

Minutes*

Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, November 11, 1997
1:00 - 3:00
Room 238 Morrill Hall

Present: Laura Koch (chair), Avram Bar-Cohen, Elayne Donahue, Darwin Hendel, Gordon Hirsch, Robert Leik, Judith Martin, Kathleen Newell, Kevin Nicholson, Tina Rovick, Craig Swan, William Van Essendelft, Gayle Graham Yates

egrets: Thomas Johnson, Jessie Jo Roos

Absent: Palmer Rogers

Guests: V. J. Agarwal (ACE Fellow)

[In these minutes: Graduate/professional education award; grading policy; review of educational policies]

1. Award for Graduate and Professional Education

Professor Koch convened the meeting at 1:10, introduced Professor V. J. Agarwal from Moorhead State University, an ACE Fellow working with the University, and then turned to Professor Yates to for a brief discussion of the graduate and professional teaching award.

Professor Yates reported that her subcommittee had met and worked through several details to implement the policy, had written to Executive Vice President Bruininks about them, and needed the approval of SCEP to move forward. The subcommittee reached several conclusions:

- It did not wish the award to move forward if there were no funding available, but urged strongly that funding be identified so that the award would parallel the Morse-Alumni award
- Nominees had to be regular faculty, at least 2/3 time appointment, and salaried through the University
- There would be no self-nominations; the colleges would nominate, as is the case with the Morse-Alumni award
- The proposed name for the award is the Mulford Q. Sibley award (with allowance for a hyphenated name, as is the case with the Morse-Alumni award).

Following discussion with the Committee, several conclusions were reached.

*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.

- The award is to include faculty in the Medical School (and health sciences generally).
- The percentage of time requirement will be eliminated.
- It may be necessary to delay the deadline for nominations, inasmuch as the process is not fully developed yet.

2. Grades

The Committee continued discussion of the problem of the "I" for graduate and professional students typically remaining an "I" until action is taken to change it, which runs contrary to the provisions of the new grading policy, which require an "I" to convert to an "F" or an "N" after one quarter.

Committee members accepted the proposition that it is inappropriate to impose an arbitrary time limit on grading practices at the graduate and professional level. They also noted that few faculty make use of the "K" grade, to be given for work that continues beyond one quarter.

The Committee voted unanimously to recommend to the Senate that the policy be changed so that the "I" for any student enrolled in a post-baccalaureate program would not change until the instructor or department submits a grade. It was also agreed that Professor Koch would meet with the Registrar to explore more fully how the "K" grade might be better used.

3. Twin Cities Curriculum Committee

The Committee returned once again to the question of whether to try to make the curriculum oversight committee for the Twin Cities campus an Assembly committee, rather than a subcommittee of SCEP. Committee members debated the merits of having a subcommittee (more flexible?) or an Assembly committee (more authority?); it was suggested that any such body should be supported by the undergraduate deans.

The Committee reached no conclusions; Professor Koch asked Committee members to look over the two proposals (one for the subcommittee, one for an Assembly committee) and to be prepared to discuss the matter at an upcoming meeting.

4. Policies

Professor Koch drew the attention of Committee members to the multi-page list of Twin Cities campus policies that required review and, in some cases, future Senate or Assembly action. The Committee began to march through the policies, taking up points of interest or concern as it went along.

The policies covered by the discussion included:

- enrollment targets for new high school and new advanced standing students (no change recommended)
- admissions standards for new high school and new advanced standing students (no substantive

- change recommended)
- conditional admits (accepted recommended change for differentiating conditions necessary for matriculation and for graduation)
 - readmission policy, which is related to requirements for following old or new program rules for readmitted students and to leaves of absence granted to students (the Committee deliberated this at length, debating whether readmission should be routine or not, whether it would affect retention and graduation rates, whether the University had legal obligations with respect to students being permitted to complete a program once begun, whether there should be a period after which the University would not longer have to honor previous program rules; no conclusions were reached, although there was some sentiment for leaving the decision up to each program, so long as there is adequate notification to students about how long program rules will be honored, with adequate notice that exceptions can be granted, and subject to conversation with the General Counsel's office)
 - whether transfer credits carrying the "D" grade should not be counted, and whether, once accepted by any college, all colleges must honor transfer credits (the Committee accepted the recommendation to accept no courses with less than a "C" grade, and that the policy clearly stipulate that a "C-" grade would NOT be acceptable, because a "C-" grade is not equivalent to an "S" on the University grading scale; this policy would not affect the authority of individual programs to determine which credits would be acceptable for their degree program)

Professor Koch said the policy review would continue at the next meeting, a week hence. She adjourned the meeting at 3:00.

-- Gary Engstrand

University of Minnesota