

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

9-11-2017

Curriculum minutes 09/11/2017

Curriculum Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 09/11/2017" (2017). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 87. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/87>

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.

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well
University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee

Campus Governance

Fall 9-11-2017

Curriculum Minutes 09/11/2017

Darla K. Peterson

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

UMM CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

2017-18 MEETING #1 Minutes DRAFT

September 11, 2017, 8:00 a.m., Moccasin Flower Room

Members Present: Janet Ericksen (chair), Arne Kildegaard, Stacey Aronson, Peh Ng, Gwen Rudney, Tracey Anderson, Denise Odello, Stephen Crabtree, Jennifer Deane, Kellie Meehlhause, Stephanie Ferrian, and Judy Korn

Members Absent: Students not yet named

Visitors: Nancy Helsper and Jeri Squier

In these minutes: Discussion of the committee's charge and process; recap of 2016-17 academic year; topics for 2017-18 academic year; and EDP priorities

Introductions and Announcements

The student representatives have not yet been named, so introductions will take place at the next meeting. Ericksen welcomed the members and shared the committee's functions as stated in the UMM Bylaws, Article II, Section III:

The Curriculum Committee develops, reviews, and recommends curricular policy. It deals with majors, minors, general education, the honors program, and all academic requirements. It oversees the body of courses offered at UMM and receives and considers all curriculum-related proposals.

Ericksen stated that the first item of business is carried over from last year: approval of minutes from the May 1, 2017 meeting. Minutes were approved by voice vote.

Recap of 2016-17 Curriculum Committee Accomplishments

Ericksen stated that last year was a catalog year so the work of this committee during fall semester was focused on course and program proposals. The EDP criteria were approved. The call for proposals resulted in 14 applications; the EDP review committee recommended 13 awards; and this committee approved the recommendations. During spring semester the committee considered directed studies requesting Gen Eds; the CEL attribute was presented and endorsed; and three program review reports were presented (by Mathematics, Secondary Education, and Spanish).

Topics for Academic Year 2017-18

Program reviews will continue this year. We are not quite through the 9-year cycle. Theatre Arts and Environmental Studies are left over from last year and will be completed this year. We will also complete Economics/Management, Elementary Education, and Studio Art. Next year, the interdisciplinary majors and the Sport Management major will be reviewed.

Other agenda items that are holdovers were from last year include replacing the FL Gen Ed requirement with the World Languages, Literatures, and Cultures (WLLC) Gen Ed requirement. The Global Village Gen Ed Task Force proposal was brought to the committee at the end of the year and “the spirit” of the proposal was approved by a vote of 5-0-4. With only five in favor, and given that our chancellor wants to go through the entire Gen Ed program as part of the Strategic Planning Initiative, Ericksen decided after talking with the division chairs, that it would be a good idea to put both of the proposals on hold. If the committee agrees, she will then communicate the decision to those who presented the proposals.

Kildegard stated that the Gen Ed proposals should be tabled, but that he did not believe that the Gen Ed program could be successfully carried out as part of the Strategic Planning Initiative. Ericksen answered that we might want to tweak some of the language in our Gen Ed program with the larger plan in mind. Deane agreed that it’s a good idea to table the proposals. She has heard that there were significant concerns across campus about both proposals. Ng agreed with tabling. She noted that when the Global Village revision was voted on last spring, the motion was made to approve the “spirit” of the proposal (not the details). Ericksen stated that with a vote of 5-0-4, it did not receive a strong endorsement. Meehlhause asked if the work that was done by the Global Village Task Force will be considered when Gen Ed is reviewed. The Task Force did a fair amount of work, and she would hope that the committee can pick up where it left off rather than starting at square one. Deane noted that the original work was based on certain premises and assumptions, so we may need to start fresh, asking different questions. Ericksen stated that she is hopeful to find, as the Strategic Planning Initiative plays out, whether we will need to change our Gen Ed. That wouldn’t begin until next year, which is a catalog year. Anderson asked if we have anything specific from the chancellor about looking at Gen Ed as part of the Strategic Planning Initiative. Ericksen said that we don’t have specifics yet. Kildegard stated that he was on the Strategic Planning Task Force 10 years ago, and it was like a state of the union address, with random things thrown in, some of which led to the tail wagging the dog. Some wound up in our mission statement, and the Curriculum Committee ended up wondering how that affects our committee.

Rudney stated that she would argue that the committee should have a prominent role in contributing to the planning if a topic relates to the committee’s charge. Ng agreed that if anything comes from the Strategic Planning Initiative that is curriculum related, this committee should have a voice. Rudney stated that we need to think about the Strategic Planning Initiative and, as leaders, provide a coherent contribution to the Strategic Planning Initiative. Ericksen noted that, so far, the first step in the fall is to look at common readings that show what other colleges do and what we can or should do. We could also look at what was done the last time we reviewed Gen Ed. Korn noted that we could look at the documents Professor Bezanson shared with the committee in spring 2016. She had taken the time to compile how Gen Ed programs are done at some peer institutions and aspirational institutions.

