# 2.9 & 2.9.1 Satisfactory Academic Progress

This is quite a change:

Part 1. Qualitative Measure of Progress—Grade Point Average (GPA).

Academic progress is monitored beginning with the first registered credit. All students are required to maintain a minimum cumulative GPA as follows:

* 1-5 attempted credits 0.00
* 6-12 attempted credits 1.50
* 13 or more attempted credits 2.00

I understand the 1-5 and 0.0, as that is what we’ve been doing for some time now, already. The 6-12 and 1.5 is new, and confusing to me. Seems difficult to explain to students (and staff) and makes this all more challenging. It can also create more barriers for students by allowing them to dig themselves into deeper holes.  I also wonder if this is OK with Financial Aid regulations.

And this part:

## Part 2. Quantitative Measure of Progress—Completion Rate and Maximum Time Frame.

### Subpart A. Completion Rate

Academic progress is monitored beginning with the first registered credit. All students are required to maintain a minimum cumulative Completion Rate of 66.67%. The cumulative Completion Rate is calculated by dividing the cumulative completed credits by the cumulative attempted credits. The Completion Rate also includes credits accepted in transfer and applied to the student’s degree/certificate.

A new thing for the System is not counting Developmental Credits in the Completion Rate. This is a big change and should be mentioned in this policy/procedure.

The change is okay with Financial Aid. The new language is benefitting students.

This policy was expedited in Fall, and so this scale was used this semester, and gave students more grace. The idea is to benefit students who have only taken two or three classes. The proposed language was based on an examination of the data, and is more beneficial to students.

The Dev Ed credits change is addressed in Part 8 #8.

We agree the change is nuanced for both staff and students. A good policy can be beneficial and complicated at the same time. We know we need to continue to work to improve our communications around these changes.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

For Sat Acad Progress, I have a student now who says he’s still on probation even though he achieved a B average fall semester. He wanted to know if it was cumulative and included the semester in the pandemic when he failed his classes as Augsburg.

I couldn’t answer him from what is in this policy.

It’s possible to be on probation after a good semester because it has to be the cumulative GPA. We encourage the student to reach out to his advisor for better information, the policy/procedure isn’t going to provide the best answer for case-by-case situations. As an FYI, GPAs do not transfer.

# 2.21 & 2.21.1 Privacy of Education Records

### Subpart F. Official Email for Current Students.

The official email for all current students is the system-issued email address. All email accounts are distributed through user.name@go.minnstate.edu for students. For the purposes of communication, the system and college email accounts are equivalent.

My thoughts:

I recognize that the highlighted portion is factual. But is it necessary to spell it out so specifically in this policy? It makes me very uncomfortable to explicitly share the college’s email format in a policy about privacy. The college does not include email addresses as ‘directory information’ in 2.21.1. However, it does include student names. So, if a 3rd party asks for student names (which is directory information) and we publicize the format in the policy they also have the email address. Since I have been at NHCC the email format has been modified. Placing it in the policy would require a policy revision specifically for such a change in the future.

We had two comments related to this issue, see our response below.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

Policy Committee, Please see my suggestions below.

2.21 Privacy of Education Records Policy:

The newly added Subpart E & F does not represent the actuality of the college, nor does the language ‘official’ email as ‘official’ is considered school issued email. In practice to support students, specifically returning students (who are considered current students because their enrollment status is open) the practice is that data privacy may be communicated through the “Email that is kept on file.” This means, if they had an NHCC email from 10 years ago (which is no longer active but a “system issued email”) a student would need their personal email to communicate with NHCC. Technically, they have a system issued email address but cannot access it or it is no longer valid for the system. Keep in mind, a student’s NHCC email is deactivated 180 days after their last registration (I believe). They also need that personal email to reset passwords, activate, send official transcripts etc.. We would communicate with a student based on their personal email on file because they have consented to use with when they submitted it to the college.

With subpart F, student affairs will need to confirm minnstate users with common names, not all professionals have access to do so as starID look up access is limited. If non-faculty employee receives an email from John.smith@go.minnstate.edu or mohammed.mohammed@go.minnstate.edu we would have to do a second verification before proceeding with assistance. This will extend the turn-around time to assist students.

I believe the intent of this change was to alleviate back-forth for students and faculty, however, the proposed language has inadvertently left out the ‘other side of the house business.’ As a person who is knee deep in FERPA every day, I suggest the following language.

### Subpart F. Official Email for Current Students.

The official email for all current students is the system-issued email address or personal email a student has provided in the student record system when necessary. All email accounts are distributed through user.name@go.minnstate.edu for students. For the purposes of communication, the system and college email accounts are equivalent.

Thanks for this feedback. We will incorporate this suggestion combined with the suggestions below to protect student privacy.

2.21.1 Procedure Feedback:

Subpart 5 #2 & #3 additional language does not represent how we need to serve students. We use the email address in the SIS system interchangeable with their NHCC email address- again because of the issues/services listed above.

By email: College personnel will respond to questions sent from the North Hennepin email addresses and may respond using private educational data. Questions sent from other email addresses not stored in the student record system will be answered without the use of private educational data. (The SIS includes all of Minnstate, but also includes what a student has provided on file.)

Thanks for this suggested language and bringing this lens to the procedure!

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

I believe the use and clarification of “official e-mail address” is a good idea in principle. However, I do not agree with including the email format of the official email in 2.21 subpart F. The format of the email may, and has, changed over time. Specifying it in the policy necessitates that the policy be changed every time that the email address format changes. My suggestion is to leave the specific email address format out of the policy. Possible options I have for subpart F are below:

Subpart F. Official Email for Current Students.

