commented to the SCEP committee, "Our Scholastic Committee meets Tuesday afternoon but the initial response is that we see this as much improved language. However we remain very concerned about not all absences being equal: finals, midterms, labs. There really isn't a policy police and the students worry that faculty won't allow make-ups without verification

in those circumstances putting them in the tough position of appealing or they'd have to go to Health Services for colds or stomach bugs or migraines for that instructor since this new language wouldn't allow for the phone-in system that is working well here. At UMM that faculty member may be their advisor or someone they will have to take more classes from.”

“I'm wondering if we could tweak #10 to add verifications -- then UMM could take up the issue on our own and find language which works for us.”

“Also note this new language may put pressure on faculty to take/track attendance and many don't.”

Members discussed how the language could be changed to afford more clarity on which absences would be allowed.

Members unanimously supported Goodnough's recommendation to add verifications to #10 and have a scheduled moment to discuss the language that would work for Morris.

4. Admissions presentation by Jennifer Herrmann

Jennifer Herrmann presented data and provided some clarification of the Admissions process for new high school students (NHS). She provided a review of the baseline of the number of NHS graduates and the challenges Morris faces in recruiting these students. For example, Morris not only has to compete with other Minnesota colleges and universities, but the declining number of NHS graduates has led schools from the east coast to also begin recruiting in the Midwest.

Herrmann also presented data on Morris' application numbers and a review on the breakdown by race and ethnicity as well as gender. Admissions begin recruiting students as sophomores and the counselors focus on maintaining relationships with students as seniors. Most students respond or apply via mobile device. Admissions targets students who have reached out or responded in some way to better focus their efforts and funds.

Admissions is focused on keeping the application process straightforward to maintain a higher yield rate. They have noticed a steady increase in applications submitted via mobile device. There was a significant spike in applications from 2014 to 2015, but low completion rates which could be due to not receiving enough offers of Admissions. A November 1 deadline has been added to help move things up earlier especially now that students and parents can submit their FAFSA applications earlier. However, Admissions has the added challenge of processing more applications with the same number of staff.

Herrmann reviewed breakdown of students of color NHS enrollees. The percentage of students are tied to class size and make up a growing percentage of our students. The application pool is diversifying.

The gender breakdown has been pretty steady and reflects the national trend composition of sixty percent female students compared to forty percent male students. Students have the option to self-identify gender on the Admissions application which offers more than two choices, however the PeopleSoft software does not support more than two gender options. This is the first year Admissions can capture and use a student's preferred name for letters.

The N/A column of the High School Rank enrollees includes high schools without a ranking system and schools where the ranking system does not necessarily apply (eg. #2 of 2 students). It was noted that Morris does not superscore.

A look at the ACT scores and their breakdown show an equal distribution of scores. Recruiting more students in the 28-30 ACT score range could bring up the ACT scoreband.

The waitlist is not an actual waitlist. A student who has been waitlisted is simply one who is not admissible at the moment. Being on the waitlist usually means there has been a request for additional information. Students on the waitlist are reconsidered after fall high school grades are available. A challenge Morris faces is that in some cases Morris will admit students who have been waitlisted and begin moving forward when the Twin Cities opens up their waitlist and begins admitting students who have enrolled at Morris.

Herrmann provided a review of the Extra Advising (EADV) flag which replaced the Conditional Admit flag used by Admissions. The conditional admit flag was used for students who needed conditions to ensure their success at Morris. The change from conditional admit to extra advising happened because the conditional admit was perceived more as a scarlet letter than a protection. The intent of the EADV flag is to make sure students receive extra care. Admissions could move away from using the flag with the new success coaching model.

However, success coaching is mainly for NHS students, the committee would also like to look at what could be done to support transfer students. Many transfer students would also benefit from a success coach.

The SC committee shared their concern about how the EADV flag was shared and passed forward. Currently the EADV flag is only a recruiting category in PeopleSoft and is only visible to Admissions staff as it is not a student group. Herrmann noted that it may not be an issue as there is a strong connection between Admissions and Advising. The flag is only to ensure a continuity of care. The flag was used in Pharos and it could move into APlus, but in some cases the reason behind the flag should not be shared with all (eg. a parent's passing). The reasons behind an EADV flag have a broad range. Many are purely academic in nature which can be addressed with advising and success coaching. The reason for not making the EADV flag a student group is because without context for the flag it would be difficult to provide the proper care. Another reason for not making the EADV flag a student group is because Admissions doesn't want it to become a self-fulfilling prophecy or don't want the students to be written off.

Herrmann agreed there should be a conversation about make the EADV flag a student group and discussing the additional/supporting information that should be included. The discussion should address whether the flag is helpful or hurtful.

New Twin Cities enrollment goals include recruiting more students from rural Minnesota in STEM fields. The system campuses voiced their concern about the impact this would have on their enrollment.

The University of Minnesota system recruiting includes the Share My App program where students apply to the Twin Cities in October and their application is shared with the system campuses for no additional fee. However, it's questioned whether there is a reasonable timeframe to recruit these students. There are about 5-10 later international applications shared after December 15.

With Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MNSCU) tightening up their transfers it is becoming more difficult to recruit transfer students. MNSCU institutions were mandated by legislature to create transfer pathways among the schools which guarantee admissions and guarantee the students can complete their degree in four years. The Minnesota Transfer Curriculum remains Morris' transfer pathway with other MNSCU institutions.

The SC was asked to continue its advocacy when changes to general education requirements can impact admissions and enrollment. The committee was also asked to continue review of A-Level exams to provide Admissions with more options for transfer credit.

Respectfully submitted,

Angie Senger,
Office of the Registrar