Ericksen stated that another topic relevant to this is that she will be attending a Steering Committee meeting at which committee chairs are invited. She talked with the chair of the Steering Committee about lightening committee roles this year so people feel freer to serve on

Strategic Planning Initiative committees. That's another reason why this committee should not take on any tasks too large to allow participation in other larger cross-campus committees. We will have periodic discussions about Gen Ed, and continue to address such tasks as curricular approvals, and EDP. She would like to have fewer meetings over the course of the year, keep focused now on the regular timeline-related work of the committee, and then have discussions on Gen Ed. Anderson stated that she was in favor of fewer 8 AM meetings, but would like the committee to be more proactive than simply being pulled along with the Strategic Planning Initiative process. Ericksen noted that the chancellor is trying to make sure no single committee feels it's theirs alone. It needs to have a campus-wide balance, and that will be a challenge.

Ericksen stated that although the committee is scheduled to meet every Monday at 8 AM, the committee will not meet next week, September 18, unless something crucial comes up.

Educational Development Program (EDP)

The criteria for the EDP awards over the past five years were displayed. The criteria last year were as follows:

- 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:
 - Human Diversity (HDiv) Gen Ed Global Village requirement
 - Ethical and Civic Responsibility (E/CR) Gen Ed Global Village requirement
- 3) Courses that utilize new pedagogical tools to better realize our Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs).
- 4) New or revised courses that explicitly include a sustainability and/or leadership component.
- 5) Proposals that infuse significant Native American content into existing courses or programs.

Anderson stated that last year's EDP Review Committee found it hard to find anything in the proposals that fit the criteria for #4. Meehlhause (chair of last year's review committee) added that the review committee had to spend a considerable amount of time deciding which criteria fit each proposal. The application form should ask people to state which criteria is addressed by the proposed course. They should also say whether it is a brand new course, an existing course new to the faculty member, or a revised course.

Ericksen stated that we are entering the last year of the grant that funds criteria #4. Is there any change in the phrasing for that criteria that could help draw proposals? We have a fair number of sustainability courses now, and we have very few courses on the leadership component. Meehlhause noted that we could offer some examples. Rudney agreed that a couple of short sentences would help. Deane noted that the concept of leadership fits better with certain disciplines, and we could acknowledge that, since the grant is specific to sustainability leadership. Korn added that the Twin Cities has a leadership certificate and we could see how they define leadership. Ng stated that she would like to know the criteria for a course that satisfies leadership. Then the EDP proposal could be clearer for the review committee reading it.

If you don't have criteria, it's up to the interpretation of the review committee. Ericksen asked what language could be added to describe leadership. Odello suggested courses that have a service learning component that are independently led. Ericksen stated that we could also add a component that speaks to leadership for an existing course. Rudney added that some majors have leadership components that EDP could support. Other majors could be more intentional if they revised their courses to make management a key part of the course. Anderson stated that the emphasis on work outside the classroom would be good because of the need to target leadership efforts. Meehlhause asked if a service learning component would count in the idea of "outside the classroom." Anderson answered that she wouldn't want that to be an equivalent. Ericksen added that it doesn't have to be the priority. Korn stated that we are creating leaders and citizens so maybe it's the language; for example with public speaking, communication skills, research skills, and identifying a need in the community, we are already creating leaders. Ericksen said that we are encouraging EDPs for courses that face outward. Deane stated that civic leadership is less vague.

Ericksen stated that she had come to the meeting intending to promote co-taught honors courses. Anderson responded that those courses would fit well in criteria #1 ". . . proposals that address a significant need within the curriculum." Ericksen asked if the review committee had argued about what constitutes a "significant need." Anderson stated that there are a number of courses in biology that would be appropriate for that criteria. Meehlhause noted that since 2015-16, we had one criteria that targeted specific Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). Are there any other SLOs we may want to include in criteria #3? Helsper said we were gathering artifacts for the MN Value Project, which has now ended.

Korn stated that she has retention on her mind and sees a need for 2-credit second-half of semester classes for those students who have to drop a course and then struggle to get enough credits for financial aid. Specific classes that advisers know about that students can take in the second half of the semester to gain credits, made academic progress, and get another Gen Ed are needed. Aronson stated that Professor Bezanson is proposing a course with just that purpose. Ericksen added that Political Science did that a couple of years ago to cover more of a variety of topics. Korn added that the majors are doing that already, and they've been talking about holding some seats for those students.

Kildegaard stated that a delegation from the Humphrey Institute came to see Morris and to experience rural people. They were surprised that nobody out here knows much about the concept of "rural." We could ask for courses that study race, place, and rural sociology, rural studies, or rurality. Crabtree noted that the Center for Small Towns (CST) would be a good way to start with that. They have a sense of the wider community. Ericksen asked if Kildegaard is referring to rural generally or "rural here." Kildegaard answered that he is thinking generally. Deane added that "rural here" could be a subset. A rural sociology course couldn't spend all of its time on this part of Minnesota. Crabtree asked if rural community is defined within the U.S. context or a more world context. Ericksen stated that she can envision proposals that do both.

To recap, Ericksen stated that she understands the committee to agree to the following priorities:

- 1) New or revised courses that explicitly include some aspect of civic leadership or rural studies
- 2) New 2-credit courses, especially to run in the second half of the semester
- 3) Co-taught honors courses
- 4) [If grant funding is available] Proposals for revising existing courses in order to infuse significant Native American content

Deane asked if the Honors program would be getting any additional resources. Ericksen answered no. Nobody is getting any extra money. With 2-credit classes, it's much more flexible to offer more. The more half-semester courses majors offer, the more flexible faculty can be, as well. Students prefer the 2-credit honors courses. That would be a nice pairing. Proposals can fill more than one criteria.

Submitted by Darla Peterson