The official email for all current students is the system-issued email address. ~~All email accounts are distributed through~~ user.name@go.minnstate.edu ~~for students.~~ For the purposes of communication, the system and college email accounts are equivalent.

Subpart F. Official Email for Current Students.

The official email for all current students is the system- or college-issued email address.

Subpart F. Official Email for Current Students.

The official emails for all current students are the system- or college-issued email addresses.

Note that the use of the third option may necessitate altering 2.21 and 2.21.1 to state “an official e-mail address” instead of simply “official e-mail address.”

Protecting student privacy is important, thanks for thinking of this perspective and providing potential language. We’ve incorporated your suggestions into the policy.

# 3.8 & 3.8.1 Complaints & Grievances

Student Complaint and Grievance: Are 3.8 and 3.8.1 restricted to nonacademic student complaints? This didn’t seem to be the case. I could have missed it, but I did not see any language specific to academic or nonacademic complaints. I would like to see language encouraging students to meet with faculty as the first step to resolving academic disputes if possible. Or do we (faculty) leave it to Deans to mediate and kick it back to faculty if student hasn’t started with us?

3.8 & 3.8.1 can be used for non-grade related academic student complaints. When students file a complaint, the form directs them to talk to the person who they believe treated them unfairly first, and also distinguishes between grade appeal, discrimination and other complaints.

# 3.26 Intellectual Property

Only question I have and maybe it doesn’t matter. 3.26 Intellectual Property – We have moved away from the hardware behind “Classroom Capture” to using Zoom. I am not sure if courses are still being titled “Classroom Capture” maybe it doesn’t matter, but thought I would mention it.

We think faculty may want to use classroom capture in the future, so we think it’s worth keeping the language for now. The currently language is pretty vague about hardware.

# 3.35 & 3.35.1 Credit for Prior Learning

3.35.1 CPL Procedure

 Subpart B : Due to our structure change I would suggest the Dean title be updated to *Dean-School of Business, Careers, Education & Workforce Innovation*

Also: they system policy has been updated so this language is no longer valid and conflicts with System Policy 3.29/3.29.1 AND 3.35.1 .

All credits earned through this procedure will be recorded on the student’s official transcript clearly marked as “a transfer credit” in the semester awarded in compliance with Minnesota State Policy 3.29 and Procedure 3.29.1 and will count towards NHCC residency. This is what the current CPL system procedure 3.35.1 says:

 *Subpart D. Residency credit for CPL external assessments*
 *Colleges and universities shall award credit for CPL external assessments consistent with the residency and graduation requirements in Board Policy 3.36 and System Procedure 3.36.1 Academic Programs. Credit awarded through CPL external assessment does not apply toward residency credit requirements.*

 My suggested language for that section would be:

 All credits earned through this procedure will be recorded on a student’s official transcript in compliance with Minnesota State Policies 3.29, 3.35 and procedures 3.291 and 3.35.1.

 Same with Subpart C #7. The only time CPL is listed as transfer is when it is an exam.

Thanks for catching this! We adopted the language above and clarified that credit awarded by NHCC faculty counts for residency, since it is not external assessment.

# 3.36 and 3.36.1 Degrees and Certificates

3.336.1 Degrees & Certificates Procedures (suggested changes)

Part 2.

3. A student must apply for each degree or certificate in the Records and Registration Office. An application for degree must be made ~~in the first five weeks of the semester in which the student intends to graduate.~~ prior to final grade submission for the term in which the award may be granted.

1. 4. A student has four years to complete the graduation requirements as published in the catalog in effect at the time of initial enrollment. Students taking longer than four years to complete their graduation requirements may follow any catalog published during the four year period preceding their graduation. In extenuating circumstances, a student may request a one term extension via appeal to Registrar.

Thanks for this language! We’ve incorporated it.W

# 3.53 Program Review

* Part 4 Accountability: Where is the accountability exactly? Did I miss it? It reads more as “Working Methods” as it is written now than “Accountability.” Is it possible to add a “this work MUST be completed” type statement to add in the accountability component.
* Part 4 Subpart B and Part 4 Subpart C: I see a lot of potential issues here. What if a 3+ member department refuses to rotate the workload and forces one person to do the work all the time (and Dean will not intervene)? What if a department has 3 employees (e.g., 2 full time and 3rd employee who is teaching 1 course)? These are both scenarios that do not qualify for assistance as it is outlined in Subpart C, but I think should qualify for help because it is needed. To be clear, I am 100% in support of offering help and assistance. I just foresee many problems and special situations.

Thanks, we made some minor changes based on this feedback.

# 5.34 & 5.34.1 Visitors and Minors on Campus

Could the visitors policy include information about visitors in classes? For example, don’t/shouldn’t faculty have the right to know about visitors who wish to attend a class and determine whether they’re allowed to be in class on a given day?

This policy is aimed at people being on campus in general. We currently have suggested language about visitors to classes in the Syllabus Checklist, and prefer to keep decisions about visitors in classes as under faculty purview.

# 5.34 & 5.34.1 Visitors and Minors on Campus

I took a look at the visitor procedures and policy documents. I have a question rather than a suggested change to the language. I like how the procedure says that employers must contact Career Services for campus recruiting. Do you know if we state anywhere that employers cannot randomly post their job openings on our noticeboards? It isn’t as bad as it used to be but we still get some unvetted job postings appearing on noticeboards. Otherwise, it looks good to me.

Karen P