

North Park University
School of Business and Nonprofit Management

SBNM 5745
Higher Education Curriculum Development

Spring, 2014
Online

Observations to ponder:

**“Changing a curriculum has all the physical and psychological problems of moving a graveyard”
-- Malcolm Gillis, (then) President of Rice University**

**“Curricular history is American history and therefore carries the burden of revealing the central purposes and driving directions of American society.”
--Frederick Rudolph (prominent historian of higher education)**

**“More important than the curriculum is the questions of the methods of teaching and the spirit in which the teaching is given.”
-- Bertrand Russell**

FACILITATOR: Chris Nicholson, Ph.D.
Office location: Old Main, third floor
Office phone: 773-244-5518
Cell phone: 773-318-3452 (Please do not call after 10 p.m. CST)
E-mail: cnicholson@northpark.edu

Welcome to Higher Education Curriculum Development!

Take a moment and reflect on your undergraduate experience, specifically the courses you took in college. At some point – or perhaps on several occasions! – I imagine you asked yourself the question, “Why do I need to take this course?” Do you recall what led you to ask the question? Perhaps you felt the course provided no practical value and/or you would never apply the knowledge gained in the course? Or perhaps you felt the content did not relate to your major?

Reflect on your undergraduate curriculum a bit longer and additional questions may come to mind. You might wonder who created – and mandated – courses required in your major and degree, or why you could not develop a personalized curriculum that better address your personal professional interests. Perhaps you question how external variables influence faculty and administrators as they create curricula.

Fast forward to today. You currently work at a college or university, aspire to work in one, or desire to broaden your knowledge about higher education administration. Have you reflected on the curriculum-related questions you puzzled about as an undergraduate – and perhaps now, as a graduate student? If you work in higher education – especially within program management, have you grappled with questions about the curriculum in meetings, on committees, and with colleagues? Others of you perhaps haven’t given much thought about them since your undergraduate experience.

Regardless of whether you ponder curriculum related issues frequently, or if you haven't given much thought to curriculum matters since your undergraduate experience, we can benefit from better understanding this thing we call the undergraduate curriculum. But where do we start? And what parameters will frame our study of curriculum? How can we get our hands around this living, breathing big idea (the undergraduate curriculum) that is at times ambiguous, surly, amorphous, unwieldy, frustrating, and....*created* by us?

There are several frameworks we might employ to study the American undergraduate curriculum. Consider, for example, some perspectives:

- A historical perspective (from Harvard's founding in 1636)
- A philosophical perspective (what should be taught and learned)
- A thematic perspective (analyzing curricular trends)
- A learner perspective (analysis of curriculum on different types of learners)
- A stakeholder perspective (analysis of how curriculum responds to non-student stakeholders)
- A instructional perspective (analysis of how curriculum is delivered)
- A design perspective (analysis of how curriculum is designed)
- An administrative perspective (analysis of curriculum is managed and administered)
- An assessment perspective (analysis of how curriculum is assessed and evaluated)
- A hierarchical/institutional perspective (analysis of community college and traditional four year institutions and public, private, and proprietary – for-profit – institutions)

Are there other perspectives through which you wish to study and evaluate the undergraduate curriculum?

Obviously, we'd like to explore thoroughly all of these frameworks, but North Park's curriculum limits us to seven weeks ☺ – therefore, our course design will feature three major themes, each of which will address to varying degrees many of the perspectives noted above. I should also add that our study will generally focus on the undergraduate curriculum, although the Lattuca and Stark text transcends hierarchical boundaries, and the Conrad and Johnson text includes readings about issues related to the graduate curriculum (I invite you to explore these resources as you see fit). Now, the three themes we'll study:

The what and why of curriculum

Philosophy, mission, purposes, concepts, definitions, objectives, aims, history, influences on, content, functions of higher education curriculum

The who and how of curriculum

Creation, delivery, administration, and assessment of the curriculum

The future of curriculum

What factors and issues will determine the future of the higher education curriculum?

COURSE GOALS & LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After staying relatively constant for the first 250 years of American higher education, the undergraduate curriculum has undergone significant change since the late 1800s, and continues to represent a battleground of competing aims, ideas, etc. for what undergraduates should learn and know.

Throughout the course we'll explore the undergraduate curriculum from a variety of angles, focusing on three central themes:

- The what and why of curriculum
- The who and how of curriculum
- The future of curriculum

The purpose of the course is to enhance and sharpen your understanding of the American undergraduate curriculum, and specifically the elements of effective curricular analysis, planning, design, implementation, and evaluation. The course will also help you:

- Articulate your perspectives on the purpose and structures of the undergraduate curriculum (and what factors inform your perspectives)
- Explain the historical development and evolution of the undergraduate curriculum within the context of the political, social, and cultural landscape of the United States and higher education
- Evaluate critically the set of assumptions and general theories that informed curriculum design, both from a historical and contemporary perspective, including emerging perspectives on curriculum development
- Examine the influence and relationships of and between stakeholders on curricular change – and the dynamics of academic change – and how these can vary in different types of institutions
- Develop and hone administrative skills in formulating, developing, implementing, and evaluating curriculum and academic programs.
- Understand, anticipate, and prepare for curricular trends and challenges within colleges and universities, particularly those growing out of increased learner diversity, rapid technological change, and increased focus on assessment and outcomes

North Park uses an IDEA course rating system (administered at the end of the course) to measure your progress toward learning objectives, and satisfaction with your overall learning experience. You'll receive the electronic course evaluation after completion of the course. The feedback you provide on the evaluation is extremely important to me personally (I use this feedback to modify/improve the course each year), and to the School of Business and Nonprofit Management and, as such, I implore (is that a strong enough word!) to complete the IDEA evaluation at the end of the course.

Within the IDEA course rating system, there are several objectives that I, as the course facilitator, can choose to emphasize throughout the course. Although you will be asked to evaluate your learning in the course on a number of metrics, I ask that you keep the following three objectives top-of-mind throughout the course:

- Comprehension of fundamental principles, generalizations, or theories
- Application of course material to improve thinking, problem solving, and decisions
- Develop specific skills, competencies, and points of view needed by professionals in the field

One of my goals as the course facilitator is to enable you to learn as much as you can in our time together.

Please contact me if you have questions or observations about any aspect of the course. I am more than happy to help, and I welcome your interest and queries regarding the class, higher education, or North Park University!

WHAT WE'LL READ

There are two required books for this course, and one required case study:

Foster, Leonar (Sr. Ed.), and Conrad, Clifton F. and Johnson, Jason (Eds.) (2012). *College and university curriculum. Placing learning at the epicenter of courses, programs and institutions*. Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
Please note that this text is abbreviated C&J in the assignments section.

