

Minutes\*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy**  
**Wednesday, January 10, 1996**  
**1:15 - 3:00**  
**Room 626 Campus Club**

- Present: Laura Koch (chair), Anita Cholewa, Elayne Donahue, Megan Gunnar, Robert Johnson, Judith Martin, Glenn Merkel, Mark Schuller, William Van Essendelft
- Regrets: Gayle Graham Yates, Thomas Johnson, Jeffrey Larsen
- Absent: Avram Bar-Cohen, Paul Cleary, Darwin Hendel, Ryan Nilsen, Helen Phin, W. Phillips Shively
- Guests: Elizabeth Grundner (Office of the Registrar)
- Others: none

[In these minutes: Grading policy revisions; semester conversion standards]

Professor Koch convened the meeting at 1:00 and drew the attention of Committee members to the grading policy. A number of comments had been received since the previous meeting that warranted attention. The Committee agreed to the following changes:

- The name should be changed from "honor point system" to grading policy.
- The provision on release of transcripts must allow for whatever state and federal law provide, and provision of copies to students are contingent on them not having a "transcript hold" on their records.
- Individual instructors should not be permitted to deviate from the grading system.
- The definitions of each of the grades apply to undergraduates, but the grade points will be the same for everyone; language should be added indicating there is widespread understanding that the meaning of grades is different at the graduate level.
- The work to complete an I must be submitted within 72 hours of the last final examination of the student's next period of enrollment, and if not, the grade will convert to an F or N the sixth week of the following term. Instructors must turn in a grade for the work completed within four weeks of receiving it.
- An I that has lapsed to an F or an N may later be changed to a grade, upon petition to the college

---

\*These minutes reflect discussion and debate at a meeting of a committee of the University of Minnesota Senate or Twin Cities Campus Assembly; none of the comments, conclusions, or actions reported in these minutes reflect the views of, nor are they binding on, the Senate or Assembly, the Administration, or the Board of Regents.

scholastic committee.

- The option of having campus-wide policies, rather than a system-wide policy, should be offered, but no variation below the level of the campus should be permitted.

The Committee discussed for a considerable period the extent to which there should be discretion in using pluses and minuses--discretion by college, by unit, and by faculty member. There appeared to be a general consensus that discretion should NOT be permitted, but also a sense that the Senate should be asked if the policy should be system-wide or campus-wide. It was agreed that if the motion calling for a system-wide policy did not receive adequate support, the grading policy should be written so that there is campus autonomy but no discretion within campuses.

If each campus decides to have a different system, the computer expenses will likely be greater; the question will arise, with Responsibility Center Management, who pays?

On the semester conversion standards, the Committee spoke with Ms. Grundner about the possible length of the final examination period, a question raised by the Senate Consultative Committee. Ms. Grundner presented a hypothetical final exam schedule of five days, and she noted that at at least one Big Ten institution there is an exam period of two days followed by another study day.

Another question raised was whether or not final examinations should be three hours rather than two; Ms. Grundner agreed to find out what the practice is at peer institutions. At least one Committee member expressed distaste for three-hour exams. There is nowhere written, however, that exams must be two hours; that is simply the way things have been. Ms. Grundner reported that frequently there are three-hour exams for five-credit courses. It was suggested that the Committee suggest for discussion that as matter of policy, exams will normally be two hours long.

The Committee also considered the impact on revenue and on tuition paid by students if tuition banding is or is not counted across the spring semester and a May interim. To include it could increase costs with no corresponding increase in revenues; not to include it might discourage students from enrolling in the interim, which would defeat the purpose of offering it. It was agreed there are financial implications that should be considered, and Professor Koch was asked to inquire of the Finance and Planning Committee if it would take up the issue.

Professor Koch then adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota