

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

11-30-2016

Curriculum minutes 11/30/2016

Curriculum Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 11/30/2016" (2016). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 78. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/78>

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

2016-17 MEETING #9 Minutes

November 30, 2016, 8:00 a.m., Moccasin Flower Room

Members Present: Bart Finzel (chair), Arne Kildegaard, Pieranna Garavaso, Peh Ng, Gwen Rudney, Tracey Anderson, Mary Elizabeth Bezanson, Stephen Crabtree, Jennifer Deane, Christi Perkinson, Stephanie Ferrian, Kerri Barnstuble, and Judy Korn

Members Absent: Kellie Meehlhause, Jessica Gardner, and Madison Hughes

Visitors: Nancy Helsper and Jeri Squier

In these minutes: EDP Review Committee Report; Global Village GenEd Requirements Discussion

Announcements

Finzel stated that this is the final meeting of the semester and announced that after reviewing schedules, it appears that Mondays at 2:30 PM will be the spring semester meeting time. Darla will send out a schedule with dates and location. A replacement has not yet been named to replace Hughes, who will be on study abroad spring semester. The first meeting will occur the first Monday of the semester, January 23.

Approval of Minutes from Meeting #8, November 23, 2016

MOTION (Ng/Garavaso) to approve the November 23, 2016 minutes as presented. Minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Educational Development Program (EDP) Review Committee Report

Anderson reported for the review committee that the committee met and started by reviewing the categories of funding. There were three categories of funding that fit the five priorities in the following manner: EDP, covering priorities 1-3; Sustainability Leaders of the Future (SLF) grant, covering priority 4; and Native American Student Success (NASS) Project grant, covering priority 5. The first three priorities were 1) Well-developed proposals that address a significant need within the curriculum or that will benefit large numbers of students; 2) Courses that enhance our general education course offerings in the Gen Ed Global Village requirements of Human Diversity (HDiv) or Ethical and Civic Responsibility (E/CR); and 3) Courses that utilize new pedagogical tools to better realize our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). There was \$18,000 available to fund those proposals. Priority 4 funds proposals explicitly include a sustainability and/or leadership component. There was \$12,000 for those grants through the SLF grant. Priority 5 funds proposals infuse significant Native American content into existing courses or programs. There was \$10,000 for those grants through the NASS grant.

The 13 courses recommended for funding are listed in the order in which they were considered (by category of funding):

1. Becca Gercken, English and American Indian Studies

Request: \$3,000

Recommendation: \$3,000

Category of Funding: NASS

Project: *Honoring Native Treaties: Human Rights and Civic Responsibilities*

Anderson stated that Gercken is currently working on this topic during her single semester leave.

2. Becca Gercken, English and American Indian Studies

Janet Schrunk Ericksen, English and Honors Program

Request: \$3,000

Recommendation: \$3,000

Category of Funding: NASS

Project: *Reading Texts You Can't Read: Interpreting Medieval Manuscripts and American Indian Ledger Art*

Anderson stated that the committee was pleased that the course Gercken and Ericksen have proposed will offer diversification in the honors program. That was particularly attractive.

3. Sheri Breen, Political Science

Ben Narvaez, History

Request: \$3,000 (\$2,000 salary + \$1,000 travel expenses to Cuba)

Recommendation: \$3,000 (\$2,000 salary + \$1,000 travel expenses to Cuba)

Category of Funding: SLF

Project: *Study Abroad Program in Cuba*

Sustainability dimensions are described in the proposal, making it an easy fit for priority 4.

4. Dan Demetriou, Philosophy

Request: \$1,500

Recommendation: \$1,500

Category of Funding: SLF

Project: *Tailoring Professional Ethics for UMM Students*

Anderson explained that this proposal is a revamping of a course for which 50% of the enrollment is targeted for sport management majors. He will be retooling the course to make the content more appropriate and will be saving \$100 by not using a textbook. The course includes an aspect of cultivating leadership, and it was endorsed by Clement Loo, the SLF coordinator.

5. Margaret Kuchenreuther, Biology
Request: \$1,500
Recommendation: \$1,500
Category of Funding: SLF
Project: *Conservation Biology Course Revision*

Anderson stated that this revision of the conservation biology course is a logical fit under sustainability.

6. Jong-Min Kim, Statistics
Request: \$3,000
Recommendation: \$3,000
Category of Funding: SLF
Project: *Deep Learning and Bayesian Spatial Statistics*

Anderson stated that this new course will address environmental data sets. The review committee was uncertain about the fit but with the SLF coordinator's endorsement, they agreed to fund it.

7. David G. Brown, Economics/Management
Request: \$3,000
Recommendation: \$3,000
Category of Funding: EDP
Project: *Supply Chain Logistics Management*

The review committee recommended funding this proposal.

8. Rachel Johnson, Biology
Request: \$3,000 (\$2,650 salary + \$250 for 3D printing charges)
Recommendation: \$3,000 (\$2,650 salary + \$250 for 3D printing charges)
Category of Funding: EDP
Project: *Incorporating Active Learning into Biol 1111 (Fundamentals of Genetics, Development, and Evolution) and Biol 3121 (Molecular Biology)*

The review committee recommended funding this proposal.

9. Kiel Harell, Education
Sara Lam, Elementary Education
Request: \$3,000
Recommendation: \$3,000
Category of Funding: EDP
Project: *Curriculum Development for Faculty Led Study Abroad Course China*

The review committee noted that the proposal did not mention a GenEd designator, but it appeared obvious that International Perspective (IP) would apply.

10. Michelle Page, Secondary Education

Jennifer Rothchild, Sociology

Request: \$3,000

Recommendation: \$3,000

Category of Funding: EDP

Project: *Gender, Women, and Sexuality Studies Program Coherence and Growth*

This proposal was approved, although the review committee was not clear on how it fit the priorities (that will be brought up later).

11. Tisha Turk, English

Request: \$3,000

Recommendation: \$3,000

Category of Funding: EDP

Project: *Expanding UMM's Writing Curriculum*

The proposal by Tisha Turk was approved at \$3,000 although the review committee was unsure whether they should reduce the amount for a 2-credit course. There were no guidelines addressing that so they approved it at the full amount.

12. Jennifer Goodnough, Chemistry

Sylke Boyd, Physics

Request: \$3,000

Recommendation: \$1,500

Category of Funding: EDP

Project: *Career Skills for STEM Majors*

The review committee suggested funding the proposal at a reduced level of \$1,500 because they asked for \$3,000 to develop a 1-credit, half-semester class. It seems logical to cut there when looking to cut and yet fund as many as possible. Contacting speakers and developing a schedule, as opposed to curricular content, was questioned by the review committee as falling under curricular development. They do hope the course can be developed with the reduced amount.

13. Bibhudutta Panda, Economics/Management

Request: \$3,000

Recommendation: \$1,500

Category of Funding: EDP

Project: *A proposal to develop "Mgmt 3101: Financial Management" for the Management major*

The course proposed by Bibhudutta Panda was listed as a new course on the proposal but it is an existing course. It is a new course to Panda who has not taught it before, but the review committee felt that with the information provided, they should propose funding it at the same level that Kuchenreuther's conservation course was funded. Both are existing courses being taught for the first time by this particular instructor. They decided to treat all existing courses the same.

Finally, the review committee recommended not funding the proposal by Satis Devkota.

14. Satis Devkota, Economics/Management

Request: \$3,000

Recommendation: \$0

Category of Funding: EDP

Project: *Curriculum Development in Investment and Portfolio Analysis*

The review committee recommended not funding this proposal because there was not enough money to fund everyone, and this proposal was not as fully-developed as the other proposals and lacked an abstract. Kildegaard stated that Devkota had been asked to do something extraordinary and teach a course outside his field. There is no question that the course is essential for the curriculum. There is a significant institutional need for this course by this faculty member. There is a strong need for this course development to be funded.

Anderson stated that there are some questions that the review committee would like the full committee to weigh in on.

1. What is the definition of a new course? The review committee defined it as a course that is new to the curriculum. Should an existing course that is new to the instructor proposing it be considered a new course? The review committee made a clear distinction but it would like to see that clarified in the priorities and on the application form for the future.

Garavaso answered that the course must be new to the curriculum. It can't just be new to the instructor or we would be asked to give money to each faculty member for any course they teach. To prepare for teaching a course that is new to you is part of the faculty member's job. Here we are talking about being original or introducing something new in the curriculum and going beyond. Bezanson stated that she has a somewhat different perspective about what constitutes newness. If you are a new faculty member, everything is new. I think this could be well spent encouraging new faculty members at a lower salary to bring a new perspective to a course. Faculty who have been here for a time and are looking at teaching a class for the first time can be encouraged to bring that experience to a new class. This can be used as a very small carrot given the depth of work for a person to teach a new class out of their area. Garavaso stated we offer funding for the revision of an existing course. It's not that we don't consider that as important.

Anderson stated that whether the course is new for faculty or new for the curriculum would be a valuable clarification for next year. It is important to treat everybody on an equal footing.

2. The review committee would like a modification of the proposal form for the applicant to clearly indicate which priority or priorities the proposed course is meant to address (and how). Some proposals are obvious, but some are problematic. It would be a simple addition that would help minimize guess work by the review committee. Garavaso asked if a person can be allowed to choose more than one priority. Anderson answered yes. The committee should not be made to guess where it fits.

3. Anderson noted that another question came out the review of the proposal by Michelle Page and Jennifer Rothchild. It focused on programmatic curricular development with an emphasis on mapping the curriculum. It made the review committee wonder whether the EDP program is

intended for specific course development only or if it will also fund larger-scaled curricular projects. The review committee didn't find a match specifically in the criteria, but the criteria is broad enough in the call to justify funding the proposal. For the future, that should be clarified.

4. If SLF funding is available in the future, a clarification should be made about whether a course proposal that mentions an environmental topic should be assumed to fall under the category of sustainability. That was the basis of some of the discussion of the review committee.

MOTION (Bezanson/Garavaso) to approve the recommendations of EDP Review Committee. The motion passed unanimously (10-0-0).

Global Village GenEd Requirements

Finzel reminded the committee that he will ask the student members to schedule meetings with students, the staff members to schedule meetings with staff members, and division chairs to schedule meetings with faculty to collect opinions on the Global Village area of the GenEd program. From these forums, the committee will identify what is seen as problematic to guide our discussions on that set of requirements.

He would like the focus to be on the 4 different categories of the Global Village: Human Diversity (HDiv), People and the Environment (Envt), International Perspective (IP), and Ethical and Civic Responsibility (E/CR). It would be helpful to agree on a series of questions that are framed around a reaffirmation of whether the four remain vital to the institution and are consistent with the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) goals. Also, are we content with the current structure where students must take only two of the four choices, or would a more universal requirement be more appropriate?

Ng asked if there is room for people to discuss changing or updating some of the definitions. Finzel answered that he would like the first discussion to focus on the more basic question of whether or not these four areas are still important to the campus community. When that has been answered, we can then discuss updating or clarifying the descriptions.

In summary, the questions would consist of:

1. Are these themes still important/essential to our curriculum?
2. Do these themes still fit the understanding of what the words mean?

Garavaso stated that in her division people tend to discuss topics broadly. If the discussion is to be well-focused, providing the history of why we are focusing narrowly on Global Village would be helpful. When we get to the second question, her division will be stuck on the definitions of environment and sustainability. Are they the same? Are they not? She would prefer to think about what the words mean before the discussion begins.

Deane stated that she is struck at how easy it is to misunderstand the intent of a question. If you want to focus on whether the four things matter, it may be a disaster to ask divisions to weigh in generally on the meaning of words. She suggested stating clearly that we want a list of themes that still matter at UMM, and ask people to choose between sustainability and environment. It would be best to get people thinking exclusively and critically first. Finzel added that what

happens when people say one is more important than the other but they are using those terms differently. Deane noted that we do need to start by not debating “either-or.” Bezanson stated that she is concerned about the use of the word “matter.” She could not believe anyone on this campus would say having an International Perspective does not matter. Deane replied that they might if they are asked to choose one over another.