Lattuca, Lisa and Stark, Joan. (2009). Shaping the college curriculum: Academic plans in context. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
Please note that this text is abbreviated L&S in the assignments section.

Harvard Education Publishing Group. (1999). *Locke College*.

The case study may be purchased online at <http://www.hepg.org/hepg/case/10/LockeCollege>

The Lattuca and Stark text is considered by many curriculum scholars as the watershed book on higher education curriculum from the last quarter century. The first edition – published in 1997 – quickly went out of print (and was very expensive on the secondary market), so we're fortunate Lattuca and Stark published a second edition, which they significantly revised and updated. As a result, do not purchase the first edition of this text. It is imperative that you obtain the updated second edition.

In addition to the required texts, we will also study several articles that you may access online through the North Park library.

I strongly suggest that you read, if you don't already, the Chronicle of Higher Education and Inside Higher Education (IHE). IHE is an international online news site about higher education (www.insidehighered.com), and we will refer to articles in the Chronicle and IHE throughout the course.

Throughout the course you may want to investigate the following websites, all of which are good resources for information about higher education curriculum and college students.

The Chronicle of Higher Education	www.chronicle.com
Inside Higher Education	www.insidehighered.com
American Council on Education	www.acenet.edu
National Association of Student Personnel Administrators	www.naspa.org
Association of College Personnel Administrators	www.myacpa.org
American Association for Higher Education	www.aahe.org
Association for the Study of Higher Education	www.ashe.ws
American Educational Research Association	www.aera.net/divisions/j
A privately maintained site with excellent links, including instructions to sign up for listservs related to student affairs	www.Studentaffairs.com
A private higher education resource site with links to many useful and interesting higher education sites	www.Higher-Ed.org

A final note: This course is relatively "reading heavy," and, quite honestly, I struggle with the amount of reading to assign. On one hand, readings serve as a conduit to important knowledge and perspectives, help stimulate thinking and critique, and provide a common foundation for class dialogue. I recognize, however, that too much reading – by virtue of sheer workload – can dull comprehension, inhibit deep thinking and reflection and, therefore, stifle

learning. As a result, I sometimes divide weekly readings into two sections: required and optional. Please address the optional readings only after you've read carefully and reflected upon the required readings.

As you engage with the readings, I encourage you to reflect upon the following questions. Some students find it helpful to jot down their observations/thoughts regarding the questions:

- What are the most important ideas expressed in the readings and why? A corollary: what are the strengths and limitations of these ideas, especially as it relates to professional practice
- What connections between theory and practice (if any) do you find most meaningful? A corollary: how can the reading help inform professional practice?
- To what extent is your experiences similar to or different from the major ideas expressed in the reading, and why do you think that is the case?

MY APPROACH TO TEACHING AND LEARNING

In his excellent book, *The Courage to Teach*, Parker Palmer observes that teachers teach who they are. Put another way, a teacher's (and aren't we all teachers at many points in our lives?) knowledge and instructional techniques are informed by his/her collective experience, wisdom, beliefs, biases, passions, etc. – in short, who they are as an individual. Palmer suggests that teachers are generally more effective in maximizing student learning if their approach to teaching aligns with their true self, or *authentic* self. As I am passionate about teaching and learning (my true self), my teaching philosophy is distinctly *learning*-centered (as opposed to *learner*-centered) and strongly rooted in constructivist theory (more on that later!).

Over the last decade, several commentators have noted that the ways U.S. colleges and universities typically approach teaching and learning is antiquated, and largely has been since Harvard was founded as the first U.S. college in 1636. They note that postsecondary institutions need to move from an educational paradigm focused on instruction (or the act of teaching) to one focused on learning. In short, a learning paradigm makes student learning the driving consideration in all administrative decisions at all levels of a university. Rather than focusing on how to deliver effective instruction, the learning paradigm stresses that what matters most is student learning, and how well instructors and others design and manage learning environments to maximize student learning.

Within the context of a learning paradigm, the teacher's role becomes that of a designer, facilitator, coach, role model, and learning partner, one who seeks to create and nurture a learning environment in which all participants come to know and develop understanding of the subject that connects them together. Metaphorically, the teacher is a craftsman, who patiently and lovingly shares his or her craft with others.

The learning paradigm is informed by the "constructivist stance" on teaching and learning. In a nutshell, constructivist education "emphasize(s) the active role of learners in building and interpreting their own understanding of reality.... [this] view of learning rests on the assumption that knowledge is constructed by learners as they attempt to make meaning of the subject under formal or informal study within a given context." (Stage, et. al., 1999, p. 34). Accordingly, the student's role is that of a self-directed inquirer and learning collaborator, working alone and with others to develop meaningful insights into the subject. Educators whose teaching is informed by constructivist theory generally tend to:

1. emphasize shared responsibility among all learners (teachers and students alike) for constructing and making sense of knowledge within a learning laboratory;
2. involve students actively in the learning process, encouraging them to "think out loud" in class;
3. appreciate and support multiple (and, often, different) perspectives on knowledge and practice

4. emphasize the critical role that others play in the learning process, particularly in terms of how they help each other interpret, make meaning, and promote understanding of the subject.
5. emphasize the importance that our understanding of any particular concept or issue is informed by the context in which the learning occurs; and
6. use challenging and relevant investigations in realistic contexts that provide learners with authentic opportunities to apply what they are learning in meaningful ways, exercises that often requires learners to explore rival approaches and solutions. (Haworth, 2004, p. 3-4)

I invite you to join me in creating a learning-centered educational environment in which all of us can develop a deeper understanding of curriculum through invigorating and respectful dialogue, a spirit of inquiry, and a willingness to make learning fun – for both yourself and others in the course. To help us achieve this, I ask that each of us (teacher and student alike) work to help develop a welcoming course environment where we all feel valued and “safe” to share our perspectives, and a willingness to respectfully examine others’ assumptions and test new ideas.

ONLINE COURSE TEACHING & LEARNING METHODS & RESPONSIBILITIES

This course is offered in an intensive online format, and it’s essential that you keep current with reading assignments and online discussions of the reading. To pass the course, you must complete the assigned readings each and every week. While the readings offer us (as a class) a common foundation with which to explore our thinking, the readings themselves do not determine or create thinking – rather, that is your job as a learner. Therefore, I encourage you to read critically, think about how the readings interact with your previous beliefs and professional practice, and perhaps reflect on the following questions: Do I understand what is being explained? Do these ideas fit my experience? Do they change how I think about issues? What are the implications of these ideas on my practice in higher education? What are the issues that emerge from these concepts and ideas?

