

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

---

10-7-1998

### Curriculum minutes 10/07/1998

Curriculum Committee

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 10/07/1998" (1998). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 314. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/314>

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](mailto:skulann@morris.umn.edu).

**MINUTES—1998-99 CURRICULUM COMMITTEE MEETING**

October 07, 1998; 8:00 a.m.; Behmler Conference Room

Present: Busch, Cerar, Farrell, Frenier, Haugen, Kissock, Korth, Lee, Leroux, McIntosh, Taylor, Utoft

Guest(s): Mooney

Absent: Neuharth, Thielke, Woll

[In these minutes: meeting time for the quarter, agenda for the year, one course/ one GER designation rule, Provision (V) of the GER, and EDP Funds. ]

---

**MISCELLANEOUS:** Veenendaal distributed copies of items pertaining to one course, one category GER designation. Korth distributed copies of a document entitled Curriculum Committee Agenda Items for 1998-99.

**INTRODUCTIONS:** Korth indicated that he would be chairing the Curriculum Committee (CC) during the time that Schuman is Interim Chancellor. He asked committee members to introduce themselves. McIntosh asked if the Commission on Women Coordinator was the equivalent to the Coordinator of Minnesota Plan II. Mooney confirmed that this was the case. Korth referred members to the source of McIntosh's question, the UMM Bylaws, which were attached to the meeting agenda. Korth feels the committee should review what they are about. He then read the bylaws aloud to the committee members. Korth asked if there were any questions regarding the last group which is covered under Academic Support Services but still report to the CC. There were no questions.

**MEETING TIME:** Korth suggested meeting every other week. He asked which days appeared to be best for committee members. Veenendaal stated that Wednesday mornings at 8:00 were open for the highest percentage of committee members. Veenendaal stated that Taylor was the only member with a conflict at this time. After some discussion, Korth said he would look at other possibilities, and send a meeting schedule out with the next agenda.

**AGENDA FOR THE YEAR:** Korth referred members to the list of agenda items handed out before the meeting. Korth stated that he had reviewed the minutes from last year looking for unfinished items to include in this year's agenda. He also included some suggestions that came from the Executive Committee. Korth requested that members think about other agenda items that are not on this list. Korth listed agenda items for the year as follows:

1. Semester GER: one course, one GER designation clarification.
2. Provision (v) of the semester GER: writing and computing.
3. EDP funds: whether to use for common course.

Farrell wondered if EDP stood for Education Development Program. Mooney stated that was accurate.

4. Adjunct Committee for Honors: add UROP and MAP oversight? Korth stated that this concerns the formation of a new adjunct committee to combine oversight of Honors, UROP, and MAPs. Farrell questioned why MAIs were not included. Korth said they were not mentioned. Farrell stated maybe they were not thought of. Lee said they are different in that the others are academic while MAIs are administrative. Farrell wondered who oversees the MAPs and MAIs. Lee said the Dean does. Korth wondered who made decisions regarding these programs this year. Mooney was not sure, but thought that Schuman would be making decisions for this year.

5. ITV Guidelines. Korth said this has passed its intended time and might be revisited.

6. Review of GenEdWeb? Guidelines?

7. Assessment of General Education at UMM: subcommittee report. Korth stated that Curriculum Committee established a subcommittee to deal with this. There has been no report back. Frenier stated that she was confused since the GEC was discontinued. Korth indicated that this committee was dealing with "assessment" of the General Education program. The GEC has been discontinued.

8. Titles and responsibilities of Minority Experience Committee (MEC). Korth stated there was a question during last year's review of adjunct committees about titles and responsibilities of the MEC. There was concern about the committee's responsibilities in the bylaws. Korth states that is an issue for that committee. He might remind the MEC of this issue and the CC would deal with any proposals coming from the MEC.

9. Motion to label courses that have TAs in charge. This was referred to Curriculum Committee by the Campus Assembly. Mooney believes we have settled this issue. Farrell wondered why we would say a student is in charge of any course? Farrell feels this needs to be revisited. McIntosh said this was voted down by CC last year by a vote of 8 to 3. Lee wondered what would be the nature of a course in which a TA would be solely in charge? Kissock said item #9 is a closed issue and shouldn't be on the agenda. Item #10 is not settled.

[Leroux arrived at this point]

10. Policy on students grading students.

11. Curricular change proposals will be dealt with as they are submitted. Kissock said to cancel item #11. Farrell wondered what does #11 mean? Korth said it means business as usual.

Korth questioned if there are any more items. Frenier mentioned that she hopes to bring the Women Studies major proposal, which would be part of #11. Farrell wondered if the committee was prepared for more business because of the hardening of positions (changing temporary positions to a permanent status.) Was this going to affect the CC? Mooney wondered if this wouldn't be more of an issue next year after new faculty are hired. Farrell did not know. He said it may or may not be an issue, but would fall under agenda item #11.

**ONE COURSE, ONE GER DESIGNATION RULE:** Korth found in the three pages excerpted from the CC minutes that the motion was made in CC to designate one category per course. The CC forwarded the one GER category per course proposal to the Campus Assembly. The Campus Assembly minutes dated June 2, 1997 (part IV) do not mention this explicitly, but they did give blanket approval to the proposal. Mooney stated that the note on the bottom reads "although the above three items were voted upon separately by the CC, we bring the complete General Education program to the Assembly as a whole and unified proposal." Farrell wondered why this was an issue. Korth stated that the course catalog was voted on by the CC and the Campus Assembly and was adopted. Mooney said that what is in the course catalog is what GenEd sent to CC. As originally stated, provision iv limits courses to one Expanding Perspectives category. The implication is that there could be additional Skills categories.

