

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

2-14-2007

Curriculum minutes 02/14/2007

Curriculum Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 02/14/2007" (2007). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 196. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/196>

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

MEETING # 16 Minutes

February 14, 2007, 8:00 a.m., Behmler Hall Conference Room

Present: Judy Kuechle (chair), Escillia Allen, Van Gooch, Harold Hinds, Michael Korth, Jooinn Lee, Pieranna Garavaso for Jenny Nellis, Gwen Rudney, Ray Schultz, Nancy Helsper, Sara Haugen, Jeri Mullin, Clare Strand

Absent: Ferolyn Angell, Amanda Jasken, two students yet to be named

Visiting: Brenda Boever

Kuechle opened the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM JANUARY 31, 2007

Kuechle asked for approval of minutes from the January 31, 2007 meeting.

MOTION (Hinds/Korth) to approve the minutes of January 31, 2007.

VOTE: Motion passed unanimously.

Kuechle updated the committee on the progress made forming a First Year Seminar review committee. She hopes to have them begin meeting soon and bring their report to the Curriculum Committee in April.

AREAS OF CONCENTRATION

Kuechle handed out an excerpt from the minutes of the February 9, 2005, meeting of the Curriculum Committee, regarding a discussion of areas of concentration. Members also received a list of areas of concentration proposed over the past five years. The committee was given a few minutes to read through the documents before the discussion began.

Kuechle mentioned that Helsper had created the list from data collected over the past few years. Areas of concentration were grouped under similar headings for better understanding, but each area is a separate major. Helsper explained that the areas highlighted in red are on the original "prototype" list in the 2005-2007 catalog (page 54). These areas don't match the list of balance sheets on the Advising Web site. No changes were brought forward to change the catalog copy, so the list will remain the same for the 2007-2009 catalog. Kuechle noted that areas of concentration information is located on pages 54 and 62 in the current catalog. Helsper explained that Sports Management is highlighted in blue on the list because it's the only area of concentration that has proposed courses to fulfil the program listed in the catalog. It can be found under Wellness and Sport Science (page 163).

Strand stated, for clarification, that the minutes of February 9, 2005, indicate that the process includes faculty and divisional approval, review by the registrar, and approval by the dean. As interim registrar, she no longer reviews areas of concentration. Previously, the only way students could see if a similar program existed elsewhere was to come to the registrar to view microfiche of catalogs from all over U.S. That information is now on the Internet, so it is no longer necessary for the registrar to meet with students to review catalogs. Currently, the registrar sees the areas of concentration after the approval process and aligns the APAS. Strand asked whether there should be a limit placed on use of D grades in areas of concentration, as there are in many other majors. Currently, two prototypes limit the number of D grades: American Indian Studies and Sports Management.

Strand also asked whether a minimum number of credits should be established for an area of concentration or area of emphasis. She added that as long as it's approved, she puts it into APAS regardless of the number of credits proposed. She also asked, on a broader scale, if there was much overlapping allowed in multiple majors. Kuechle stated that she reviews the number of credits proposed for areas of concentration or areas of emphasis that come to her for approval. The range she looks for is 40 credits for an area of concentration and 20 credits for an area of emphasis. If a proposal comes through with too few credits, she sends it back to the student. She also added that she looks at who signed the form, and if a faculty member knows the proposed major and a division chair has signed off, she is confident that they know what they are doing. Strand countered that she has received questions from faculty who feel they don't have

sufficient knowledge.

Kuechle asked for a discussion of Strand's question regarding a limit on D grades. Schultz stated that it seems if we are trying to make an area of concentration equivalent to a major, it should be decided whether any D grades will be allowed. Hinds stated that not all majors have a limit on D grades, and questioned why we must do so for areas of concentration. Korth answered that statistics does not have a minimum. He asked if many students use grades of D in areas of concentration.

MOTION: (Garavaso/Lee) To add to the areas of concentration the sentence "Up to four credits of D/D+ may be used to meet the area of concentration requirements if offset by a sufficient number of higher grades to meet the minimum requirement of a cumulative GPA of 2.0 in all courses included in the area of concentration." The intent is to be in line with requirements of most other majors.

Korth stated that no credits of D is the most commonly used requirement. Garavaso agreed that her intent was to do what the majority of the majors do, so she offered the following amendment to her motion:

AMENDED MOTION: (Garavaso/Lee) To add to the areas of concentration the sentence "Courses with grades lower than C- may not be used to meet the area of concentration requirements.

Strand asked if this decision will override what was already done in Sports Management. Kuechle answered that it would in that case. Korth added that there is no standing area of concentration because they are created and approved individually. Hinds stated that he didn't think the committee could override an area of concentration that was already approved. Mullin asked if the decision on Ds should be made when the individual area of concentration is designed. Schultz answered that then, theoretically, they can approve a major of all Ds. Hinds stated that the problem would arise if a student wants an area of concentration but got a D as a freshman, which would make them ineligible.

Garavaso said that she was willing to change her motion again, taking a more moderate view by allowing one D. It wouldn't then infringe on Sports Management. It would also take into account that science and math does allow Ds for some of their majors. Strand stated that when the assembly voted to discontinue the number of D grades that could count toward the degree, she put together a report that showed a number of the majors that always intended to limit Ds, but it never got in the catalog. The new catalog is the most up-to-date in terms of limiting Ds. With the exception of statistics, every major has a statement about D grades.