Each week’s discussion draws directly from the readings, and your posts should incorporate important points from the readings (in order to receive the maximum points). Again, allow me to reiterate this point: your posts should routinely incorporate and/or apply lessons from the readings.

Successful completion of the assignments in this course requires thorough preparation, critical analysis, and reflection, which, in turn, demand an adequate allocation of time and effort. **There is simply no shortcut to producing good, thoughtful work. As a result, I expect you to put forth an honest, aggressive, and enthusiastic effort towards your performance in the course.**

Weekly Course Schedule

Each week, I will post questions on the course site to stimulate discussion on that week’s reading. Think of this dialogue as discussion that might take place in a classroom. Therefore, you may respond directly to the question asked, but I also expect that you will respond to the thoughts and ideas presented by your colleagues. Indeed, the more robust the discussion on particular topics, the greater opportunity for learning.

Beginning with week two, one or more students (depending on the enrollment in the course) will be assigned each week to serve as discussion leaders. In this role, it is the responsibility of these students to provide the opening posts to that’s week’s discussion questions, to “manage” the discussion during the week by posting frequently and probing other’s posts, and to post a summary of the key points at the end of the week. Discussion leaders will be assigned during the first week of the course.

Discussion questions for each week of the course will be posted on the course site in the discussion forum section. I've provided below a "standard operating procedure" for our weekly reading assignments and online discussion. As professional courtesy to your class colleagues (and as a means of facilitating discussion), please strictly adhere to the deadlines established.

1. Complete all assigned readings for the week no later than Wednesday evening. Please note it is essential that you complete your assigned readings for each week as early as possible in order to provide meaningful and substantive discussion comments. Remember, you should spend time thinking and reflecting on the readings before posting.
2. The week's discussion begins at 8 p.m. CT each Monday.
3. The week's discussion ends (and the discussion forum closes) at 9 p.m. CT the following Sunday.
4. At the close of postings, I will review your posts for the week for that week and assign your weekly points (which you can review at the grade book section of the course site).

Please note that as the course progresses, your posts should reflect your growing understanding of the undergraduate curriculum. As a result, your posts may refer to previously covered topics that are germane to the issues we are discussing that week.

In order to maximize your learning and facilitate an enjoyable educational experience for all of us, it's extremely important that we are comfortable with certain expectations and responsibilities important in an online course. I've outlined below several rubrics which will guide our time together and inform our dialogue. Please carefully review them, and contact me immediately if you are uncomfortable with the expectations.

Student Expectations and Responsibilities

1. You will take primary responsibility for your own learning throughout this course.
2. Your presence online is required for this course. You are expected to log in to the course site a minimum of **four to five times per week throughout the week** – not just on one day – and post substantive comments throughout the week.
3. You are expected to post substantive contributions. Simply saying or "I agree" is not considered a substantive contribution (see *Guidelines for Writing Good Discussion Comments* in the Course Information folder on Moodle for more detail and examples of "good" posts). **In most cases, simply relating your professional or collegiate experiences without reference to the readings is not considered a substantive post.**

In order to receive points available for each week's discussion forum, your posts need to respond to the guidelines outlined in Criteria for Grading Moodle Discussion Forum Participation on page 11 of the syllabus. Please also remember the golden rule for online posting: The quality of comments is more important than the quantity. As a result, your posts should rarely exceed 250 words.

4. **You are expected to post regularly throughout the week (say, Wednesday, Friday, and Sunday).** We are a learning community (we learn from one another), and professional courtesy requires that you reflect on (and respond to) the comments of your colleagues throughout the week, just as they will reflect on and may respond to your observations. Therefore, it's unfair to your colleagues to post "all at once" or post the majority of your comments very late in the week – say, on Sunday afternoon. As a result, I do not grant credit for posts that are made all at once, or when a majority of posts are made on Saturday and/or Sunday.

5. Although I strongly suggest that all issues, questions, and problems be dealt with online, you may contact me by phone regarding course issues at any time (please no phone calls after 10 p.m. CT).
6. It is imperative that you practice good netiquette (see *A Guide to Netiquette* in the Course Information folder on Moodle). Please be aware that I have zero tolerance for inappropriate netiquette.
7. In general, online courses require a greater commitment of time (per week) than face-to-face courses. Please don't conflate the convenience of an online course with the significant amount of time it requires. **In general, expect to spend 11-13 hours per week on course responsibilities (readings, assignments, online discussion)**, recognizing this figure will vary depending on your knowledge of the material, the amount of materials/deliverables due, and your study habits. If you don't have this amount of time to devote to the class, I strongly suggest that you take the course at another time.
8. We are all busy professionals, and unexpected situations sometimes arise that may compromise your ability to make posts as promptly as you might like (e.g. business trips, illness, computer glitch). Please be aware, however, that the learning of your colleagues will be disrupted by your tardiness. Because of this, and given that maximization of student learning is my ultimate goal for the course, no late posts will be accepted for course credit.
9. As I mentioned earlier, we are community of learners. Just as you will learn for your colleagues, they will learn from you. As a result, it's essential – both for your learning and your colleagues' – that you enthusiastically participate in all facets of the course. If circumstances in your personal/professional life preclude you from making a serious commitment to the course, it's not fair to you or your peers in the course. Therefore, if any of the following circumstances apply I strongly suggest you take the course at another time, and when you can devote to it your full attention:
 - ✓ You do not have access to a computer at home.
 - ✓ You do not have the time to take a face-to-face course. If you don't have time to take a face-to-face course, you certainly won't have the time to take an online course. Please note this is not a scheduling issue – this is a time issue. Expect to devote 10-13 hours per week towards this course.
 - ✓ You expect this course to be easier than a face-to-face course (as former students will testify, an online course is often more time-intensive).
 - ✓ You expect to spend **ANY** length of time away from a computer with an internet connection. This is a course with regular due dates and commitments, and I do not accept late posts.

A note on personal responsibility

As students and professionals, we are responsible for our academic and professional work, and we recognize that a lack of responsibility is often detrimental to our fellow students or co-workers. Therefore, it's incumbent upon each of us to take responsibility for our active and enthusiastic engagement in the course – whether it's participating on the discussion board, completing assignments, or grading papers.

As it relates to this course (and perhaps many other things in our life!), I encourage you to observe personal responsibility through this very simple lens:

- Show up To engage with one another requires that you participate.
- Do the work Complete assignments on time.
- Own it Your work is a reflection of who you are. Take pride in your work – own it! – and devote sufficient time to producing thoughtful, high quality work.

