

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

2-8-2016

Curriculum minutes 02/08/2016

Curriculum Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum>

Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 02/08/2016" (2016). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 56. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/56>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Curriculum Committee at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Curriculum Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

UMM CURRICULUM COMMITTEE
2015-16 MEETING #7 Minutes
February 8, 2016, 2:15 p.m., MFR

Members Present: Bart Finzel (chair), Pieranna Garavaso, Arne Kildegaard, Peh Ng, Gwen Rudney, Tracey Anderson, Mary Elizabeth Bezanson, Stephen Crabtree, Jennifer Deane, Madison Hughes, Kellie Meehlhause, Christi Perkinson, Lauren Velde, and Kerri Barnstuble

Members Absent: Sarah Ashkar, Emily Sunderman, and Judy Korn

Visitors: Nancy Helsper and Clement Loo

In these minutes: Course Approvals, Request for Gen Ed Designator on Directed Study, Continued General Education Discussion, and Sustainability Leaders of the Future Program: Possible Implications for the Curriculum

Announcements

Finzel announced that the committee will meet every two weeks throughout the remainder of the semester. In addition to making progress on the Gen Ed discussion, he encouraged divisions to get a head start on forwarding curriculum changes to the committee, in advance of next fall's catalog changes.

Approval of Minutes of December 11, 2015 Meeting

MOTION (Bezanson/Garavaso) to approve the December 11, 2015 minutes. Minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Course Approvals

Division of Education

New Courses:

ED 3010 – Teaching Sustainability: Global Storylines (4 cr, Evt)

SSA 2221 – Theory of Coaching (2 cr, SS)

SSA 2403 – Sport, Gender, and Sexuality (2 cr, SS)

SSA 2404 – Sport and Indigenous Cultures (2 cr, HDiv)

Revised Courses:

SSA 1802 – The Olympic Games: History, Culture, and Society (2 cr, IC)

SSA 2302 – Introduction to Sport Management (4 cr)

Rudney stated that the development of ED 3010 was supported by SLF and IPC funds. It was provisionally approved in October and full approval is requested. It will be offered only when feasible.

The three new SSA courses will meet the three goals of the Sport Studies and Athletics (SSA) program: to support the coaching endorsement, to provide a general understanding of fitness and wellness, and to support the Sport Management major.

SSA 2221 will be offered to all students seeking a coaching endorsement. They will take this course before taking the coaching skills course in a particular sport. Finzel asked if it will be required of everyone seeking a coaching endorsement. Rudney stated that it was her hope that it will become part of the coaching endorsement, but at this point it is being offered as an elective. She offered to go back to the discipline to seek clarification of the intent. Finzel asked how many students are expected to take the course. Rudney stated that she expects one section of approximately 15 students. The new Sport Management instructor developed the course and plans to teach it, allowing him to expand his presence into SSA, and not just Sport Management. This will free up others in SSA to teach courses that will support the Sport Management major so the major is taught by more than one faculty member. Crabtree asked if any prerequisites were considered. Rudney answered that none were necessary for this course. Finzel suggested that the number be changed to have it precede the coaching skills courses that it is intended to precede. Rudney was asked to bring it back to the division to revisit. [Note: course number has been changed to SSA 2131.]

Rudney explained that SSA 2403 and 2404 are new courses that will contribute to the SSA program in general. They are not required for the Sport Management major. They are a wonderful contribution to campus because they also help integrate SSA into the goals and mission of UMM and contribute to other majors. These courses will be offered every year. Finzel asked if the new instructor's schedule will accommodate all of the new courses that he has proposed. Rudney noted that by offering these courses, space will be freed up for other people to contribute to SSA. Bezanson asked if SSA 2403 will be put on the GWSS list of electives. Garavaso answered that when the course was discussed at an earlier meeting during the EDP grant funding discussion, it was encouraged then to let the GWSS coordinator know that the course will exist so that it can be included in the GWSS major when PCAS changes are proposed next fall.

Rudney explained that SSA 1802 (an IC course) was developed by a coach who is no longer at UMM. The new instructor is making an improvement to the course that he believes is more cultural in nature. The course will be offered every other fall, to coincide with the Olympics.

