

Minutes*

**Senate Committee on Educational Policy
Wednesday, September 24, 2008
2:00 – 4:00
238A Morrill Hall**

Present: Cathrine Wambach (chair), (George Green for) Gail Dubrow, April Knutson, James Leger, Kristen Nelson, Richard McCormick, Robert McMaster, Peh Ng, Jane Phillips, Emily Ronning, Paul Siliciano, Donna Spannaus-Martin, Molly Tolzmann, Michael Wade, Joel Weinsheimer

Absent: LeAnn Alstadt, Norman Chervany, David Zeller

Guests: Richard Howard, Daniel Jones-White, John Kellogg, Andrea Shaw (Institutional Research), Susan Van Voorhis, Tina Falkner (Office for Academic Support Resources); Karen Zentner Bacig, Jeremy Hernandez (Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty and Academic Affairs)

Other: none

[In these minutes: (1) credits, degrees, and majors; (2) use of new student-rating data for teaching awards; (3) review of educational policies (use of class notes and course materials, campus-specific credit requirements for degrees, classroom expectations)]

1. Credits, Degrees, and Majors

Professor Wambach convened the meeting at 2:00 and welcomed Dr. Howard, Mr. Jones-White, Mr. Kellogg, and Mr. Shaw to join with Ms. Van Voorhis in providing a report the Committee has long been awaiting on credits, degrees, and majors. One question is whether some programs take longer than others to complete.

Ms. Van Voorhis began by commenting that the information they have for the Committee may generate more questions than they have answers and they may need to gather more data for the Committee. She turned to Dr. Howard, whose office, she explained, had spent the summer gathering the data they had to present.

Dr. Howard introduced members of the Institutional Research staff, Mr. Jones-White and Ms. Shaw, and said that along with them he, Ms. Van Voorhis, and Mr. Kellogg met a number of times to discuss the data requested by the Committee. Messrs. Jones-White and Kellogg and Ms. Shaw are the ones who did the work in producing the data. He cautioned that a lot of time had been spent developing these graduation rates, and they want to be sure that they have data comparable with that from other AAU schools that participate in the AAU Data Exchange.

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

Mr. Kellogg distributed copies of data tables containing information on time to degree, by college, for cohorts of new entering freshmen for five degree-years beginning in 2003. He said they were not presenting the data by major partially because of small numbers in the cells. Over the course of the five years covered, Mr. Kellogg said that in general students took an increasing number of credits but graduated faster. The number of credits students graduated with across all colleges (Twin Cities) increased from 134.4 in 2002-2003 to 136.7 in 2006-2007. The average number of credits students took to obtain a degree varied by college. For the undergraduate-admitting, baccalaureate-degree-granting colleges, the data were as follows for 2007 (including colleges that have since been merged).

CBS	140.8
CDes	138.7
CFANS	135.4
CHE	132.8 (now part of CDes and CFANS)
CLA	134.2
CNR	146.5 (n = 9 majors; now part of CFANS)
CSOM	141.8
CEHD	133.8
IT	149.6

The University requires a student to take a minimum of 120 credits to obtain a baccalaureate degree.

The new entering freshmen are also coming with more credits (PSEO, CLEP, AP) but are still considered freshmen. If they come in with 30 credits, that does not mean they take 30 fewer credits at the University; on average, they take about 15 fewer than students who come with no credits already in hand. Mr. Kellogg said it is possible for students to come in as freshmen with 60 credits earned before they graduated from high school; because the credits were earned before high-school graduation, they are still considered new entering freshmen. The numbers of students in the College in the Schools program has been skyrocketing, Mr. Kellogg reported, but students with those credits are also still reported as freshmen.

Mr. Kellogg explained that there are two different ways to measure "time to degree." One is a straightforward calendar calculation: if one entered the University on September X, 2002, and graduated on May Y, 2006, the program will count the number of days from start to end and divide by 365.25, yielding a "time to degree." Someone who entered in the fall, enrolled for four academic years, and graduated in the spring, would have taken 3.69 years. They created another calculation, one that conforms to a common understanding of an academic year that considers the 3.69 years to be 4 years, and uses an algorithm to calculate time to degree for students who take more than the "standard" 4 years. Each additional fall plus spring would count as an additional year, with summer an additional 1.25 years. Mr. Kellogg reported that he had removed students who took more than 8 years to graduate because they skew the average up significantly. (Asked later during the meeting, he said this is not a standard approach to calculating time to degree; they just reviewed the data and realized that including those students would unreasonably skew the results.) The time to degree using the second version, the one that represents common understanding, across all colleges was 4.6 years in 2003 and 4.4 years in 2007. The time-to-degree numbers for the colleges varied, as follows (2007).