Course Facilitator Responsibilities and Expectations

True to my constructivist approach toward teaching and learning, I see my role in this course as your “learning facilitator.” I do not see my role as one that requires me to respond to every post – or every third post, for that matter. Although I will participate frequently in course discussions, I will rely upon you to share important learnings and observations and for you to take primary responsibility for your learning throughout the course.

Specifically, you can expect from me:

1. To design the course and learning modules in such a way that students have every opportunity to achieve the learning objectives.
2. To not lead the online discussion; rather I will provide reactions to your responses and discussion as appropriate in order to clarify important ideas and concepts.
3. To provide relevant readings and assignments, including updated information on relevant resources for the various topics of interest.
4. To read and critically assess your assignments and provide feedback within 7-10 days of receipt.
5. To respond to all student correspondence within 48 hours of receipt.
6. To evaluate student progress in the course and provide a final grade.

Computer Requirements

In order to effectively participate in and successfully complete this course, each student must meet the minimum hardware, software, and connectivity computer specifications as outlined by the Office of Distributed Learning. If you have any questions about this, please review minimum requirements on North Park’s website.

EXPLANATION OF EVALUATION & ASSIGNMENTS

I believe that evaluation should serve as an enriching activity that achieves three outcomes:

- Allows you to demonstrate your understanding of the material
- Provides for critical and constructive feedback that further clarifies and enhances understanding
- Promotes self-knowledge through self-reflection of what is learned, and the implications this learning may have for your continued professional growth and development

In short, evaluation helps us learn more about what we do well, and in what areas we can improve. In this context, there is no better evaluator than *you*. I believe strongly that as highly engaged learners (which we all are, right?!), we must take responsibility for our learning. To do so well requires that we learn how to reflect critically upon our strengths and limitations. Self examination through critical reflection and assessment is often difficult, as it requires unflinching honesty as we acknowledge and begin to understand our fears, limitation, and areas for growth as we seek to enhance our strengths.

As course facilitator, I will provide you with timely and extensive feedback regarding your work. Just as critically reflective professionals carefully evaluate feedback regarding their performance, I expect that you, too, will reflect on the feedback I provide as a point of reference to target improvement where needed and enhance your engagement with the content.

To provide evidence of understanding, I will ask each of you to complete several assignments throughout the course. Each assignment will allow you to demonstrate your understanding of the American undergraduate curriculum, explore the relevance of these understandings to your personal and professional experiences, and promote reflection on the implications your understandings may have for your professional practice. The assignments that you complete throughout the course will comprise your “learning portfolio.” Elements of the learning portfolio include:

Portfolio Item	Due Date	Points Possible
Moodle posts in response to readings and colleagues’ observations; discussion leader for a week	All posts must be made by 9 p.m. CT on Sunday ending the week.	50 points for posts (6 points for each week, and 8 points for serving as discussion leader)
Philosophy of Education Statement	January 27 @ 8 a.m.	30 points
Final project deliverable 1 Overview and scope of project	February 3 @ 8 a.m.	15 points
Locke College case study	None	Everyone will receive 20 points for this assignment
Final project deliverable 2 Internal/external factors & interview results	February 19 @ 8 a.m.	25 points
Final project deliverable 3 Complete paper	March 4 @ 8 a.m.	50 points
Professional Assessment Commentary	March 3 @ 8 a.m.	30 points

		220 Total Points
--	--	-------------------------

Moodle posts and discussion leader

You will receive up to a maximum of 6 points for participating in each of the week's discussion forums. Please refer to the section "Criteria for Evaluation" below for information on how I will grade discussion posts. In addition, you will receive up to a maximum of 8 points for serving as forum discussion leader for one week. As forum facilitator, you are expected to post frequently and help manage the week's conversation. In this role, you might think of yourself as the conductor of an orchestra or master chef in a fine restaurant, in that you help guide the conversation (just as you might guide music making and the preparation of a seven course meal) by encouraging dialogue, posing questions that clarify and expand others' posts, soliciting feedback about questions/topics, and making sure to bring to the conversation perspectives from course readings.

Philosophy of education statement

As you will learn throughout the course, stakeholders in undergraduate education have differing beliefs about the purposes and goals post-secondary education, and those assumptions help shape the undergraduate curriculum. As someone who currently participates in curricular design (or will in the future), it's important that you become conscious of and actively examine your beliefs and how they currently (or will) influence your professional practice – indeed, as reflective practitioners we should understand how our beliefs guide our work and interactions with our colleagues.

For this portfolio item, I want you to compose a short essay (1,500 – 2,000 words) in which you articulate your beliefs about undergraduate education and how these guide (or should guide) your administrative and/or teaching practice. Please be sure to comment on how and what factors have shaped your beliefs, and feel free to reference the impact on your thinking of ideas and research from theorists, teachers, and philosophers.

Locke College Case Study

Please refer to the course site for instructions regarding the case study.

Final course project

Throughout the course we will discuss and debate the "how" of curriculum development, and we'll use as a foundation for our study Lattuca and Stark's text, which promotes the concept of an "academic plan" for curricular development and change.

As professionals working in higher education, curriculum is all around us – whether the formal curriculum or the extra curriculum – and it's important that we hone our skills in analyzing and developing academic plans. With that in mind, the final project for the course asks you to complete a comprehensive analysis of a component of the formal curriculum (degree, major, certificate, general education program, etc.) at a college or university of your choosing. Your analysis will include an interview with an individual who oversees and, ideally, helped develop the curriculum under examination.

The assignment will loosely follow Lattuca and Stark's framework for an academic plan, and your final analysis will include:

- A detailed description of the curriculum under review
- A comprehensive examination of the strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum that makes sure to address key elements of academic plans, including (but not limited to) institutional mission, academic disciplines, learners, instructional processes, evaluation and assessment, external and internal factors, leadership, and financial considerations

- An academic plan that addresses in detail your ideas for improving the curriculum or pursuing an alternative course of action (say, sunsetting the curriculum or merging it with another program), including factors (political, financial, etc.) that may impede the changes you suggest.
- Discussion of strategies you would employ to accomplish your recommendation(s) (how you would effect and influence the change process), and an overview of the practical considerations regarding implementation of your proposed changes

As you approach this assignment, you might think of yourself as a consultant who has been hired to evaluate the curriculum you choose. As such, you will need to develop a strong understanding of the college/university in general, and the department/unit which houses the curriculum specifically. As you continue your analysis, you will need data on the curriculum under examination: number of students, faculty, graduates, etc., and you will speak with at least person who is intimately familiar with the curriculum. Finally, in your final report, you will offer recommendations for improvement, whether in the current curriculum itself, or in the process of curriculum making.

Your final paper – consisting of 5,500 – 6,500 words, exclusive of addenda – should carefully connect with the theoretical models, ideas, and best practices from our readings and class discussions.

