

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

2-25-2009

Curriculum minutes 02/25/2009

Curriculum Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 02/25/2009" (2009). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 264. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/264>

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
2008-09 MEETING #16 Minutes
February 25, 2009, 8:00 a.m., Behmler 130

Present: Cheryl Contant (chair), Mark Collier, Janet Ericksen, Van Gooch, Donovan Hanson, Sara Haugen, Michael Korth, Judy Kuechle, Pareena Lawrence, Axl McChesney, Gwen Rudney, Dennis Stewart, Clare Strand, Nancy Helsper, Jeri Squier

Absent: Brenda Boever, Mike McBride, Alex Murphy

Visiting: Jayne Blodgett

In these minutes: EDP Subcommittee and Discussion of Program Reviews

Contant announced that official word has been received from the Minnesota Board of Teaching that our educational programs have been continued until 2016 in terms of licensure. It is a significant accomplishment. NCATE results are expected in April.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION (Ericksen/Hanson) to approve the February 4, 2009 minutes.

Discussion: One minor correction was noted.

Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

MOTION (Ericksen/Hanson) to approve the February 11, 2009 minutes.

Discussion: One minor correction was noted.

Motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

2. EDP SUBCOMMITTEE

Contant stated that one of the responsibilities of the Curriculum Committee is to review and suggest recipients of the Education Development Program (EDP). The review process occurs in early April, with awards announced in mid-April. She asked for three volunteers to serve on the review committee. The traditional make-up of the subcommittee has been one division chair, one faculty member, and one student member. Gooch, Kuechle, and Hanson volunteered, with Gooch as chair.

3. DISCUSSION OF PROGRAM REVIEWS

Contant handed out some materials that described the criteria, timeframe, and process that was in place for program reviews in 1994. The purpose of this discussion will be to throw out thoughts on 1) the purpose of program reviews, and 2) suggested criteria for reviews. She described the materials as voluminous and encyclopedic.

Following are the ideas that came from that discussion:

Purposes of program review

- Improvement of program
- Articulate to external audiences the purpose of the program
- Aligns with mission
- Where best to apply resources
- Prioritization of programs
- Identifying strengths and weaknesses of the program

- Compliance with university policy
- Respond to student need or interest
- Coherence of programs within and across programs
- Because it was the right thing to do

The committee members were asked to list two purposes they considered of most importance. The first four listed above were given top priority.

Criteria

- Have program goals been identified and updated (if needed)?
- Student success or outcomes
- Number of varieties of Gen Ed categories offered by a single discipline
- Fit to Liberal Arts Mission
- Student demand
 - Enrollment numbers
 - Student credit hours
 - Majors
 - Graduates
 - Minors
 - Prospective student inquiries
 - Class sizes
- Upper and lower distribution of courses
 - Fair distribution
 - Useful distribution
- Service to other disciplines/majors
- Alignment of program course work to national standards or expectations
- Alignment of goals to national standards or expectations
- Student faculty ratios
- Resources required
 - Studio space
 - Lab space
 - Lab equipment
 - Facilities
 - Materials
 - Support staff
 - Faculty, by type, expense, and availability
 - Money (budgets)
- Funding to support student activities
 - Participation in conferences
 - Performance travel
- Quality of program
- Marketability of program to attract students and jobs/careers
- Faculty research/creative output
 - Quantity
 - Distinction
- Faculty teaching
 - Quantity
 - Distinction
- Faculty service

- Committees
- Service to profession
- Community engagement
- University-wide
- Outside classroom instruction
 - Study Abroad
 - Internships
 - Service-learning
 - Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP)
 - Morris Academic Partners (MAP)
- Academic Advising
 - Quantity
 - Extent
 - Career
 - Intellectual advising
- Diversity
 - Student
 - Faculty
 - Curricular
- Internationalism
 - Student
 - Faculty
 - Curricular
- Retention and graduation rates (4, 5, and 6 year)
- Innovation
 - Curricular
 - Student-faculty research/creative work approach
- Instructional approach/method
 - Lab
 - Lecture
 - Discussion
 - On-line
- Faculty qualifications
 - Terminal degrees
 - Institutional diversity
- Faculty retention
- Grants
 - Received
 - Applied for
 - Pedagogical
 - Research/creative work
 - Internal
 - External
- Contribution to general education
- Is curriculum robust or stagnant

Helsper stated that another word for the two top-voted purposes for a program review is assessment. Contant added that when she thinks of assessment most of what we do is curricular. So in some ways, curricular assessment ends up being a part of the bigger process of program review. If we get to the day where every year programs are assessing their curriculum, after 5 years of general assessments there should be some things changed and updated to accomplish goals based on assessments.

Adjourned 9:05 a.m.
Submitted by Darla Peterson