CBS	4.4 years
-----	-----------

CDes	4.6
CFANS	4.5
CHE	5.2
CLA	4.4
CNR	5.7 (n = 9)
CSOM	4.2
CEHD	4.4
IT	4.5

The same general patterns hold for transfer students, Mr. Kellogg said—they are graduating faster but with slightly more credits than in the past.

Professor Wambach said she had hoped the Committee would see the data for majors because that is where the Committee's interest lies. She has looked at some of those data, she said, and there is a wide variation between majors. She thought the Committee would find the data revealing; there are 160 majors, some very small, and in some students take a long time to graduate. Ms. Van Voorhis said that in some majors, the number of credits at graduation is very close to the program requirements. The program may require 150 credits, and students in the field are very close to that number, so they are being efficient—it is the program that is requiring a large number of credits.

Professor McCormick asked how they accounted for double majors. Mr. Kellogg said he used the primary major; Ms. Van Voorhis said students designate a primary major.

Dean Green asked if it would be possible to obtain the number of credits required by major for a degree. Some require a large number, Professor Wambach observed. This is a serious issue, she said, because not only does the University strive to see a 4-year graduation rate, students lose eligibility for some types of financial aid after their fourth year. If a program requires more than 4 years, students need to borrow money to continue, so there are severe consequences for them. It is time to look at program requirements to see if there is good reason for requiring a 5th year and whether students need aid for that year. For that purpose, Dean Green said, the Committee only needs to see the credit requirements, not the time students take to graduate. Some programs need more than 120 credits; these data do not address that question.

In some programs, it is POSSIBLE to complete a degree in four years, Mr. Kellogg said, but if a student misses one course, he or she will end up taking more time. That is an issue, Ms. Van Voorhis said; some programs are not honest about the number of credits required. Most say a student can graduate with 120 credits, but when one looks at the program requirements, they could total up to 150 or more, and one can inquire whether it is possible to graduate in four years even with double-dipping to meet liberal education requirements. She said she tried in a few cases to do a graduation plan and could not figure out a way to graduate in four years, much less meet the requirements to apply, for example, to a professional school. (Figuring this out, she said, is a very labor-intensive process, because one must lay out every course to figure out a graduation plan.) So that requires a first-term freshman to make perfect choices, Dean Green observed. And they may need to take 18 credits from the beginning, Ms. Van Voorhis added. One of the Big Ten schools does a very good job of laying this all out for students.

Some students may be taking longer to graduate because they switch majors. These data do not account for students who switch majors, Mr. Kellogg pointed out; he could break out those data. Some students bounce around among majors while others stick with the one they chose first. Some majors are very rigid, Ms. Van Voorhis said, so that if a student transfers in for spring semester, the student will need to take an extra term to graduate. Some majors want students to complete their liberal education requirements first while others want them spread over all four years; if a student transfers from the latter to the former, he or she will be behind.

Professor Siliciano asked if they could tell, even with a good plan, if students are delayed because they cannot get into a course they need. They cannot, Ms. Van Voorhis said. Vice Provost McMaster commented that no one has cashed in the guaranteed four-year-degree plan the University offers, so it appears unlikely that is a major problem. Dr. Knutson said that there are waiting lists for language classes and she is not sure that all students get in. Some students are on several lists, Ms. Van Voorhis said, and may get into one if not another. She also said they hope that as students use the grad planner, her office will be able to compare what students plan for versus what they take.

Professor Leger said that in his college (IT), some students do not take a full load (IT requires 16 credits to graduate in four years) because they are working 20 hours per week. Have they calculated average credit load per student, he asked? They can, Mr. Kellogg said. IT has done all it can to convince students to be full time, not always successfully. There may be more of a push to be full time in IT because of the greater number of courses in sequence, compared to more unstructured majors, Dean Green suggested. Professor Leger agreed, and there are more in the smaller majors in IT. There is one engineering program that requires 166 credits, Ms. Van Voorhis reported, which can be reduced some by double-dipping.