SSA 2302 was a 2-credit course that was piloted and it was found that there was not enough time to do what was necessary for the major. They have expanded it to four credits. This will increase the number of credits in the major as well. This will be looked at when the program is reviewed.

MOTION (Meehlhause/Garavaso) to approve the Education course changes, with the exception of SSA 2221.

The motion passed unanimously (10-0-0).

Request for Gen Ed Designator on Directed Study

Finzel explained that several years ago the Scholastic Committee asked this committee to take on the task of considering requests to acknowledge a Gen Ed designator on directed studies. It's rare, and he discourages it because the curriculum is rich enough for students to get their Gen Eds in their regular curriculum. In this case, however, the student is a senior who hasn't had the HDiv and needs it to graduate. Although this is rarely done, he did recommend approval. The committee agreed to approve the Gen Ed by unanimous voice vote.

Continued General Education Discussion

Finzel noted that at the last meeting he shared a proposal that included trying to ensure all Global Village categories are taken by all students. The proposal suggests double-counting in some areas to increase the Global Village requirement while not adding to the overall Gen Ed requirements. This might also address the strong desire to add IS components to Gen Ed. Beyond Global Village, there is a strong desire to have Gen Ed thought of as something throughout the student's career, eliminating the concept of Gen Ed being something to "get done with" in order to move on to real stuff. Finally, there is a desire to add value to the FL requirement. We seem to be lagging behind many of our peers in this regard. The last curriculum reform, held when the campus moved to semesters, required all courses to have a Gen Ed. Finzel stressed a desire to create more deliberately conceived courses to meet Gen Ed. He asked if the committee believes those goals are the ones that should be addressed, if others should be added to the list, or if there are Gen Eds on the list that are not significant.

Deane stated that for many faculty the idea of a Gen Ed overhaul is terrifying. The proposal strikes her as reasonable without dismantling everything and starting needlessly from scratch. Finzel stated that he sees the committee going forward in the form of small working groups to address each of the three different aspects of the proposal. One working group could look at Global Village. He referenced the College of William and Mary whose new Gen Ed program has struggled with the same depth issue without adding requirements. In particular, key pieces they wrestled with were to define knowledge domains, but then have a lookout beyond that. He suggested that Garavaso's particular expertise might be helpful on that working group.

Another working group could look at IP and consider the language proposal as a strategy to fulfill IP. A third group could look at the capstone issue. Students have voiced concerns when they have 2-4 majors, resulting in multiple capstone projects. It's also taxing on resources. Perhaps there are majors that could join and fulfill a capstone requirement that would be

acceptable to multiple disciplines. For example, could disciplines come together and identify a research capstone that covers multiple disciplines.

Anderson asked if the discussion about rethinking our Gen Ed includes envisioning existing courses to fit in, or creating new courses. To say “here’s our new Gen Ed, now come up with courses to fit it” could be problematic. Finzel answered that he envisions both approaches. New courses might well be proposed to meet a Gen Ed. Existing courses might be modified to fit a Gen Ed, and those that would not meet a Gen Ed will still exist to service the major rather than Gen Ed. We can’t say what it will be until we know what the new program will look like.

Finzel stated that we don’t want to design a Gen Ed exclusive of disciplines. Biology courses are almost exclusively designed for the major. They now have limited Gen Ed offerings because of student enrollment in the major. Other disciplines fill Gen Ed seats. Deane noted that history is an example of a discipline designed with a lot of flexibility that could handle Gen Eds.

Anderson stated that she would like all disciplines to play some role in our Gen Ed, if not, then we are not achieving our goal.

Garavaso expressed concern that the new proposal might be seen as coming from the top and not starting with a discussion that is then brought to this committee. Finzel noted that first we need to develop a concrete proposal that can be vetted by the entire campus.

Deane asked if there has been communication with discipline coordinators yet. Is there a way of asking disciplines what they think and gathering and initiating a conversation self-identified by the disciplines? Garavaso responded that it is important to think about Gen Ed by itself and not yet connected to the disciplines. Talking about the goals independently would be easier without the anxiety that might arise from discipline concerns.