Ferrian asked if the UMM Mission statement was tied into the GenEds. Finzel stated that the Mission statement and the SLOs are our two tools. He is interested in an idea of how to frame that.

Perkinson suggested that a Google Doc be made available for committee members to workshop questions over break and come back with something to work on. The committee agreed that would be a good idea.

Ng asked if a preface could be prepared to keep the division meetings focused on the Global Village. Garavaso stated that starting with definitions will help people focus and stay on task. Crabtree stated that the question that has to be raised at division meetings is why Global Village requirements matter on an individual, topic-by-topic basis. Then we can hammer out a better way to phrase the GenEd in the catalog. For example, Env't can be taken a lot of different ways. One course he teaches, Forensic Geology, fits Env't because of the interrelatedness. The current definitions may lead to an altogether different focus in the development of courses. We not only need to know whether it matters, but why each one matters. Students should have an intuitive sense of why the courses fit the GenEd.

Bezanson stated that we have to make a case for choosing a GenEd course as an adviser. Other institutions have more functional Mission statements. Ours does not function to touch people emotionally. It describes something, but it doesn't touch people. We have to be able to make a better case. Kildegaard stated that a Mission statement is either poetic or legalistic. Ours is legalistic. We cannot assume there would be a consensus among divisions on how to explain the GenEd. Obviously, we want input, but ultimately it will have to be explained by this committee and go from there. This GenEd program was designed in 1997. We can come to some common understanding. Anyone who teaches in any of these areas would have to rethink their course and how it fits. That's why people are so anxious about revising the program piecemeal. If we do it at all, we need to focus on priorities, values of institutions, poorly written mission statement, SLOs. If we could get a list of 8 or 10, then this group will have to come together to fashion categories. Another thing we learned from GenEd years ago was that no one wants to add requirements.

Ng stated that the second question should be whether we should continue to ask students to choose two out of four courses in the Global Village. If we think all four are important, we could design the question to ask if all four are good. Maybe we could redesign the courses in Global Village to touch on two topics. Korn stated that if we start this brainstorming session, she's not so sure it is a good idea if right off the bat we say two out of four. If she had her druthers she would say we should do all of the four. We need to gather information and talk about how we would work that out. The Twin Cities campus is trying to figure out a way to do all of the four.

Rudney stated that she would support including all four categories and we should add a general wellness and fitness requirement. One possible way to do that is to look at some of the broad themes like the Human Behavior, Social Processes, and Institutions (SS) requirement and rephrase it.

Anderson stated that she was not clear what the objective is. First, we have the discussions, and then it's April. What do we hope to accomplish? Finzel answered that the discussions will have taken place by the end of January. By March, we would have a clear indication of whether these thematic areas are vital to the campus or if we should be rethinking the list. Then, this body should create a mechanism by which we fashion a curriculum program. We do not have a catalog next year and can meet in the fall to act on the issues. There are possibilities for improvement. In 2011 we had wonderful conversations about General Education in forums across campus. Those forums identified problems with GenEd. His objective now is to walk through that list of problems and address them. The foremost concern expressed from the forums was strengthening the writing GenEd. That has been addressed with Writing for the Liberal Arts (WLA). Global Village is the second area that was identified.

Bezanson stated that this committee could contextualize the conversation to explain why we are looking at Global Village specifically. We should be prepared to tell people the history of what has brought us to this discussion. Finzel replied that the discussion will be more productive if we can keep it focused on the Global Village. If we don't frame the questions to address the Global Village, it is unlikely we will be able to make progress. He also agreed that adding context will be important.

Darla will share a Google doc with the committee to populate with preliminary questions before our next meeting in January.

Finzel thanked the committee for its work this semester.

Submitted by Darla Peterson