Professor Weinsheimer said he was sympathetic with students who must work, especially the quantity of hours they work—which is a lot more than most of the faculty in this room did when they were students, he surmised. The University must teach to the clientele it has, however, and it cannot tell students they cannot work. Ms. Phillips said she recalled the data about students working and Minnesota was not different from its peer institutions. Dr. McMaster said a recent study by the Boynton Health Service demonstrated that the number of hours students work per week does not affect graduation; he said he does not believe the data. Professor Leger recalled seeing data suggesting that students who worked up to 10 hours per week had a higher graduation rate than those who worked no hours, but that working more than 10 hours had a negative effect on graduation.

Professor Wambach asked if the college data provided to the Committee looked like the data from other institutions. Mr. Kellogg said they looked very similar. Then how does he explain the lower graduation rate at Minnesota compared to its peers, Professor Wambach next asked? That is the big question, Mr. Kellogg said. At the lower end of academic performance measures, it is likely the characteristics of the entering freshmen, he said, but he did not know why Minnesota has fewer students graduating within six years.

Dr. Howard said that if one looks at the data on students who transfer out and graduate elsewhere, the University's graduation rate would increase by about 3%--but that is similar to what would happen at other schools, Mr. Kellogg added.

The question is what implications these data have for policy, Professor Wambach said. Current policy requires that any major that requires over 128 credits must receive approval. The Committee could ask the Provost to re-review programs that require a high number of credits. The Committee could also publicize the data and let faculty see them, because often faculty do not know the number and do not know students take a long time. The best information they have had came from the study of student-athletes, Dr. McMaster said, where they found many had a lot of credits but still had not graduated. That study suggested interesting trends in credits but that it may be hard to graduate. They need to study the issue, not just look at data, he said, because it could be that students were badly advised or that they bounced around majors, or some may have the credits they need but simply haven't graduated.

Professor Wambach said the data show time to graduation; departments could ask if they are requiring the right number of credits and if it takes too long for their students. Dean Green suggested the Committee and departments need data on the non-graduates. It may also be, Professor Wambach said, that some students leave because there are so many requirements and they run out of money. Dean Green said that in graduate education they distinguish between early and late attrition. If a student leaves when still early in the program, that is acceptable; if late, it is not, because there has been a lot of investment by the student and the institution. The University might want to look at early versus late attrition among undergraduates as well. It would be a bigger problem if many of those who do not graduate are already in their major field.

Dean Green also said that he changed majors as an undergraduate and it took him five years to graduate. The University should not say it is bad to take longer because a student changes a major—that is part of college. The University wants to make the process for changing majors smooth, but students should not be blamed for changing majors. Ms. Van Voorhis agreed but said a student should not be required to take an extra term because he or she changed majors after one term at the University.

Vice Provost McMaster said he did not agree with Dean Green and that the University must push students to graduate in four years or they could leave with an additional \$20,000 in debt, which they will have to pay for years. One can change majors and take four and one-half years, but not five. Dean Green said he did not believe students must finish with the major they started in, but the University should work on processes so they can graduate in four years. Professor Weinsheimer said the University must be sure that if the catalogue says a student can graduate with 128 credits, students understand that is under ideal conditions and that the average might 147. Students should know that up front; an informed choice is central.

Dr. Howard commented, apropos transfer students and changes in major, that there are different consequences depending on what one transfers to or from—and a lot revolves around math. If students come from a liberal-arts curriculum into a technical field, they must understand they will be behind after the first semester. So does that mean the University should have a policy prohibiting students from transferring into a field because it will increase his or her time to degree, Dean Green inquired? Vice Provost McMaster said not. He reported that his office is working on a center for students in transition to help them sort through transfer and requirements if they change majors.

In addition to wanting to change majors, Dr. Knutson said, there are students in technical fields who may want to study language or literature; she has seen a number of such students and said

she would hate to see them so programmed they must follow a narrow course of study. There should be encouragement for students to take courses on the side outside their field.

Mr. Jones-White next distributed a set of graphs (using survival rates calculations) to plot the time to degree for students in Twin Cities colleges and overall for the campus. Most colleges have improved their time to degree statistics, he noted.

