

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

11-20-2017

Curriculum Minutes 11/20/2017

Curriculum Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum Minutes 11/20/2017" (2017). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 269. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/269>

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

2017-18 MEETING #5 Minutes

November 20, 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, Mitchell Scanlan, Karyssa Scheck, Sarah Severson, and Judy Korn

Members Absent: Annika Nelson

Visitors: Nancy Helsper and Jeri Squier

In these minutes: Course proposals; EDP Review Committee report

Announcements

Ericksen announced that the committee will not meet next week.

Approval of Minutes from Meeting #4, October 23, 2017

Minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Course Approvals

Division of the Humanities

Music

The two revised courses on the agenda, Mus 1062 and 3109, were tabled because they had not yet received divisional approval.

Division of Science and Mathematics

Mathematics

Math 1801 – Geometry Collides With Culture (new course)

Ng stated that the course was approved by the division in April. This is a new IC course that was given provisional approval to teach it in fall 2017. It is likely that the instructor will want to offer it again, so regular approval is requested.

Physics

Phys 3301 – Optics (course revision)

Ng stated that the faculty member teaching this course wants to be sure the catalog description of lecture and lab are clearer. At present it just states “lab TBA.”

Ericksen stated that both of these courses can wait to go to Campus Assembly for approval with catalog changes next fall.

MOTION (Anderson/Aronson) to approve the proposed course changes as presented, effective next catalog. Motion was approved by a vote of 13-0-0.

Division of the Social Sciences

Economics

Econ 4201 – Foundations of Microeconomic Theory (new course)

Kildegaard explained that economics is one of the majors that is currently desperately understaffed, making a senior seminar problematic, so it is appropriate to offer this 4xxx-level course. It has provisional approval to be offered in spring 2018.

Ericksen asked if there are plans to offer the course next year if there are staffing changes. Could anyone else teach the course? Kildegaard answered that he did not know how staffing changes will play out. Deane noted that there are courses offered routinely that will only be taught by one person.

MOTION (Crabtree/Deane) to approve the proposed course as presented, effective next catalog. Motion was approved by a vote of 13-0-0.

Interdisciplinary Studies

IS 1091 – Ethical and Social Implications of Technology (course revision)

Ericksen explained that a very minor revision is being made to this course to clarify when it is typically offered.

IS 2102 – Research Success Seminar (new course)

Ericksen explained that this course is tied to the McNair grant. It's an extremely important course involving faculty from different areas on campus. Nancy Carpenter will be the initial instructor. Ng added that the course already has provisional approval since it will be taught in spring 2018. Meehlhause stated that she strongly recommends that the instructor consult with library staff, since literature searching skills are noted in the grant.

IS 3252H – Honors: Archaeoastronomy (new course)

Ericksen explained that this course has provisional approval and regular approval is requested. She expects it will be a popular course. Gordon McIntosh is the instructor and incorporates guest lecturers across campus on topics such as Latin American structures and northern European landscapes such as Stonehenge.

IS 3253H – Honors: Honoring Native Treaties: Human Rights and Civic Responsibilities (new course)

Ericksen noted that she was originally planning to co-teach this course with Becca Gercken this spring but plans changed when she became the dean. The hope is to offer this honors course and then, depending on demand and appeal, adapt a non-honors version of it later as well. Both courses would be 2-credit courses. Anderson asked if this course would be a half-

semester course or one that stretches out over the course of the semester. Ericksen answered that it would be offered the first half of the semester. It's currently filled. Korn asked if this course would become part of the NAIS major. Squier answered that she would check. Ericksen noted that it would be fun to offer it as an honors section the first half, and a non-honors section the second half. Meehlhause stated that it states that the prereq is participation in Honors Program or instructor consent. Could someone not in the Honors Program take it with instructor consent? Ericksen answered that if it becomes offered as a non-honors course, it would have to state that no credit would be given for this course if the student had taken the honors course.

MOTION (Ng/Meehlhause) to approve the proposed courses as presented, effective next catalog. Motion was approved by a vote of 13-0-0.

EDP Review Committee Report

Ericksen thanked the members of the EDP Review Committee (Meehlhause, chair; Crabtree; Odello; and Severson) for reading the proposals and preparing their recommendation report for this committee. Two of the members of the Curriculum Committee recused themselves from the remainder of the meeting because they had submitted proposals.

