

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Curriculum Committee Minutes

Curriculum Committee

11-12-2020

Curriculum minutes 11/12/2020

Curriculum Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Curriculum Committee, "Curriculum minutes 11/12/2020" (2020). *Curriculum Committee Minutes*. 384. <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/curriculum/384>

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.

UMN Morris Curriculum Committee

November 12, 2020, 11:40 a.m. Meeting #11

Zoom

Members Present: Janet Ericksen (Chair), Stacey Aronson, John Barber, Cameron Berthiaume, Barbara Burke, Rebecca Dean, Jennifer Deane, Simón Franco, Stephen Gross, Nic McPhee, Marcus Muller, Ben Narvaez, Peh Ng, Michelle Page, Shanda Pittman, Emily Wittkop

Members Absent: none

Others present: Lisa Bevevino, Emma Kloos, Jeri Squier, Robyn VanEps

In these minutes: Catalog changes Cleanup, Writing Requirement

#1 Welcome and announcements

This is the last meeting of the semester.

#2 Approval of minutes

Motion and second (McPhee, Page) to approve minutes from Meeting #8 - October 22, 2020. Motion passed (12-0-0).

Motion and second (Barber, Deane) to approve minutes from Meeting #9 - October 29, 2020. Dean will be moved to "members present" and out of "others present" to reflect her ex-officio status on the committee. Motion passed (11-0-1).

Motion and second (Franco, Narvaez) to approve minutes from Meeting #10 - November 5, 2020. Motion passed (10-0-2).

#3 Catalog changes - Cleanup

There will be additional cleanup items at the start of next semester.

Continued review of French request to include 8 credits of S/N. Lisa Bevevino is present to explain. 2001 and 2002 are the basis for this request. Students have shared concern for wanting to continue in the language but are concerned about their GPA. Allowing students to take courses S/N encourages them to take a chance and continue with the language. Franco asked if the S/N allowance is just for these two courses or is it open to other courses. Bevevino responded that they did leave it vague and would accept other courses, but they could also limit it to those courses for this catalog. Narvaez asked if other disciplines could then follow. Particularly if other disciplines do request similar changes, more discussion seems likely in order to set a campus standard. Ericksen commented that students are increasingly grade concerned, as the cost of education rises. Deane commented that being flexible is very important now and in the future. Dean also supported flexibility. McPhee reiterated that the floor of S/N is essentially the same as the major requirement of a minimum grade of C-. He supports encouraging exploration without as much risk and would support even more. Franco agrees with

flexibility. He asked about the impact on graduate programs. Bevevino has seen students very successfully go on to graduate school where recommendations are more important. Squier commented that a greater discussion and parameters are necessary. McPhee stated that concern for our own students should be the first consideration. Advising can help address and guide student choices. Motion from Humanities and seconded by McPhee to allow 8 credits of S/N in French. Motion passed (12-0-1).

McPhee asked if we have statistics about the number of students who go on to graduate school. Ericksen stated that it is voluntary for graduates to share that information with us, so we do not have reliable statistics on this.

Designator change: World Languages (WL) instead of Foreign Languages (FL). Language faculty are supportive and Humanities has approved the name change. The change acknowledges that Native languages are not foreign languages and is more in line with what other colleges offer. Motion made by Franco, Burke to approve change. Wittkop commented that WL is close to WI and might be indistinguishable in small print. Ericksen shared that WI (writing intensive) will be proposed as WE (writing enriched), in part due to the same concern. Motion passed (13-0-0)

Practicum courses. Squier shared that as proposed, practicums could only be repeated four times. The proposal is that only 4 credits will count toward the 120 credits needed for the BA, but up to 12 credits could be earned. A new form asks for more information about the learning activity and evaluation. Page appreciates the new form and the question about the learning activity. Burke asked about why it is only for three divisions. Ng commented that internships and paid TA's are more generally used. Only Biology currently has a practicum. Science and Math could be added to the practicum choice in the future. Motion includes IS 3820 which only has provisional approval. Motion passed (13-0-0).

Motion from Science and Math for two additional course revisions, seconded by Narvaez. Remove prerequisite from Math 4401 to accommodate more students. Changing CSci 4604 description and changing prerequisite. Motion passed (13-0-0).

Motion from Education to approve ED 1103. The course description was revised to clarify the difference between this course and the MLEAD program. Title was also changed to Fundamentals of Student Development and Support. It no longer uses the leadership word which was causing confusion. Ng asked about the 0 credit option and Page clarified that it allows students to take the class more than once. Motion passed (12-0-1).

Description for IS 1051 changed to better define the course. Motion from Franco to approve IS 1051, seconded by Deane. Motion passed (13-0-0).