This has been an overview at a high level, Ms. Van Voorhis said; she can later provide the numbers by major and the Committee can discuss them. Dean Green suggested providing the numbers in advance of the meeting so people could reflect on them. Professor Wambach said she has seen the data and it appears that majors with many students have a lower time to graduation than majors with smaller numbers; it might be appropriate for the Committee to start with majors that serve large numbers of students and then look at those that serve smaller numbers. Mr. Kellogg said he can sort the data in a number of ways, including by number of students in the major, and it may be that large departments have figured out a way to get students through in four years.

Professor Siliciano asked what the student members of the Committee thought about changing majors and major requirements. Ms. Tolzmann said it can be difficult to figure them out because one doesn't know what will count for the major, how liberal education requirements figure in, and what the overlap might be. Professor McCormick noted that most CLA majors require 30-36 credits; other colleges may be different. The grad planner should help, Professor Wambach responded, and agreed with Professor Weinsheimer's point that students must be told. Professor Weinsheimer said it sounds like it would be easy to provide accurate information to students about the average number of credits it takes to complete the degree. The University should not hide this information from the students—or from itself. The function of the grad planner, Dr. Falkner said, is to add transparency for students so they know what will take longer. Ms. Tolzmann said that use of the grad planner will probably increase (now about 18,000 out of 25,000 undergraduates, Dr. Falkner said) because at her point in college, she doesn't need it.

Professor Wambach asked Ms. Van Voorhis and Dr. Howard and their colleagues to return to the Committee with data about which they are confident. The goal is increased awareness of programs that require a large number of credits and to ensure there is appropriate oversight. Vice Provost McMaster inquired if she was thinking about any policy changes. Professor Wambach noted the policy requiring approval of any major over 128 credits; perhaps that policy needs to be reviewed.

Ms. Van Voorhis said that with the grad planner, colleges can show how to complete a degree in four years. It may be that there is more or less room to explore other fields and fulfill liberal education requirements. Professor Wambach made the point that the Committee is interested in the likelihood that students can finish in four years, not just that one student might be able to do so.

Professor Wambach thanked Ms. Van Voorhis, Dr. Howard, Mr. Kellogg, Dr. Falkner, Mr. Jones-White, and Mr. Shaw for joining the meeting and providing the information.

2. Award Committee Use of New Student-Rating Data

Professor Wambach turned next to Drs. Karen Zentner Bacig and Jeremy Hernandez to discuss the way they expect the Morse-Alumni and Graduate-Professional nominating committees to

use the data from the new student-rating forms. There has been a history with the prior form but now there is a new one, so there is need to think about how to use the data.

Dr. Bacig introduced Dr. Hernandez, the new coordinator of faculty awards in Vice Provost Carney's office. She recalled that when she worked with the two nominating committees, there was a feeling in the past that the teaching-award data came to them in different formats; as a result, they standardized the format for the last couple of years. Now there are new data to consider.

Dr. Hernandez distributed copies of two forms, one for tabulating student-rating data from 2003-2007 courses and a new one for courses beginning with 2008. He noted that the committees will have to use data from both forms for awhile; once five years have elapsed, all the data will be on the new form.

Professor Ng noted that the new form includes data from one of the student-release questions; why that one, she asked? ("I would recommend this instructor to other students." % yes) The committee chose it, Dr. Bacig said, because they thought it more useful than the other student-release questions. The student-release data go only to the instructor, Professor Wambach observed. Professor McCormick said that if someone is interested enough that they apply or are nominated, they will be required to release the data to the committee, which does not mean it would have to be released generally.

Professor Siliciano, who has served on the Morse-Alumni committee and who chairs it this year, joked that he's already getting a headache thinking about how to use the two different forms. It will be comparing apples to oranges and it will be a challenge to evaluate the results. Professor Wambach said it will also be interesting to see how those faculty who received positive reviews with the old form will fare with the new one. Dr. Bacig suggested that Dr. Hernandez could return to the Committee to discuss that question once they have finished the nominating process. The new form will not have much effect on the nominations this year, Dean Green observed, since it will provide data for only one semester of instruction.