The final project consists of three distinct deliverables, the first two of which will contribute directly to the last deliverable, your final paper.

Final project deliverable 1: Overview of project and basic information

For the first deliverable, you will provide an overview of your planned project, including the following elements:

- Short description of the college or university you have chosen, including the institution's history, mission, enrollment, and other characteristics that are germane to your analysis.
- Description of the curricular area you expect to analyze. Be sure to identify specifically what you are analyzing (degree, major, etc.), the level (graduate or undergraduate) and relevant information regarding the unit of the university in which the program is housed (school/department), including the governance structure of the unit which manages the curricular area under analysis. You will also provide an overview of the curricular area, including mission (if any), enrollment, number of faculty, curriculum delivery methods, assessment mechanisms utilized (if any), etc.
- Name and title of the person(s) you expect to interview as part of your analysis

The focus of this paper is more about reporting (an overview of what you'll study) than an in-depth analysis. You will begin to analyze the curriculum in the second paper (deliverable 2) and develop fully your analysis in the final paper.

Be sure to access and evaluate web pages and print collateral for the curriculum you are studying.

Final project deliverable 2: Analysis of curriculum and interview feedback

The second final project deliverable requires that you begin to analyze the curriculum you chose and incorporate into your analysis feedback from the individual(s) you interviewed, as well as content from course readings and discussion.

Specifically, your paper should include the following elements:

- Description of the the purpose, rationale, learning objectives, and content for the course or program

- What instructional methodologies are employed and how they contribute to achieving intended learning objectives
- How the curriculum's effectiveness is assessed and evaluated
- Strengths and weaknesses of the curriculum as it relates to internal and external contexts

I expect that woven throughout your analysis will be feedback you obtained from interviews with individuals who directly manage the curriculum under examination. During your interview(s), you will certainly want to explore what assumptions informed curricular decisions. For instance, what factors informed the stated purposes of the curriculum? What assumptions informed decisions to choose certain courses/objectives and not other topics/outcomes? If at the course level, what factors informed the chosen assignments?

The second deliverable provides a thorough analysis of your chosen curriculum and, as such, your examination should reference the theories, ideas, and institutional practices from our readings and class discussions.

Final project deliverable 3: The final report

Your final paper – due on Tuesday, 6 March – represents an integrated, comprehensive, and critical examination that includes the revised and refined content from the first two deliverables, along with your ideas and recommendations for curricular change and realistic strategies to achieve your desired outcomes.

As mentioned earlier, your final paper – consisting of 5,500 – 6,500 words, exclusive of addenda – should carefully connect the theoretical models, ideas, and best practices from our readings and class discussions.

Professional assessment commentary

For this evaluation item, I ask that you respond to three of the questions listed below. All of the questions should encourage you to reflect on your continued development as higher education professionals. I expect that your responses will demonstrate careful thinking and offer examples to support your assessments. The most thoughtful commentaries usually require 400-500 words for each question. **Please respond to three of the following questions:**

1. What are the two or three most important things you have learned in this course?
2. What are two or three things that you want to work on in your professional setting as a result of this course? Be specific. Why?
3. Reflect on the final course project you completed, and respond to the following queries:
 - What challenges did you face in completing/writing the assignment? Why do you think this was so?
 - Do you feel you better understand the curriculum-making process as a result of completing the assignment? Explain.
4. At the completion of the first week of class, you submitted your philosophy of education. Now that you are at the end of the course, reflect back on this assignment. Did your experience and learnings in the course cause you to re-evaluate your philosophy of education? Specifically, in what ways do your learnings in the course support your philosophy of education? In what ways do they encourage you to re-evaluate your philosophy?

5. Compose an assignment that you would give to another person in this class that, in your opinion, would demonstrate that he or she had developed a solid understanding of one or more of the concepts covered in this course. In addition, provide thoughtful commentary on why you chose to require such an assignment.

EVALUATION CRITERIA, COURSE GRADING, & CITATION OF WORK

Criteria for Grading Blackboard Discussion Forum Participation

Your discussion board postings should be thorough and thoughtful. Just posting an “I agree/disagree with your comment” or an “I think the same” to someone else’s thoughts is not considered to be an adequate response. At the same time, I do not encourage “excessive” posting. You should be able to make a substantive posting in 250 words or less (roughly two short paragraphs). It must be obvious from your postings that you have read and that you comprehend the assigned readings for the week. Your posts will be graded on a weekly basis according to the following criteria:

POINT VALUE	CHARACTERIZATION OF THE RESPONSE
0-2	Maximum of 1-3 responses that exhibit one or more of the following characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No original posts, or majority of posts were posted at one time, or posted on Saturday and/or Sunday • Responses demonstrate little or no interaction with other participants’ posts • Little or no evidence that student has completed reading assignments or understands key points. • Content of responses do not relate to subject matter and/or simply agree or disagree with a previous post. • Posts are poorly written (poor grammar and spelling), lack thoughtful structure, and are difficult to understand and follow.
3-4	Minimum of 4-5 responses that exhibit several of the following characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum of two original posts • Posts were generally submitted throughout the week • Posts refer to content covered in the week’s readings and/or other relevant source material, but observations are often not scholarly substantiated and may not provide references to external sources • Some posts build on, reflect, and/or challenge content/assertions in posts from course colleagues • Posts demonstrate an adequate understanding of main concepts covered for the week • Posts are generally well-written (some grammar and spelling issues) and structured, and easy to understand.
5-6	Minimum of 6-7 responses that exhibit several of the following characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A minimum of three original posts • Posts are submitted consistently throughout the week • Posts contribute in a significant way to class dialogue by offering

	<p>relevant, appropriate, and often scholarly substantiated observations from course material, and provide references to external sources so others can easily follow. Posts integrate multiple views and relate concepts to applications within higher education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Posts often build on, reflect, and/or challenge content/assertions in posts from course colleagues • Responses demonstrate good understanding of main concepts and principles covered in that week's readings • Posts are well-written, including correct grammar and spelling, well-structured, and easy to understand and follow.
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Criteria for Grading Written Assignments

Note: All written work is expected to be typed, double-spaced with 1" margins, proofread, and conform to APA style

As an instructor and higher education professional, I value, and consider important, good writing skills. As a result, I likely place greater emphasis on writing skills than other instructors. Whether in a personal or professional context, good writing often helps increase understanding, eliminates confusion and uncertainty, and conveys clarity of thought. Moreover, others will often judge you based on your writing – think about the ubiquity of email communication! – and strong writing skills can advantage you in professional situations.