Lee stated that areas of concentration should not be treated as a major that students with Ds pursue because they can't meet the requirements of any other major. Rudney asked if the language will be the new one using the C- statement. Korth stated that he would prefer the statement read no grades of D are allowed, and if necessary, we can grandfather in the Sports Management until the next catalog. An area of concentration is a special advantage for a student to do something different and unique. They aren't housed in any particular division or major and the standard is no credits of D. Gooch questioned what would happen if a student gets a D and wants to retake the course that is offered every other year. That could be a problem for the student if we did not allow a D grade.

Allen asked if there might be a way to change the process so you can see the grades of the courses the student has already taken before it's approved. Kuechle answered that the dean can review the grades of completed courses at time of request for approval, however students are requesting approval before most courses are completed. Students need to know if their proposal for an area of concentration will be accepted before they take many courses. Rudney stated that someone has to look at them at the end. Strand answered that she can set it up in APAS for this major like all the other majors to allow 4 credits of D or to totally reject D grades. As the courses are taken, the system enforces whatever limit she puts in it.

Helsper stated that one of her concerns is that no one is looking at the prototypes that were created and posted, to ensure they are updated. She was unclear as to who is in charge of them. Hinds answered that the dean is the division chair of interdisciplinary studies. Strand answered that interdisciplinary studies majors such as European studies, Latin American area studies, and women's studies all have division homes. Hinds replied that the dean is the division chair for those majors. Gooch added that often the courses listed are very specific on the prototypes. In a major, you can

select a course from a number of courses at a given level. What happens if they get a D, and that is the only course listed on the area of concentration proposal? Korth answered that they simply submit a revised plan for approval. Helsper added that we receive maybe one or two requests for changes in the area of concentration plan every year.

ORIGINAL MOTION: (Garavaso/Lee) To add to the areas of concentration the sentence “Up to four credits of D/D+ may be used to meet the area of concentration requirements if offset by a sufficient number of higher grades to meet the minimum requirement of a cumulative GPA of 2.0 in all courses included in the area of concentration.” The intent is to be in line with requirements of many other majors.

VOTE: Motion passed (5-3-0)

Gooch stated that this has to go through Campus Assembly. Kuechle answered that it will go on the agenda of the April 3rd campus assembly. Rudney asked if housing areas of concentration in the Dean’s Office is the best idea. Korth asked what “housed” means in this case. Rudney replied that if its approval has an impact on disciplines, shouldn’t division chairs be signing if their courses are involved? Kuechle answered that a faculty member and a division chair approves it before it comes to the dean. Hinds stated that an area of concentration named “International Computer Science” does suggest that it involves courses outside the computer science discipline. It would probably fall under the purview of more than one division chair, which is exactly why the dean has been the chair for areas of concentration.

Helsper stated that various lists of prototypes on the dean’s Web site and in the catalog don’t agree with each other. Korth answered that the list doesn’t need to be the same, because they are only examples of what can be done. Boever stated that the admissions office Web site lists a variety of prototypes they refer to when talking with potential students. It is widely different from the prototypes on the advising Web site or on the list Helsper prepared. Helsper restated her question of who is responsible for updating the prototypes, which contain courses that no longer exist. She does not know who to contact about revising it for catalog copy. When we say in the catalog that you can go out to the Web site to see prototypes, and they contain courses that no longer exist, we are misleading students. Gooch stated that the word “prototype” should be replaced by the word “template” or “example.” Haugen suggested using the word “sample.”

Strand asked if prototypes need to go through the same approval process as the other catalog changes, now that we have the PCAS system. Things won’t get into the online catalog unless they go through this committee and PCAS. Korth answered that they shouldn’t appear in PCAS or be programmed into APAS, unless it’s required. A single set-up may not be used again by another student. Boever said that the old prototypes are in PCAS and have not been updated. Korth suggested they be deleted. Strand did not think a student should have to go to the Dean’s Office to get a paper copy of an example, when it can be found conveniently online. Mullin replied that putting it online means it’s an approved program. It’s not an approved program. It’s an example. Kuechle agreed that it is an option to attract and retain students. Helsper answered that students can still go to the Web site and look at samples without having them appear in PCAS.

Hinds added that areas of concentration often involve directed studies. Each specifically designed directed study applicable to an area of concentration is not listed in PCAS. Only the generic course is there. Strand answered that having a generic in the sample would be a message to the student they are encouraged to create a directed study in the major.

Mullin asked if there is a disclaimer in PCAS that says you can choose other courses besides those listed. What is listed is an approved list of courses for a particular area of concentration for an individual student. Each student has to have their list of courses approved. If it’s going to show up in the Grad Planner and in the online catalog, there should be a disclaimer. Boever added that Grad Planner will be a problem for pre-professional students as well as for those with an area of concentration. She added that she plans to contact appropriate faculty to see if there are substitutions before she hits the submit button later this week.

Kuechle concluded that this discussion has been hard to follow, with the mention of ECAS, PCAS, Grad Planner, etc. She suggested that Helsper, Boever, Strand, and Mullin look into the topics discussed today and report back to the committee at a future meeting.

Next week's agenda will include a visit by Bryan Herrmann from Admissions to talk about a spring celebration event which will impact classes scheduled that day. The February 28 agenda the following week will again address the American Indian Studies major proposal. It had been tabled until after the chancellor gives her address to the campus (on February 22).

Boever added one more comment regarding areas of concentrations. She reported that 80 students have declared areas of concentration on APAS. She did not know how that matches the number of approved areas of concentration.

Meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

Submitted by Darla Peterson