Ms. Phillips recalled that there had been a concern about ratings from courses students are required to take versus the courses they choose to take. There are a lot of students in introductory courses who do not want to be there. Will the Morse-Alumni committee deal with that? Many candidates deal with the issue in their personal statement, Dr. Bacig said. Professor McCormick said that departments should provide norms for different kinds of courses. That information will still not get at the results from an unpopular course but it will allow comparisons with other departments and colleges.

Professor Wambach asked Mss. Ronning and Tolzmann how important the scores are in evaluating candidates for the award. Ms. Ronning said the selection depends on a lot of other factors as well. Ms. Tolzmann said the scores are considered less than the personal statement and nomination letters and only stick out if there is a big discrepancy between the scores and the other materials. They are not the deciding factor, Ms. Ronning added.

Dr. Bacig said, in response to a question from Dean Green about whether the data are helpful, that they are part of the information used. She asked if the Committee saw any problems with the new form. Once they go through the process this year, they can return in the spring to report any issues.

She also affirmed that exactly the same form is used for the Graduate-Professional award. Dean Green said that graduate and professional education is so different across fields that it will be interesting to know if the rating data are taken as seriously at that level as they are for the undergraduate awards.

Professor Wambach said she would consider the new form endorsed by the Committee. There was no disagreement.

3. Review of Educational Policies

The Committee returned to the review of the revised educational policies and took up "Appropriate Student Use of Class Notes and Course Materials: Twin Cities, Morris, and Rochester." The policy read as follows:

* * *

General Provisions

The faculty of the University of Minnesota encourages students to take and share notes in their classes, laboratories, and the many other instructional settings in which they participate as they pursue their education at the University. Taking notes is a means of recording information but more importantly of personally absorbing and integrating the educational experience. The faculty recognizes that collaborative note-sharing and discussion helps students learn.

However, the organization, preparation, and presentation of materials in a class or other instructional setting represent the intellectual effort of the instructor. Instructors have an interest in protecting this intellectual effort and in assuring the accuracy of any public representations of their course lectures and presentations. The classroom should also be a place where instructors feel free to share with students the full range of information available in their subject areas, including results of new research as it is produced, without concern that such new knowledge will be shared prematurely outside the University learning community. Broadly disseminating class notes beyond the classroom community or accepting compensation for taking and distributing classroom notes undermines instructor interests in their intellectual work product while not substantially furthering instructor and student interests in effective learning. Such actions violate shared norms and standards of the academic community.

Regulations

1. Students may not distribute, via the Internet or other means, instructor-provided lecture notes or other instructor-provided materials, except to other members of the same class or with the express consent of the instructor.
2. Instructors have the right to impose additional restrictions on course materials in accordance with copyright and intellectual property law and policy. See Board of Regents Policies: [Copyright](#) and [Commercialization of Intellectual Property Rights](#).
3. While students hold the copyright to their own notes from a course, students may not engage in the sale or widespread distribution of transcript-like notes or notes that are close to verbatim records of a lecture or class presentation.

4. The provisions of this policy are enforceable as University rules under the University of Minnesota Statement of Standards of Student Conduct.
5. If the faculty of a department or collegiate unit, as a group, or individual faculty in a particular course, have assented to or authorized the distribution of lecture notes or instructor-provided materials, such action does not violate this policy.

* * *

Professor Wambach reported that the subcommittee added language that the Committee had approved earlier and also redrafted some language in order to meet legal standards; the subcommittee had received advice from the Office of the General Counsel on wording. The subcommittee also recommends eliminating the threats that appeared in the earlier version (a student might be subject to sanctions, including expulsion) and simply noted that a student who violates the policy is subject to the provisions of the Regents Student Conduct Code.

Ms. Phillips asked about item 3 in the regulations. It seems somewhat vague, she said. Professor Wambach reported that the subcommittee discussed this language at some length and it was as close as they could get to making the situation clear while also staying within the confines of copyright law.

The Committee moved next to the policy "Campus-Specific Credits Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester," which read as follows:

* * *

POLICY STATEMENT

All credit awarded by the University, regardless of the campus or type of instruction, shall count toward the credit requirements for the degree (subject to the limitation on skills credits), but this policy establishes additional requirements for campus-specific coursework from the campus from which the student seeks to graduate.

A student's college or campus may, under extraordinary circumstances, waive the requirements in sections 2, 3, and 4, below, but not section 1.