I strongly encourage you to have someone whom you consider a strong writer proofread each of your deliverables, and provide feedback regarding your writing, especially relating to content structure, grammar, and spelling. As I consider technical writing proficiency as part of the grading process, obtaining feedback from a proofreader regarding the technical quality of your deliverables can help improve your grade!

Written assignments are graded using the following guide/rubrics:

- A/A- Well written with appropriate content structure (intro, body, conclusion), grammar, and very few errors (spelling, sentence fragments, unclear sentences, etc.). Excellent, thorough, and clearly superior analysis and research. Well-supported conclusions that examine issues from a variety of perspectives, citing appropriate sources in the literature. Demonstrates complex understanding of topics and integrates concepts covered throughout the course. Answers are fully and clearly responsive to assignment guidelines/questions. Paper strictly follows APA format.
- B/B- Moderately well-written with some errors related to grammar, spelling, and appropriate content structure. Good analysis, research, and well-supported conclusions. Demonstrates solid understanding of concepts and answers are responsive to questions asked. Some answers may not fully respond to assignment guidelines, and/or literature may not be adequately documented. A good paper, but does not exhibit the level and/or scope of analysis and research of an "A" paper. Paper generally follows APA format.
- C/C- Content shows average understanding of material. May demonstrate lack of effort in completing assignment, as evidenced by inadequate research and analysis, support of conclusions, and reference to the literature. Several answers may not fully address assignment guidelines. Several errors related to spelling and grammar, and confusing content structure. Often, "C" papers result from work that is done at the last minute in a harried, haphazard way. Paper does not generally reflect APA format.

- F Poor overall effort. Research and analysis grossly inadequate and/or not responsive to the directions of the assignment. Work does not demonstrate comprehension of material. Poor writing and grammar mistakes may make work difficult to follow and understand. Grossly insufficient analysis, and very limited, if any, external research. Paper is not responsive to assignment guidelines. Paper does not conform to APA format.

Computation of course grades

At the completion of this course, you will receive a letter grade reflecting your performance in the course. Letter grades will be awarded according to the existing policies of the School of Business and Nonprofit Management. The final course grade will be computed according to the total number of points earned for all assignments, and a letter grade will be assigned as follows.

Points	Letter grade	Points	Letter grade
205 – 220	A	170 – 175	C+
198 – 204	A-	161 – 169	C
191 – 197	B+	154 – 160	C-
183 – 190	B	< 153	F
176 – 182	B-		

Submission of work

Written assignments are expected to be turned in on time, and be double-spaced with 1" margins. As a matter of fairness and professional integrity to your peers in the course, **assignments submitted late will be penalized one full letter grade (e.g. A to B) for each 24 hour segment the assignment is not turned in, up to 72 hours after the due date. After 72 hours from the original due date/time, no assignments will be accepted.** Assignments will be considered late if they are emailed to me past the date/time (Central Standard Time!) as noted in the syllabus. I strongly encourage you to complete assignments ahead of the due date so sudden, unforeseen circumstances do not preclude you from competently completing and submitting on time your assignments.

Please submit all your assignments via Moodle.

Students with disabilities

Students with disabilities who believe that they may need accommodations in this class are encouraged to contact the Center for Academic Services at 773-244-5737, advising@northpark.edu or stop by the office located on the 2nd floor of the Student Services Building. Please do so as soon as possible to better ensure that such accommodations are implemented in a timely manner. For further information please review the following website:

<http://www.northpark.edu/ada>.

Academic honesty

In keeping with our Christian heritage and commitment, North Park University and the School of Business and Nonprofit Management are committed to the highest possible ethical and moral standards. Just as I will constantly strive to live up to these high standards, I expect you to do the same. To that end, cheating of any sort will not be tolerated. **Students who are discovered cheating will fail the assignment, and the incident is reported to the Dean of the School of Business.** Students caught cheating a second time *in their SBNM program* are subject to expulsion from the University.

In the context of this course, my definition of cheating includes but is not limited to:

- Plagiarism – the use of another’s work as one’s own without giving credit to the individual.
- Deliberately allowing another to copy one’s answers or work

You are responsible for knowing and strictly following rules regarding academic honesty in the SBNM.

For further information, please refer to the Academic Dishonesty section of the University's online catalog. It is North Park's mission to prepare you for a life of significance and service, and honesty and ethical behavior are the foundation upon which such lives are built. Therefore, I expect the highest standards of you in this regard.

As it relates to plagiarism, I strongly suggest you carefully review the section below regarding how to cite your work.

HOW TO CITE YOUR WORK

Note: Much of the content in this section is borrowed from Louise Ripley, York University, 2006, and Clifton Conrad, University of Wisconsin, 2008.

All papers must follow the guidelines of the *Manual for the American Psychological Association* (5th). If you are not yet familiar with this citation style, please spend sufficient time in learning the basics – it will be necessary for other courses in your program, and for major writing projects you may pursue in the future (theses, dissertations, etc.).

It is extremely important in scholarly writing to appropriately use references. While citation of references is a technical skill (and can be acquired through a APA style guide), use of references – type, quantity, source, etc. – is more an acquired skill that comes with both reading other scholars' works, and honing your writing over time. I encourage you to keep in mind the following as you prepare writing deliverables in your SBNM coursework:

- Limit references to popular sources (e.g., magazines, newspapers, web sites) to a minimum. Scholarly references are the norm within higher education (e.g., peer reviewed journals, books from academic presses, etc.). Think of yourself as participating in a scholarly conversation, and it is both appropriate and recommended to reference other scholarly voices in that dialogue.
- Only include references to material that you read, to ensure that you are citing the material in the correct context and with the author's intended meaning. Otherwise, you risk confusing your reader or undermining your credibility as an author/scholar.
- Quality of references is more important than quantity. References you cite should support and amplify your text – superfluous references detract from it.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a serious academic offense. To avoid plagiarism, simply cite **any** information you obtain directly from **any** source, including the internet, newspapers, people with whom you speak, books, etc. You must also cite concepts outside the realm of common knowledge, original ideas, and unusual ways of describing something.

If you don't cite your source, including using as your own an idea you heard from someone else, it is plagiarism.

Below are rules regarding appropriate citation protocol. This is by no means exhaustive – please refer APA guidelines for additional information.

Coloring one's hair has long been a favorite method of cosmetic change.

No citation is needed – this is common knowledge.

Studies found that people with green hair lived three times longer than those with blonde or brown hair. (Smith and Singh 2003).

You are referring to a specific piece of information that is not general knowledge, and was published in an article or book. You are not quoting the authors' actual words so you do not use quotation marks, but you do cite the source.