#4 Writing Requirement

Ericksen shared the current summary of the General Education Writing Requirement proposals. Neither of the two new options has ENGL 2109 continuing to carry the WLA designation; it

instead is likely to be an additional Writing Enriched course. The proposals under review and ready, pending the decision of this committee, to go to Campus Assembly for a vote began with a proposal put forward by the English discipline last winter. It was first discussed at Curriculum Committee and then was reviewed by an interdisciplinary working group. That group was not asked to take ownership of the proposal; rather, the members reviewed the proposal to determine what problems or concerns there were and what questions needed to be answered ahead of further Curriculum Committee discussion. Resulting feedback and then subsequent fall consulting feedback (including with MCSA, Scholastic, Consultative, and Curriculum as well as campus conversation) is reflected in the current set of proposals.

Proposal 1 would require WLA and one writing enriched (WE) course. The 2 credit minimum was determined to recognize that at the formative level, a course of fewer than 2 credits would have difficulty meeting the demands of teaching writing in addition to any other course content, and we want to give some weight to WE requirement. The desired level of instruction seems highly unlikely to be attained with a one credit course. A sequenced set of courses, each one credit, could reach the required level of instruction, so long as students complete the second course. McPhee brought up that Ted Pappenfus has repeatedly raised the concern about allowing a one-credit course to fulfil the requirement. The course would have to be very focused on writing, but if it was, he questioned if there was another reason to exclude it. Narvaez reiterated that it seems unlikely that a one-credit course could fulfil all the requirements. Dean asked if Pappenfus has a specific course in mind. McPhee answered that it is a research class that Pappenfus believes would meet all the criteria, even at only one credit. Dean then asked if the course is truly one credit in content or work. Wittkop shared their personal experience with it and that the amount of required work is more than one credit's worth. The course is, though, part of a sequence, so the addition of a sequenced set of courses could apply if Pappenfus brought both courses forward for consideration.

Proposal 2 is to require WLA and two writing enriched (WE) courses. Individual conferences would not be required at the upper level, if proposal 2 is approved. Burke shared that her preference is for Proposal 2, option B. She likes the transition of change, but takes a small step forward. Berthiaume asked about Engl 2109 no longer being an alternative to Engl 1601. The 2109 course is being offered as an alternative to 1601 when no exceptions were available to students who had already taken a WLA course. Ericksen explained that if one of the proposals is implemented, exemptions will be allowed for 1601, so 2109 will be counted as a W course rather than allowing students to double count it as both WLA and WE.

Pittman shared that MCSA voted in favor of proposal 1, mostly due to concern about availability of courses. Ericksen shared some frustration over that vote, since MCSA did not request or have when they voted all of the current information about course availability (specifically, the results from the second survey that was sent to disciplines regarding existing courses in their majors that seem likely to meet the WE standard). Narvaez asked about proposal 1 not including 3xxx level courses. Ericksen noted that this exclusion is from the original English proposal and addresses the student and faculty concern that more writing instruction was needed specifically at the lower level. Narvaez shared that History has students jump into 3xxx

level courses so they would benefit from a course at the 3xxx level if it met all the criteria. Ericksen agreed that other considerations could continue to be explored, but at some point, a proposal has to be settled upon and moved forward, and this one has been in development for more than a year. A first poll was launched to determine the committee's wishes about moving forward. There was one vote to keep the current writing requirement and seven votes to move forward with a revision. [remaining voting members: Ng, McPhee, Narvaez, Burke, Page, 3 students]. Ericksen and McPhee agree that more time would benefit the discussion of the proposals, but the committee is constrained by community hour scheduling--and we have met weekly this fall. Ericksen stated that she favors Proposal 2A, which is still less than the Twin Cities writing requirement. Page shared that Education majors would have difficulty with that and so she favors Proposal 1 or 2B. Deane shared that 2A could be a future decision. Burke would prefer ranked choice voting, but this preliminary poll is not set up that way. Committee first voted between option A and B. Three members voted for A and four members voted for B. The final poll between Proposal 1 and 2. Five of those committee members still present--the meeting ran over time by 20 minutes--preferred Proposal 1 and three members preferred Proposal 2; two members who had to leave before the poll later reported preference for Proposal 2.

Pittman asked about the possibility of designating in the schedule the topic, other than writing instruction, of each WLA course. Ericksen explained that for at least a decade (for both ENGL 1601 and its predecessor), such designation has been discussed off and on, and it isn't practical from a registration standpoint.

The writing requirement revisions will go forward at the next Campus Assembly, with ranked choice voting between the two options, after a vote between no change and one of these proposals.