1. To be eligible for a University of Minnesota undergraduate degree, a student must present at least 30 semester credits awarded by the University of Minnesota campus from which he or she is seeking to graduate
2. At least 15 credits of the last 30 credits earned prior to the awarding of a University degree, must be awarded by the University of Minnesota campus from which a student is seeking to graduate.
3. Students must complete at least half of upper-division major work (3XXX courses or higher) on the campus from which they are seeking to graduate.
4. For students who seek an academic minor, to be eligible for record of a minor on the University of Minnesota transcript, students must take at least three upper division credits in the minor field at the campus from which they will receive their degree.

Professor Wambach noted that President Bruininks had raised a question about item 2 and asked if it might serve as a barrier to graduation for some students. Professor McCormick said he remembered when that provision was added; the view of the Committee was that students should not be able to receive a University of Minnesota Twin Cities degree if he or she has not taken courses at the Twin Cities campus close to the time of graduation. Ms. Phillips reported that the College of Biological Sciences has a program that allows students to obtain a University degree even when they take their graduate program elsewhere and finish their CBS degree at the same time.

Professor Siliciano asked if a college could increase the requirements set out in the policy. Dr. Falkner said they probably could; the policy does not say they cannot, it says "at least." Nor does it say a college can require more credits, Dean Green pointed out. But the colleges do have the right to set requirements, Dr. Falkner said, and it was also noted that one of the other educational policies requires that at least half of the upper division credits in the major be awarded by the department from which the degree is being awarded. What if one studies abroad in the last year, Professor Nelson asked? Professor McCormick said that study-abroad credits are considered University of Minnesota credits; Dr. Falkner agreed and added that the same is true of exchange programs, but in both cases the programs must be operated through the University in order to count as University credits. Dean Green said that because the provisions 2, 3, and 4 may be waived, which means down, nothing bars a major or college from requiring more credits. Vice Provost McMaster observed that any change in degree requirements flow through his office, so would be reviewed. Professor McCormick speculated that a number of majors have more stringent requirements in place.

Next the Committee took up "Classroom Expectations: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester," which read as follows:

* * *

POLICY STATEMENT

I. Instructor Responsibilities

A. **Responsibility to maintain an appropriate learning environment.**

1. Instructors have a responsibility to establish and maintain a civil, productive, and stimulating learning environment. Both instructors and students have a fundamental obligation to respect the instructional setting as a place for civil, courteous behavior.
2. Instructors should take appropriate steps to have removed from class students who disrupt the educational process because of discourteous, threatening, harassing, or other aggressive behavior. "Appropriate steps" may include calling the University Police.

B. Responsibility to provide information about courses.

Instructors are responsible for providing accurate and timely information about their courses to prospective students, current students, and relevant members of the University community. The following statements reflect good practice in providing course information.

1. The course descriptions published in University catalogs and/or in the Course Guide must be consistent with the content of the actual course taught. Descriptions should make it clear that courses evolve, and content may vary somewhat with the individual instructor.
 2. All instructors are encouraged to provide timely course descriptions for appropriate printed materials and web sites.
 3. Instructors are responsible for clearly communicating the course objectives at the beginning of each course. Class activities should be directed toward the fulfillment of these objectives and student performance should be evaluated in relationship to these objectives. If an instructor changes the course requirements or materials, students should be given timely notice consistent with the magnitude of the change (e.g., a few days for an additional article to read; some weeks if a research paper is to be added). No major change should be imposed after the second week of the semester (e.g., adding a research paper or major examination). At the same time, instructors are not barred from adding material, or from announcing at the outset of the term that additional materials will be required as part of the course as the term progresses. {See Academic Policy: [Syllabus Requirements: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester](#)}
 4. Instructors are responsible for informing students in their classes of the methods to be used in determining course grades, i.e., evaluation criteria and the contribution to the final grade of each graded component. Academic Policy: [Grading and Transcripts: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester](#) provides that "In connection with all symbols of achievement instructors will define for a class, at one of its earliest meetings and as explicitly as possible, the performance that will be necessary to earn each."
 5. Instructors are responsible for informing students of any requirements related to course attendance and participation.
 6. Instructors are responsible for informing students of any special attendance requirements for each class taught. This includes, insofar as possible, specific dates, times, and places of additional outside-of-class work such as field trips, study sessions, or extra class meetings, and whether or not attendance at these additional activities will be reflected in the grade.
- C. Responsibility to provide students with access and feedback on their work.
1. Instructors are responsible for evaluating and returning examinations and other student work with sufficient promptness to enhance the learning experience.
 2. Instructors should specify a schedule for returning student work during the semester. (It is permissible for a faculty member not to return examinations, but students must then be permitted to review the exam in order to request clarification of a grade.)
 3. Term papers and comparable projects are the property of students who prepare them; instructors who desire to retain a copy for their own files should state their intention to do so. [See Board of Regents Policy: [Copyright](#)]