After interviewing more than ten thousand people with green hair, Smith and Singh concluded that, "people with green hair just seem to have it more together." (Smith and Singh 2003:23).

You are referring to a conclusion from a specific study, and you are quoting their exact words from the study. Place quotes around the phrase taken directly from the study.

In the "References" section at the end of the paper, list the work:

Smith, John and Irma Singh (2003) "The Marketing of Hair Colour," *Journal of Cosmetic Improvements* 25 (2):136-147.

When citing a work that is contained in another work, include both works in the Reference:

Singh, Irma and John Smith (2004) "The History of Hair Colour," in Cormorant, Jane and Bill Puffin (2004) *Hair-Raising Tales*. Toronto: Wildlife Publishing Company.

For interviews, list the person's name, title, company, and the date and location you spoke with them.

Smith, John (2003) Interview with John Smith, Head Research Associate, Smith and Singh Research Associates, Toronto, March 26, 2005

You must cite material obtained from the Internet. The citation in the reference section should follow the following template:

Smith, John (2003) "Making Life Better One Hair Color at a Time. Online Article: <http://www.haircolourfun.ca>, March 26, 2005

CLASS SCHEDULE & ASSIGNMENTS

Week 1: January 13 – January 19 **Curriculum as an academic plan**
Contemporary aims and purposes of college curriculum

Student Learning Objectives

By completion of this week's module, you will understand course details and expectations for successful completion of the course. You will be oriented to the online course site and you will become acquainted with your classmates and your instructor. Finally, you will examine the framework and theoretical constructs of Lattuca and Stark's academic plan model of curricular development, and become familiar with contemporary perspectives regarding the aims and purposes of the collegiate education (and therefore the curriculum).

Required Readings

L&S: Introduction and chapter 1

C&J: Bok, Derek. (2006). Purposes.

Nussbaum, M.C. (1997). Citizens of the world.

Online: Association of American College and Universities: College learning for the new global century. Washington, D.C., 2007

Access at: http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/GlobalCentury_final.pdf

Berret, Dan. (September 25, 2011). Which Core Matters More? Chronicle of Higher Education (

Huggett, Kathryn D., Smith, Nora C, and Conrad, Clifton F. Higher education curriculum: Traditional and contemporary perspectives.

Access at: <http://www.answers.com/topic/higher-education-curriculum-traditional-and-contemporary-perspectives>

Hunkins, Francis P., and Hammill, Patricia A. (1994). Beyond Tyler and Taba: Reconceptualizing the Curriculum Process

Access through JSTOR online database at Brandel Library

Note: Ralph Tyler and Hilda Taba were curriculum scholars in the mid-1900s, and their work formed the foundation of curriculum study and practice – and is still influential today.

Lewis, H.R. (September 7, 2007). Point of view: A core curriculum for tomorrow's citizens. Chronicle of Higher Education, 52(11), A10-12.

Access through Chronicle of Higher Education database at Brandel Library

U.S. Department of Education. A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education. Washington, D.C., 2006.

Access at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/final-report.pdf>

Discussion board posting assignments

- Introduce yourself as a course of study
- Week #1 Discussion Forum (respond to week's questions)
- Choose a week to serve as discussion leader
- Post any questions you have regarding the syllabus

Date/time Due (all times CST)

Wednesday, 1/15 at 8 p.m.
 Throughout week. Board closes on
 Sunday, 1/19 at 9 p.m.
 Sunday, 1/19 at 9 p.m.
 Anytime

Week 2: January 20 – January 26**Historical Perspectives and Curricular Debates
External Influences on Curriculum****Student Learning Objectives**

By completion of this week's course module, you will understand some of the significant factors and debates that influenced the undergraduate curriculum from the seventeenth through the end of the twentieth century, become familiar with some of the prominent actors and agencies who influenced curricular debates, and increase your understanding of the role of contemporary (external) ideas/theories in curriculum construction, including the influence of post modernist thought, multiculturalism (race, gender, class, etc.), and internationalization.

Required Readings

L&S: Chapter 2

C&J: The Yale Report of 1828. (1961).

Theory of general education. (1945). Harvard Committee.

Dunn, Frederick. (1993). The educational philosophies of Washington, DuBois, and Houston: Laying the Foundations for Afrocentrism and Multiculturalism.

Grubb, Norton W. and Lazerson, Marvin. (2005). Vocationalism in Higher Education: The Triumph of the Educational Gospel.

Lucas, Christopher. (2006). Another Season of Discontent: The critics.

Online: American Council on Education (1994). Dilemma: Alpha University
Access online at Google Books. Unfortunately, this piece cannot be printed, so you'll need to read it online.

Bennett, William (1984). To Reclaim a Legacy: A Report on the Humanities in Higher Education. National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington D.C. **Read pps. i – 42.**

Access at <http://www.higher-ed.org/resources/legacy.htm>

Note: Bennett was Secretary of Education in the Reagan Administration when he published this article, which created significant discussion within (and outside) higher education

Cheney, Lynn (1989). 50 Hours: A Core Curriculum for College Students. National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington D.C. **Read only the Forward and Introduction, pps. 7-15**
Access through ERIC online database at Brandel Library (if article has been restored)

Green, Madeleine. (2002). Joining the world: The challenge of internationalizing undergraduate education. *Change*. 34(3), 12-21.
Access through ERIC online database at Brandel library

Hill, Patrick (1991). Multiculturalism: The Crucial Philosophical and Organizational Issues. *Change*. 23(4).

Access via ERIC online database through Brandel Library

Note: The reading is also available as a podcast (and can be downloaded to an MP3)

Discussion board posting assignments

- Week #2 Discussion Forum (respond to week's questions)

Date/time Due (all times CST)

Throughout week. Board closes on Sunday, 1/26 at 9 p.m.

Written deliverables

- Philosophy of Education Statement

Monday, 1/27 at 8 a.m.

Week 3: January 27 – February 2 The Future of Curriculum

Student Learning Objectives

By completion of this week's module, you will analyze emerging leading edge technologies that are beginning to impact curricula (including MOOCs, competency based models, etc.), and reflect upon how these and future disruptive technologies may impact higher education and, specifically, the curriculum.