Meehlhause explained that the review committee reviewed 16 proposals requesting a total of \$43,500. The amount available for the program this year included \$20,000 for general EDP funding; \$9,000 from the Native American Student Success (NASS) Project grant for proposals that infuse significant Native American content into existing courses or programs; and \$16,000 from the Margaret A. Cargill Foundation's Sustainability Leaders of the Future (SLF) grant for courses that explicitly include a civic leadership and/or rural studies component.

Meehlhause moved to approve 14 of the 16 proposals. One (#4) was not recommended for funding, and the other they could not fund without asking some questions. The proposal they chose not to approve because, in comparison to the other proposals, it wasn't a strong proposal, appeared underdeveloped, and lacked detail on such things as how it will meet Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) or appeal to students.

Ericksen asked that a similar proposal (same level, same co-taught honors) be displayed for members of this committee who had not seen an EDP proposal before, so they could have a sense of the contrast. Meehlhause pointed out that the proposal displayed goes into detail about how it will appeal to students, and detail about what the course will entail. This shows depth of thought and deliberations. Another minor issue was the recommendation of the division chair. It was notably blank where usually a paragraph is offered.

Ng stated that when a division chair does not make a statement on the application form, it could mean that they don't support the application, as the Review Committee suggests, or it could mean it was submitted to the division chair without sufficient time for a response. She requires 48 hours before the deadline. If it comes it late, she won't write anything. Deane noted that the proposal didn't include any example of a particular text, philosophy, or tragedy. Part of their job

with this proposal is to explain to this committee what the course is about. Crabtree noted that if you look at the date of the chair's review, it was turned in several days early, so there would have been time to develop the proposal. Aronson asked why details about SLOs were criticized when a reference to SLOs doesn't appear on the form. They shouldn't be penalized just because everyone else did mention it. Ericksen agreed and stated that the form will be revised for next year, with instructions to give details about the SLOs. That would make it easier to set up the course for assessment purposes. It would remind faculty right from the start to begin thinking of these things. Meehlhause added that the revisions done to the form this year were very helpful and made the proposals much easier to read.

Meehlhause stated that they had concerns about #13. They are willing to approve it if the cash prizes for the science slam are not included in the funding. They were concerned that it might not be an ethical use of funds. Ericksen added that the SLF grant will not cover those kinds of gifts. If we do want to fund the proposal, the salary portion can be covered by the grant, and the \$250 in expenses could come out of the EDP account. Ng noted that when she saw the proposal, she asked about the prizes and asked her how she plans to sustain giving out prizes every year the IC course is offered, after the one-time EDP funding is gone. Private funding is possible and could continue after EDP funding is gone. She hopes this is a long-term commitment to teach the course, and for the record, the Division of Science and Mathematics will commit to it long-term. Squier asked if this opens up requests to do this for other IC courses as well. Ng answered that the difference is the pedagogy with other IC courses in the division. What the instructor wants to do is try to engage the conversation about science and climate change among students including students not taking the IC course. This instructor has done this successfully at other institutions. Also, the predecessor of IC, First-Year Seminar, provided a small stipend for faculty for such purposes of getting students engaged. Ericksen noted that the IC also provides the stipend. Ericksen added that, to speak to Squier's concern about other courses wanting to do a similar thing, it may become problematic beyond IC because there isn't a budget for it. Meehlhause stated that was exactly what was discussed in the review committee's deliberations. Severson asked if the IC students would be planning or participating in the Science Slam. Ng answered that we can offer her advice now, but the course hasn't yet been developed. This committee will see the proposal for the course content when it comes through for approval.

Ericksen noted that the SLF-funded proposals don't look like they have anything to do with sustainability, but what we focused on this year was adding courses that dealt with the leadership aspect of sustainability. We have a number of proposals that have to do with the environment and sustainability. We don't have a lot of proposals that pertain to civic leadership. She added that she was happy to see the number of co-taught courses.

MOTION (Meehlhause/Ng) to approve 15 of the 16 proposals, with #4 unfunded, and #13 having the supplies portion funded by EDP and salary by SLF. Motion was approved by a vote of 11-0-0.

Submitted by Darla Peterson