4. Instructors are strongly encouraged to provide sufficient graded feedback early in the term and before the deadline for withdrawing from classes to enable students to assess their progress in the course. Instructors are also required to turn in grades within three business days after the final examination scheduled for the course (whether or not there is actually a final examination given).

5. Instructors are responsible for providing mid-term alerts, in accord with the provision of Academic Policy: [*Providing Mid-Term Alerts on Academic Performance: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester.*](#)

D. Responsibility for secure handling of examinations.

Instructors are responsible for maintaining security of student examinations both before and after exams are given. For those using the [Office of Measurement Services](#) (OMS) for scoring answer sheets, this includes submitting the examination answer sheets to OMS in a secure manner. Specifically, instructors or their designate (departmental office employee or teaching assistant) must submit examination answer sheets in the manner prescribed by OMS.

E. Responsibility for observing scheduled class times.

1. Instructors are expected to meet their classes at the scheduled times and be prepared for all class sessions. Instructors are also expected to start and end classes at the scheduled times.

2. When instructors know in advance of conflicts with particular class dates, they are responsible for working with their unit to make appropriate alternate arrangements.

F. Responsibility for observing office hours.

Instructors are expected to schedule and keep a reasonable number of office hours for student conferences. Office hours should be scheduled at times convenient to both the students and instructors with the additional option of prearranged appointments for students when there are schedule conflicts. The minimum number of office hours is typically agreed upon by the academic unit.

G. Responsibility to report academic misconduct.

Instructors are obligated to report suspected academic misconduct to their department and to the [Office of Student Academic Integrity](#)

II. Student Responsibilities

1. Satisfying prerequisites. Students are responsible for being prepared to take the courses for which they register. They should not register for courses in which they lack the prerequisites unless they have permission from the instructor.

2. Responsibility for class work. Students are responsible for all class work and materials and for any information contained in the syllabus. Students are responsible for meeting all course requirements, observing all deadlines, examination times, and other course procedures.

3. Attending class.

1. Students are expected to attend all meetings of their courses. They may be excused from class, however, to participate in religious observances, for approved University activities, and for other reasons set forth in Academic Policy: [Makeup Work for Legitimate Absences: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester](#). Instructors should be notified at the beginning of the term about such planned absences.
2. Students must attend the first class meeting of every course in which they are registered, unless they obtain approval from the instructor before the first meeting. Otherwise, they may lose their places in class to other students. (See <http://policy.umn.edu/groups/senate/documents/policy/semclasses.html>, section 3.)
3. Students are responsible for being on time and prepared for all class sessions.
4. Observing academic integrity. Students are expected to do their own assigned work. If it is determined that a student has cheated, he or she may be given an "F" or an "N" for the course, and may face additional sanctions from the University. (See Board of Regents Policy: [Student Conduct Code](#), and Senate Policy: [Academic Policy: Grading and Transcripts: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester](#), Section II (2).)
5. Seeking help and accommodation.
 - a. Students are responsible for seeking academic help in a timely fashion.
 - b. Students who need special accommodations are responsible for working first with the relevant University offices and then with the instructor at the beginning of the course.
6. Respecting intellectual property. Student must abide by the provisions of the policy Appropriate Use of Class Notes and Course Materials.
7. Keeping classroom in good order. Students may be responsible for helping straighten up a classroom at the end of a class period, if requested to do so by the instructor. Keeping a classroom in good order includes taking away or disposing of everything one came in with, such as pop cans/bottles, food containers/wrappers, newspapers, etc. Students must also not deface or damage classrooms or classroom furniture or equipment.
8. Guests should not be brought to class without permission from the instructor.