Crabtree stated that he has been preparing for the Geology capstone this year by getting information on what Geology has done and comparing it to other science disciplines. He has found that there are enough dissimilarities that combining the Geology capstone with any other discipline’s capstone would not work. To try to make it work would result in vague requirements that could be abused in unintended ways. Finzel added that capstones may prep for graduate schools and are different across disciplines. Ng stated that some disciplines have national guidelines that require specific curriculum for all undergraduate programs. Deane added that a lot of disciplines do this automatically. It has a lot to do with how faculty feel about their ideology.

Finzel stated that the discussion is tabled for today and will continue at the next meeting.

Sustainability Leaders of the Future Program (SLF): Possible Implications for the Curriculum

Finzel welcomed Clement Loo, Coordinator for the SLF Program. Loo explained that the SLF Program is a Margaret A. Cargill Grant funded program. There are five faculty, five staff members, and five fellows involved in the program that began in November of last academic year. The key strategy for UMM is to coordinate programming and curricular initiatives with sustainability leadership as its focus. He would like the committee's input on a proposal for a Sustainability Pathways Certificate. With the exception of those students in the environmental studies or environmental science programs, the majority of students report that they learn about sustainability at UMM through non-curricular programs (e.g., offices, talks, events, etc.). The certificate program is a way to have sustainability show up on the student transcript. The model of the plan has not yet been settled on. A handout (showing strategy and two model options similar to certificate programs at the University of Oregon and at UCLA) was shared as preliminary information to make the committee aware of what's coming. It will be developed over the next few months.

Both models were built around an experiential component with some courses and/or project. Courses would be added to help students frame those projects. Model 1 includes a preparatory course of 2 or more credits, as well as a post-experience seminar. This program would cover organizational structures, human resources, project analysis, and managerial skills relative to leadership. The post-experience seminar would reflect upon what they should have learned, and would include a portfolio or some sort of outcomes-related artifact.

Model 2 would not have a preparatory course, and would include courses currently in the curriculum. Students would have to take 4 of those courses. There would be a short seminar to begin the program and a follow-up seminar at the end. They would be partnering with the Office of Student Activities, which is currently doing an orientation leadership certificate program of their own.

Finzel asked in which discipline the preparatory courses for the models would reside. Loo answered that it most likely be in environmental studies, which does something similar with sustainability courses. The leadership courses are not already there.

Deane noted that a lot of work has been done thinking about resources and the curricular path. Loo responded that the key concern was not to take enrollment away from any other program. Secondly, the intent is to actively support other disciplines by providing resources and help to complement and provide support to disciplines. Garavaso stated that while she supports the element of activism and participation, she is concerned that the preparatory course is not required in the second model. Loo agreed that it may be difficult for students to enter the program without a preparatory course in the second model, but explained that the second model requires

that students choose four courses out of a list. Students have individual interests. If there is a preparatory course in the second model then a shorter list of required courses would probably be necessary.

Bezanson asked why a minor isn't being proposed. The students will be engaged in a lot of work that will count in their course load. Loo replied that a minor was considered but the minor's structure of 20 credits consisting of core courses and a list of electives doesn't fit the model that would include an experiential component. They were worried that their model might deviate too much from the minor. A lot of students are interested in doing the activities anyway, and the certificate would get it onto their transcripts. The program won't have the curriculum to tie to a minor. They will most likely back off from the second model that requires 18 credits. It will be closer to 8 to 10 credits. Bezanson stated that if experiential learning doesn't translate into credits, isn't there a way to equate these experiences into credit-bearing activities as long as they meet certain conditions? Ng noted that we do have internships that carry credits. Finzel stated a minor or even a major were considered early in the process, but both require tremendous faculty resources. There may not be enough faculty oversight awarding credit for some of those activities, but it might add up to a certificate.

Anderson stated that she was unfamiliar with a concept of a certificate and asked what it would mean on this campus and elsewhere. Is there a question about students having a job on campus and having it count toward academic credit? Barnstable answered that there are internships that already do that. Garavaso added that there is a certificate in French. Finzel noted that there are examples system-wide. It would be helpful to see solid examples of existing certificate programs. Finzel thanked Loo for introducing the plan to the committee, and noted that a big team of 15 or so people have been plugging away at the plan for over a year, so it was good to see the results to date.

Finzel stated that at the next meeting Gen Ed will be revisited.

Submitted by Darla Peterson