

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

9-28-1999

Curriculum minutes 09/28/1999

Curriculum Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 09/28/1999" (1999). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 275. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/275>

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.

-

MINUTES–1999-00 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING #2

September 28, 1999; 4:00 p.m.; Behmler Conference Room

Present: Carlson, Evans, Farrell, Finzel, Gooch, Haugen, Kissock, Kolle, Korth, Lee, Neuharth, Richardson, Urness

Guest: Mooney

Absent: Busch, Thielke

[In these minutes: curricular change forms from computer science, University College (UC) course list, and clarification of foreign language requirement.]

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: Korth asked if there were any changes or additions to the September 14, 1999 minutes. A committee member voiced objections to the way the Curriculum Committee (CC) minutes were written. The member mentioned the excessive detail, the difficulty in reading and understanding the minutes, and the lack of flow. Another committee member mentioned that the CC minutes were done in a detailed manner with attribution because that is what the CC had voted for in the past. Korth asked the CC what type or format of minutes they would prefer. Several committee members felt that summarized minutes without attribution would be preferable. Korth said he would meet with Veenendaal and Mooney to discuss the format of future minutes.

MOTION: (Carlson, Finzel) To approve the minutes of the September 14, 1999 Curriculum Committee meeting.

VOTE: In favor 10
Opposed 1

CURRICULAR CHANGE PROPOSALS FROM COMPUTER SCIENCE: Korth mentioned that the copies of the forms sent with the agenda were missing the second page that included the GER and Assessment. He asked the CC if they would prefer waiting to discuss these forms when they have the full copy or should he read the second page to the members? A committee member recommended that the CC proceed; there was no need for copying the extra pages if there were no changes in the GER or Assessment. A second committee member agreed, stating that there is too much information provided already. The committee decided to proceed with the approval process since the missing information was not extensive. Korth recommended voting on the course proposals as a group. Korth read the missing GER and Assessment pages to the CC and summarized the information on the Form Cs.

It was noted that there were semester prerequisites for the CSci 1001- Introduction to Computer Science course, but no quarter prerequisites. Was that an oversight? Korth thought it probably was, but he would check. [The addition of the quarter prerequisite, Math 1201, was added later.]

MOTION: (Understood) To approve the computer science course proposals for CSci 1001- Introduction to Computer Science; CSci 1211- Introduction to Problem Solving with Java; CSci 1301- Problem Solving and Algorithm Development I; CSci 1302- Problem Solving and Algorithm Development II; CSci 3901- Seminar.

VOTE: Unanimous (11-0-0)

A committee member wondered how to tell from the Form C if a course proposal is for a new course. It was pointed out

that in part I; a new course catalog entry would be completely underlined. In part II, "Rationale for change," it would state that this is a new course.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE SEMESTER CATALOG COPY: Korth noted that the UC course list provided by Mooney was organized by division. It was noted that the first two courses in the UC course list were not included in the UMM day school catalog. The response was that, because the courses are offered irregularly, it seemed best not to list them in the college catalog.

A question was asked as to how a student would know if a course existed if the courses are not necessarily listed in the day school catalog. Korth responded that the student would know as much as a faculty or staff person would know - he wouldn't. However, Korth did mention a UC bulletin that lists the courses available for the current academic year and another bulletin that lists courses available for the current summer. A committee member felt that all UC courses should be listed together somewhere. A member responded that listing all the courses when they are offered at irregular intervals would be unnecessarily misleading, especially since there is a brochure listing the courses to be offered in a particular term.

The question was raised as to how it is determined if a UC course is to be listed in the day school catalog. It was pointed out that the UC Form C has a question regarding the listing of the course in the day school catalog. The CC has a vote on that issue.

A committee member asked about the distinction that would make a course a UC course rather than a day school course. It was explained that the decision becomes an issue of resources. If the discipline does not have the resources to offer the course, the UC has resources from tuition charged to hire additional faculty.

A concern was expressed that if the UC courses are part of the UMM curriculum, UMM needs to have a way to review faculty hiring by the UC. It was mentioned that the CC formerly received the prospective faculty member's resume along with the course proposal form. Would the CC like to receive this again? The committee member stated that he did not expect the Curriculum Committee to decide on the hiring. Korth offered to pass these concerns along to the Division Chairs and Dean.

A committee member asked if the UC instructors involved are well qualified. If it was more than three years since the instructor was hired, must the faculty member go through review? The response was that the decision was being made now by McRoberts or McCannon. Student evaluations of teachers were done just like the day school courses. If there were comments regarding any problem, McCannon or McRoberts would look into it.

CLARIFICATION OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT: Korth pointed out the lack of clarity in the foreign language requirement statement in the catalog. As it reads now, the statement is open to different interpretations. The statement needs to be changed to state that the two foreign language courses must be in a single language.

MOTION: To revise the foreign language statement on page 56 of the catalog as follows:

1. General Education Requirements

| II. Skills for the Liberal Arts

B. *Foreign Language (FL)* - Two courses in a single language.

A committee member pointed out that item II.B *Foreign Language*: on page 57, under "Goals of the General Education Requirements," assumes one language when it states "a second language." Another committee member responded that some students might not understand what people who have been here for a time already know.

VOTE: Unanimous (12-0-0)

ASSESSMENT OF STUDENT LEARNING COMMITTEE: Korth mentioned that Vicky Demos, chair of the Assessment of Student Learning Committee (ASLC), was in the process of organizing a joint subcommittee of ASLC and the CC. In the past, Leroux and Kissock have served as CC representatives. Korth wondered if there were two volunteers to serve on this subcommittee. Korth mentioned there seemed to be an assumption that he would be one of the volunteers. Korth and Christy Kolle volunteered.

Meeting adjourned 4:45 p.m.
Submitted by Melody Veenendaal

[Send comments to Melody Veenendaal](#)
[Send comments to the Curriculum Committee](#)