III. Academic Unit Responsibilities

A. Maintaining an appropriate schedule.

1. Courses must be offered on a schedule, or frequently enough, that permits students to graduate in a timely fashion. All departments are to have a four-year graduation plan in place; they need also to have course offerings that support it.

2. Classes must be offered at standard times. Failure to observe standard class periods leads to inefficient use of classrooms and is disrespectful of students and faculty: students are forced to be late to other classes, and faculty access to classrooms they need is reduced.

B. Maintaining course records.

1. Any unclaimed final examinations or other major submitted student work must be retained by the academic unit for at least one year so that they may be reviewed and/or claimed by students. In the case of projects (e.g., design, architecture, physics, sculpture, and so on) that take space to store, however, students may be given a shorter but reasonable notice and an opportunity to retrieve their projects, after which period the projects may be discarded.

2. Academic units must maintain gradebooks or their equivalents for a minimum of one year. Instructors leaving the University must give all grading records to the department.

3. Academic units must also be aware of and follow Administrative Policy: [Managing University Records Retention](#).

IV. Expectations for Equipping and Maintaining Classrooms

A. Instructors and staff expect that the units responsible for classrooms will:

1. Provide clean and appropriate classrooms and facilities. People using the classrooms also have an obligation to help keep them clean and in order.

2. Provide sufficient and suitable classroom, laboratory, and other instructional space.

3. Provide, in consultation with instructional staff, audio, visual, and technological equipment that is capable, current, and appropriate for classroom teaching and learning. Equipment should be in good working order and be adequately maintained and adequately supplied. Operating instructions should be provided so those unfamiliar with the equipment can use it.

4. Post, in all classrooms, a telephone number for contacting appropriate personnel to report equipment malfunction or need for supplies.

5. Provide training that supports excellence in the classroom, including training for instructional improvement, effective classroom instruction, and the use of technology.

B. Instructor and student responsibility.

1. Instructors and students are expected to leave the classroom and its equipment in good order (e.g., blackboards clean, chairs straightened, electronic equipment shut off). Students may be requested to help neaten and straighten a classroom and furniture.

2. All members of the university community are expected to adhere to rules restricting the consumption of food and beverages in designated classrooms.

C. Instructor and student responsibility.

Departments should communicate with the Classroom Management Office about problems in classrooms so the responsible party can solve the problems.

* * *

Professor Wambach told the Committee that the subcommittee did not change the provisions of this policy but it did reorganize them significantly. The question of policy versus guideline has come up; she noted that the current title of the policy is "Classroom Expectations Guidelines."

Professor McCormick said that while item I(F) is not a problem, and he has always had walk-in and "by appointment" office hours, the walk-in hours are being used less and less and the "by appointment" hours more and more. If they do not raise their concerns by email, he added. Professor Spannaus-Martin said this requirement is a problem for her program because students are scheduled in clinics much of the day so that walk-in hours are not helpful; most of the lab sciences, she said, do office hours by appointment. And some faculty offer "virtual office hours" through chat lines, Professor Wambach said. It was agreed that the problems identified could be resolved if the word "additional" were struck from item F.

Professor Nelson said the change from "expectations" to "policy" is a big one that requires explanation. She said she would argue for guidelines even without specifics; policies are very different. Professor Wambach said that a number of the policies include hortatory language and guidelines and simply putting the document in the policy library does not transform them into policies. Professor Nelson asked if the Committee should hold up on putting them in the policy library until that question is settled. It was agreed that Professor Wambach would consult with the Office of the General Counsel to determine if the policy library can include guidelines. Dr. Falkner observed that there are policies embedded in the guidelines, and before the entire document is labeled "guidelines" the elements that are really policy need to be identified. Guidelines are not weak, Professor Nelson said; they express social norms, but one can question whether they would hold up in court if there were an attempt to enforce them. The documents contain a mixture of policy and guideline, Dr. McMaster observed, and policies must be enforced while guidelines are more behavioral. If everything in the document is a guideline, Dean Green commented, departments heads would never have a basis for sanctioning unacceptable behavior.

Professor Wambach said that these are Senate-passed guidelines and perhaps where they will now be located, on the University's policy website, suggests they will be enforced.

Professor Wambach said the discussion would continue at the next meeting and adjourned this one at 4:00.

-- Gary Engstrand