Kissock requested an example. Mooney said sign language was originally designated as a Social Science course. Because of the need for Foreign Language courses it was changed to Foreign Language, but could it have kept both categories? Mooney noted that provision iv and the one category/course motion conflict with each other. Farrell commented that sign language should not be a Foreign Language. Foreign Language is a term they don't want to use, but it is hard to find a term that is acceptable. It can't be termed second language since it may be the third or fourth. Sign Language doesn't fit the requirements of a Foreign Language. Korth stated that we are looking to set the general rule. Farrell thought we had voted on the entire document with no distinction between Skills and Expanding Perspectives. Lee said this was his understanding, too. Hindsight says that one course per one GER designation does not allow much flexibility and may make it harder for students. For example, in science and math every course has a science designation. Lee feels that we should revisit this if it is hard on students, and then we should revisit the entire package.

Farrell wondered about a course that has three designators and argues that it is not appropriate. Where do we stop? He agrees that we don't want this to be a hardship for students. Lee said in the past they could have double and triple designations. One course could be used three ways. Farrell said currently a student must apply a course to one category even if it carries three designators. Kissock said he is aware of this, but College Writing has a Skills category. It should

not be allowed to also have an Expanding Perspectives category. That is what we said "no" to. Korth gave two potential examples. Fine Arts is an Expanding Perspectives category; some courses might legitimately have Fine Arts and artistic performance (a Skills category.) Foreign Language could be International Perspective. Kissock said we have limited the number of requirements, having each fit one category. We are not increasing, but decreasing the requirements for GenEd. We balanced the decreased GenEd against the reduction in the number of categories allowed. McIntosh proposed that Provision iv read "Courses can be proposed to satisfy only one of the General Education categories." McIntosh stated that he supports the change. Kissock also supports the change. Korth asked for a motion.

**MOTION** (Kissock, McIntosh) To clarify that the rule is courses can be proposed to satisfy only one of the general education categories.

Farrell asked for clarification. Leroux asked which problem are we concerned about, consistency or do we have student hardship. Is this currently an obstacle for students? Lee felt it was too early to determine. If it is shown to be a hardship, we should revisit this. Farrell asked who oversees this so students aren't handicapped. Korth stated that the Scholastic Committee would tell us. Kissock said we would also be informed by the Registrar's Office. Leroux said the only way to respond to student concerns currently is to switch categories.

Kissock called the question.

**VOTE:** Unanimous in favor (9-0-0)

**PROVISION (V) OF THE GER:** Korth read aloud the provision, "In the description of each major, there will be a statement about how students majoring in that area formally acquire computing and writing skills." Korth stated that only two disciplines, biology and psychology, have submitted a statement about how students majoring in that area formally acquire computing and writing skills. Farrell suggested that the Chair should write a reminder to the disciplines. Kissock suggested that Korth send out the message now and use examples from the two disciplines. Possibly the disciplines will get the impression that they are the only ones who haven't submitted their statement. Leroux suggested that perhaps there could be a window on the curriculum change form so the disciplines see that as something they need to deal with. Korth feels that the timing makes this a distinct task. Mooney felt Leroux's idea was a good suggestion. Possibly Form B could include this item in the future. Korth wondered how it would be set off. Mooney said just as a reminder. Korth said maybe there could be a check box. Farrell stated that if this is a requirement, how do we make students aware of it? Mooney said since the bulletin is our contract with the student and if it isn't in the bulletin, it isn't required. Kissock encouraged the chair to send the reminder and to include a note. Korth will write to the Division Chairs to get this done.

**EDP FUNDS:** Korth mentioned that the EDP funds had been frozen for the past two years. Some of the funds don't seem to be there. He stated that the Vice Chancellor for Finance is tracking them down. Lee wondered what are the chances the funds will be recovered. Korth feels it is not a matter of chance. The Vice Chancellor of Finance needs to find out what happened and correct this. Korth said the question is what should the CC do with this year's \$7,500. Lee stated that he supports the position the same as the last two years. He feels the common course has been initiated and the campus needs to do all it can to encourage the faculty to be involved with development of the course. McIntosh stated that he is opposed to this. Inquiry was a common course with a budget to support it. McIntosh questioned why this common course can't have budget support now. Farrell stated that he agrees and does not want to see the EDP funds go towards the common course for a third year. Kissock concurred. He feels it is time to move on. Kissock feels that the common course is on a good track now. We should not forget about the rest of the curriculum. Lee wanted the committee to remember the different problems related to the common course. Common course needs eighteen faculty members to teach it. The EDP funds are for innovative development of the curriculum. The Inquiry budget was for administrative support. He would not expect to need EDP funds beyond this year for the common course. Lee feels it is very important to support rather than discourage teachers of the common course. We should make a model of this program on Freshman seminars that Yudof wants.

[Taylor arrived at this point]

Kissock said that if the \$15,000 already committed are spent and more is needed, he would agree. That is where he sees the difference. The money is already there to use, so use it. Kissock also stated that the \$7,500 is the same amount

budgeted for EDP funds since the Ice Age. He feels the account should be larger, easily \$10,000. Lee would rather see the whole effort in one project this year and not divert the focus to other projects. That is why this would be a good year to keep the funds for the common course.

Frenier felt that this issue should be held over. She would like a report on how the funds were distributed. Lee stated that they were frozen. Farrell said it is now suggested that we do the same for the third year. Korth asked if the committee wished to hold this issue over. McIntosh called the question. Korth asked if there were any objections to calling the question. Frenier stated she did not feel she knew what she was doing at this point. Lee agreed. Korth said to hold the issue over until next time since we were already five minutes over our scheduled time.

Meeting adjourned 8:55 a.m.

Submitted by Melody Veenendaal