

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

## University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

---

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

---

3-12-2020

### Curriculum minutes 03/12/2020

Curriculum Committee

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

---

#### Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 03/12/2020" (2020). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 370. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/370>

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).

## **UMN Morris Curriculum Committee**

March 12, 2020, 11:40 a.m. Meeting #10

Moccasin Flower Room

Members Present: Janet Ericksen (Chair), Stacey Aronson, John Barber, Adrienne Conley, Stephen Crabtree, Simón Franco, Stephen Gross, Arne Kildegaard, Marcus Muller, Ben Narvaez, Peh Ng, Gwen Rudney, Josh Westfield

Members Absent: Stephanie Ferrian, Denise Odello, Julia Scovil, Miah McNiff

Others present: Rebecca Dean, Jess Larson, Jason Ramey, Jeri Squier

### **In these minutes: Studio Art Program Review; GenEd proposals; provisional approval for 2 courses**

#### #1 Welcome and announcements

#### #2 Approval of Minutes

Reviewed minutes. Motion (Franco, Crabtree) to approve minutes from Meeting #8 on February 25, 2020. Rudney noted that she was not present. Minutes will be revised to reflect that. Motion passed.

Motion (Franco, Crabtree) to approve minutes from Meeting #9 on February 27, 2020. Peh noted one revision to add double majored “with psychology”. Motion passed.

#### #6 Studio Art Program Review - Jess Larson and Jason Ramey

Program Strengths: Working spontaneously and working in real time, working outside the box. Teaching creativity. Program is good at teaching a set of basic fundamentals with which to approach the world. Faculty spend a lot of individualized time with students. Studio students are generally less likely to work in a disciplinary silo; they often cross many modalities, and many have an Art History major or minor. Studio Art - Biology double majors are also quite common. The discipline has a strong record of accommodating other majors, meaning that they find ways to manage such things as course time conflicts and requirements.

Program review is a constant feature of this program--studio art is always critiquing their program. They pay attention to balancing group work with individual work. Students continue to evolve as well. Ng asked about Studio Art coming up with an elective that Data Science minors would be interested in. Larson stated that they are understaffed, and it would be low priority at this point (for instance, this program review was written prior to the full time painter departure, a position that has been replaced in a

minimal way). They acknowledged that there would be interest in a 3D printing course. Cross disciplinary courses developed with biology would maybe be higher priority. Crabtree noted that in Geology, he has several students who are in Studio Art. He is grateful for Studio Art students who think outside the box. Campus wide we need to do more cross-listing of courses—better buzz words to share with students. Mapping, for example, is essentially cross-disciplinary. We could and should work more, too, on talking about major skills as marketable skills. Crabtree had a sculpture student ask why one type of clay was used over another.

Ericksen asked how Ramey's recent grant for woodworking equipment figured into the discipline now. Ramey explained that other programs have a woodshop rather than, as we do, a single shop here that is used by many students. With grant funding, we have been able to get newer, safer equipment for that shared shop. Kildegaard asked about the possibility of an off-campus makers space. Larson does not think that for now the resources are available, but if it was connected with another unit, it might be more feasible. Students are looking for digital experience that could be part of a maker space on or off campus. Larson would like to add Graphic Design position (maybe at P&A level), but such a focus is not typical of a liberal arts college Studio Art program.

Kildegaard asked about the Studio Art take on GenEd models. Larson is concerned about getting lost by being lumped in with Humanities, or getting the ArtP and FA requirements confused, blended, or lost. Visual literacy is a value we should maintain. Ericksen asked if students who take GenEd courses are a significant source of Studio Arts majors. Larson said that the answer to that was unclear, but they are putting effort into getting more students into their program. They worry about incoming students and getting them interested in making art. Statistics from across the state show small numbers in Studio Art, but we are doing well in that pool in terms of percentages. R. Dean likes the Studio Art assessment model. The discipline's 1:1 (faculty:student) for an hour work in 2nd and 4th year was noted as something valuable that students appreciate.

### #3 Tier model general education proposal

This model, from the Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts, has three well-defined tiers that we could follow by regrouping and better defining our existing program. MCLA calls it a Core Curriculum. We'd also have to move into GenEd what is now only in the majors: Tier III is a Capstone Experience. Morris has most students doing a capstone, but it isn't defined as a GenEd requirement. Doing so might allow students with multiple majors to do only one capstone, which many students have asked for. This model sets out criteria that then all students would meet as outcomes, but if students pursue only one capstone, Franco suggested that students would then miss important interactions with faculty. Narvaez suggested a campus capstone experience that isn't tied directly to

any major. Crabtree commented that some majors might be difficult to meet all criteria. Ng commented that if the student incorporates all majors, they can use same core topic to meet all major requirements.

Squier did a readability study of our current GenEd and found it difficult to read: reading level grade 34. Also, the catalog provides no preamble to or explanation of our GenEd program. She suggests the MCLA layout to make it easier to understand, even if we make no other changes. Given that we are unlikely to have a new GenEd fully approved for the next catalog, this model could help us present the current requirements (or modestly different ones) more clearly. At minimum, we can expect to see brought forward a proposal to change the FL requirement from Foreign Language to World Language. Franco asked about the WLA changes for the next catalog. A proposal is pending, so far as Ericksen knows. It will go through the division, this committee, and Assembly, like other catalog changes. The MCLA model has only 4 categories in Tier II; we'd have many more in our current GenEd program.

Outcomes can and probably will be added to the GenEd current requirements for the next catalog.

#### #4 Recap of Campus Conversation (March 4, 2020)

Ericksen asked for anyone who participated in the campus conversation about general education to share information that would be good for CC to know. A Scholastic Committee member asked if the number of petitions related to our current GenEd program had been considered. Ng explained that the proposals were put together with the guidelines given at Curriculum Committee. Dean remembers that there was not overwhelming preference for any one of the proposals. There were many questions about how it would be implemented and what is the next step. It is to be expected that disciplines are nervous about changes. Ericksen proposed that some disciplines might actually benefit when requirements are presented in a meaningful way. FYE course being developed, which came up at the conversation, will come through CC for approval.

#### #5 Course revisions for provisional approval

The instructors hope to offer these courses in fall 2020, and CC's practice is to review a minimal number of courses seeking mid-catalog changes if those changes were minor and clearly would not negatively affect students' progress toward degree.

CSci 4403. Systems: Data Mining. Course presented to be offered in the fall. They are expanding an existing course to match an instructor's expertise. It will not revert to a 2-credit when that specific instructor leaves.

Motion (Ng, Narvaez) to give provisional approval for changes to CSci 4403. Motion passed (9-0-0).

Engl 2034. Contemporary Indian and Caribbean Literature. Discipline is seeking to move from 3xxx to 2xxx so more lower-level offerings are available to students. It is moving from a course with prerequisites to one without. Committee suggested changing the course name to Contemporary Literature from India and the Caribbean, to minimize potential confusion about "Indian." The course is described as a survey that follows the survey sequence, which left its place in the discipline's structure unclear to some members of the committee. Ericksen and the committee are looking for more explanation of the need for the change and what actually will change in course content in the move from 3000- to 2000-level. Committee decided to delay voting now and will ask for name change and further clarification. English will be contacted for more clarification, which will then be shared by email to committee members. Voting can happen electronically so that the course can, if approved, be listed in the schedule as soon as possible.