

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

1-21-1997

Curriculum minutes 01/21/1997

Curriculum Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 01/21/1997" (1997). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 332. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/332>

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--1996-97 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING #13
January 21, 1997; 3:00 p.m.; Education 211**

Present: Farrell, Frenier, Hansen, Imholte, Korth, J. Lee, M. Lee, Schuman, Thielke, Whelan

Absent: Ballou, Barbour, Davis, Ellis, Kissock, Vickstrom

Guest(s): Tom McRoberts, Associate Director of University College

FORUMS FOR GENERAL EDUCATION AND COMMON EXPERIENCE:

Schuman informed CC members that three separate forums had been scheduled for campus community discussion of the semester general education and common experience plans. Since the Curriculum Committee is in the line of decision making for these plans, he suggested that CC members try to attend at least one of forum.

SEMESTER FINAL EXAM SCHEDULE:

Schuman indicated that the last of the semester calendar issues is the final exam schedule. The proposal from the Registrar is for a 3-day schedule. Thielke said there are just as many time slots in the semester 3-day schedule as there were in the quarter 4-day final exam schedule.

J. Lee wondered how students feel about the proposed final exam schedule. Thielke noted that the policy of giving students an excuse if they have more than two final exams scheduled in one day would still apply under semesters. M. Lee wondered if the dates on the final exam schedule were correct. Schuman said that they were not the correct dates for the early start semester calendar. The final exam dates on the handout were from an earlier calendar proposal.

Imholte wondered why a 3-day schedule was being proposed. Thielke said the 3-day schedule was considered when UMM was proposing a later start date, with the term ending so close to the holidays. Now that the CC has approved the early start calendar, the final exam schedule could be lengthened. Imholte noted that students will be taking four classes each term under semesters and so will have to take four final exams over a three-day schedule. Hansen commented that a student with an overload of classes would really have a heavy final exam schedule. Schuman noted that many of the overload courses are less than 4 credits. Thielke wondered if UMM would have a tuition band. If so, students might take five classes since the cost would be the same as for four classes.

Schuman asked if CC members would like to see two versions of the final exam schedule--a 3-day and a 4-day version. There seemed to be agreement that CC members would like to compare the two options. J. Lee said he would like to have a reaction from students to the final exam schedule. Hansen said he could bring the issue to MCSA. Schuman said that would be a good idea. An advantage to the 3-day schedule would be to finish the term more quickly.

M. Lee wondered what the problem was with having two final exams per day. Thielke said the problem with the 3-day schedule is the greater likelihood of having three final exams in one day.

Schuman said that a decision would be deferred until Hansen reports on the student response to the final exam schedule.

AMERICAN SIGN LANGUAGE COURSES:

Schuman indicated that this was the third CC meeting where the sign language course proposal was being considered. McRoberts was a guest at the meeting, available to answer questions on these University College courses. The questions from the previous meetings had to do with the proposal to give the courses performance (E7) credit. The proposal is to add E7 to the spring quarters of the beginning and intermediate levels of the sign language courses.

McRoberts said he had a report from Togeas, Chair of the General Education Committee, saying that the GEC had unanimously approved the addition of P6 and E7 to the sign language courses. There was virtually no discussion of the proposal in the GEC meeting. McRoberts read aloud the criteria for E7 courses. Togeas had said he was comfortable with the decision to approve E7 credit for the sign language courses.

Schuman asked McRoberts to describe the performance credentials of the instructor. McRoberts said the former instructor and the current instructor were trained in deaf and sign language. Both instructors have masters degrees in that field. Farrell commented that he wanted to feel comfortable that any instructor hired would be able to carry out the performance aspect of the courses. McRoberts said he had waited for stability in the sign language offerings before asking for general education status. There has been strong student interest in the courses and in having general education status for them. Whelan noted that there is a precedent since there is a French course with E7. Could the same question be asked about the French course? Farrell said it could; when hiring, he looks for someone who can handle the performance aspect. Thielke said there is also a course in German called German Play. Farrell said that course has not been offered since the retirement of one of the German faculty many years ago.

Whelan asked if there are six courses in the sign language sequence. McRoberts said that there were: the beginning sequence consists of Ed 1010, 1012, and 1014 and the intermediate sequence consists of Ed 1016, 1040, and 1042. Whelan asked if the courses were also being given foreign language credit. McRoberts said the GEC had also approved the P6 request.

MOTION (Understood): To approve the proposal to give P6 and E7 credit to Ed 1014, Beginning Sign Language III, and E7 credit to Ed 1042, Intermediate Sign Language III.

VOTE: Unanimous in favor (7-0-0).

ART HISTORY COURSE PROPOSALS:

Schuman noted that the Art History discipline had submitted a late proposal to add general education credit to several courses. All of the new courses are made possible because we have a new faculty member in Art History through bridge funding. Mooney pointed out that the new courses listed are all specific topics courses under an already-approved general topic heading. The proposal is to approve the general topic heading for E2, E6, and E8, not to approve the new topics. Farrell said he had encouraged the discipline to wait until the next bulletin to add the new courses, but to wait two years to make these offerings known to students seemed quite a disadvantage. He just found out about the proposal last week. He agreed that the proposal is only to add the E designations.

Hansen said he had taken the Art of Ancient Rome last year and successfully petitioned for E designation.

Farrell noted that the total number of E designations on one course had been questioned in the past, but there are precedents for having three designators.

Whelan noted that adding all of the new topics courses would add to the offerings in the discipline. Farrell said that was true and was possible because of the new faculty position. Whelan wondered about the number of additional course offerings in light of the fact that the discipline was overloaded in the past. Farrell agreed that every discipline is supposed to have three faculty members and Art History had only had two faculty in the past. The new faculty member would not necessarily be offering all of the topics courses in one year. In the past the discipline has not been able to offer the topics with any frequency. He expects these topics courses to be put forward as regular courses for the next bulletin.

It was pointed out that some of the specific topics listed have already been taught, as early as spring quarter 1996. [Later: Farrell and Mooney will note that this proposal is for retroactive approval to spring 1996.]

Korth said he was troubled by a course with so many E designators. An E category should have a level of depth that cannot be covered when there are three categories associated with one course.

Farrell noted that this proposal had been submitted simultaneously to the Division and the General Education Committee since the timing is so short before the bulletin deadline. He said he would report to the CC about action taken by the other groups.

J. Lee wondered how many courses have three E designators. Mooney said she would have to do a count of the database, but noted that many Art History courses currently have three E designators. This question has been discussed in the past; the agreement in the CC was that in general a proposal with more than two E designators would be discouraged, although the Art History courses were considered an exception to this rule.

MOTION (Understood): To approve the proposal to give E2, E6, E8 status to ArtH 3600.

VOTE: In favor--6; opposed--1; abstentions--0 (6-1-0).

Schuman commented that the UMM Studio Art discipline is currently being handsomely represented in the Nash Gallery.

NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting of the Curriculum Committee will be on Tuesday, February 4, at 3:00 p.m. in Education 211. The January 28 meeting has been canceled.

Meeting adjourned 3:40 p.m.
Submitted by Nancy Mooney

[Send comments to Nancy Mooney](#)
[Send comments to the Curriculum Committee](#)