Required Readings

Online:

- Fian, Paul. (2012). A Disruption Grows Up? *Inside Higher Ed*. Access at:
<http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2012/10/01/competency-based-education-may-get-boost>
- Mintz, Steven. (22 July 2013). The Future is Now: 15 Innovations to Watch For. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.
 Access through Chronicle of Higher Education database at Brandel Library
- Pappano, Laura. (2 November 2012). The Year of the MOOC. *New York Times*. Access at:
<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/11/04/education/edlife/massive-open-online-courses-are-multiplying-at-a-rapid-pace.html?ref=education>
- Soares, Louis. (June, 2012). A Disruptive Look at Competency Based Education: How the innovative use of technology will transform the college experience. Center for American Progress.
 Access at
http://www.americanprogress.org/wpcontent/uploads/issues/2012/06/pdf/comp_based_education.pdf
- Office of Governor Scott Walker. (June, 2012). *UW Flexible Degree*. Access at
<http://walker.wi.gov/Images/News/6.19.12%20UW%20Flexible%20Degree%20Proposal%20Packet.pdf>
- Christensen, Clayton M., Horn, Michael B., Caldera, Louis, and Soares, Luis. (February, 2011). *Disrupting college: How Disruptive Innovation Can Deliver Quality and Affordability to Postsecondary Education*. Center for American Progress. Access at
http://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/issues/2011/02/pdf/disrupting_college.pdf

Discussion board posting assignments:

- Week #3 Discussion Forum (respond to week's questions)

Date/time due (all times CST)

Throughout week. Board closes on Sunday, 2/2 at 9 p.m.

Written deliverables

- Final project: Deliverable 1

Monday, 2/3 at 8 a.m.

Week 4: February 3 – February 9**Internal Influences on Academic Plans**

Student Learning Objectives

By completion of this week's course module, you will be conversant with how academic plans are shaped by influences internal to colleges and universities, including factors related to institutional mission, personnel (governing boards, faculty, and administrators), academic fields and departments, financial considerations, and students. You will also begin to learn how to create academic plans, including at the course level, program level, university level.

Required Readings

L&S: Chapters 3 and 4

C&J: Newton, Robert R. Tensions and Models in General Education Planning.

Schneider, C. G., & Shoenberg, R. (1999). Habits Hard to Break: How Persistent Features of Campus Life Frustrate Curricular Reform.

Case: Lock College

Online: Berret, Dan (2 December 2011). CUNY Proposes a Leaner Core Curriculum, to Faculty's Dismay. *Chronicle of Higher Education*.
Access through the Chronicle of Higher Education database at Brandel Library

Schneider, Alison (1999). When Revising a Curriculum, Strategy may Trump Pedagogy. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 46(26), A14.
Access through the Chronicle of Higher Education database at Brandel Library

Discussion board posting assignments

- Week #4 Discussion Forum (respond to week's questions)

Date/time Due (all times CST)

Throughout week. Board closes Sunday, 2/9 at 9 p.m.

**Week 5: February 11 – February 17 Curricular Design in an Experienced Context (learners)
and Delivered Context (instructors)**

Student Learning Objectives

By completion of this week's course module, you will understand how the acts of teaching and learning inform academic plans. Further, you will examine how to improve teaching and learning through effective curriculum design, keeping in mind the characteristics, goals, and needs of diverse learners. As such, you will learn specific techniques for improving teaching and learning in college classrooms – knowledge you can use to improve your own teaching practice, or in administering/developing teaching effectiveness efforts in your program, department, and institution.

Required Readings

L&S: Chapters 6 & 7

C&J: hooks, b. (1994). *Embracing Change: Teaching in a Multicultural World*.

Magolda, M.B. (1999). *Seeking Self-authorship*. **(OPTIONAL)**

Robertson, Douglas R. (2005). *Generative Paradox in Learner-Centered College Teaching*.

Online: Angelo, Thomas A. (1993). *Fourteen General, Research-Based Principles for Improving Higher Learning in Our Classrooms*.

Access at http://www.csuchico.edu/~lstederberg/ceeoc/teachers_dozen.pdf

Halpern, D.F. & Hakel, M. (Jul/Aug 2003). *Applying the Science of Learning to the University and Beyond*. *Change*, 35 (4), 36-43.

Access at www.earlycolleges.org/Downloads/HalpernHakel.pdf

Montgomery, S.M., & Groat, L.N., (1998). *Student Learning Styles and their Implications for Teaching*. *CRLT Occasional Paper No 10*. Ann Arbor, MI: CRLT, University of Michigan

Access at: <http://www.crlt.umich.edu/resources/occasional>

Pinder-Grover, Tershia, & Groscurth, Christopher R. (2009). *Principles for Teaching the Millennial Generation: Innovative Practices of U-M faculty*. *CRLT Occasional Paper No 26*. Ann Arbor, MI: CRLT, University of Michigan

Access at: <http://www.crlt.umich.edu/resources/occasional>

Rhodes, Terrel L. (Jan/Feb 2011). *Making Learning Visible and Meaningful through Electronic Portfolios*. *Change* 43 (1).

Access at:

<http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/2011/January-February%202011/making-learning-visible-full.html>

Discussion board posting assignments

- Week #5 Discussion Forum (respond to week's questions)

Date/time Due (all times CST)

Throughout week. Board closes Sunday, 2/16 at 9 p.m.

Written deliverables

- Final project: Deliverable 2

Monday, 2/17 at 8 a.m.

Week 6: February 17 – February 23**Assessment, evaluation, and adjustment of academic plans****Student Learning Objectives**

By completion of this week's module, you will understand the concepts of evaluation and assessment, examine components used to assess, evaluate, and adjust academic plans, and learn techniques for responding to accountability measures from stakeholder groups (accreditation organizations, governmental bodies, etc.). Further, you will learn tools that you can utilize in assessing courses and programs.

Required Readings

L&S: Chapter 8

C&J: Brooks, Rachele (2005). Measuring University Quality.

Cross, K. Patricia (1999). What Do We Know About Student Learning, and How Do We Know It?

Huba, M.E., and Freed, J.E. (1999). Experiencing a Paradigm Shift Through Assessment.

McDonald, Janet (2004). Developing Competent E-learners: The Role of Assessment (**Optional**)

Online: Boud, D. and Associates (2010). Assessment 2020: Seven Propositions for Assessment Reform in Higher Education. Sydney: Australian Learning and Teaching Council.
Access at http://www.iml.uts.edu.au/assessment-futures/Assessment-2020_propositions_final.pdf

Ekman, Richard and Pelletier, Stephen. Assessing Student Learning: A Work In Progress. *Change*
Access at <http://www.changemag.org/Archives/Back%20Issues/July-August%202008/full-assessing-student-learning.html>

Miller, M.A. (2006, September 12). The Legitimacy of Assessment. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 53(5), B24.
Access through the Chronicle of Higher Education database via Brandel Library

Nordvall, R.C. & Braxton, J.M. (1996). An Alternative Definition of Quality of Undergraduate Collegiate Education: Toward Usable Knowledge for Improvement. *Journal of Higher Education*, 67 (5), 483-497.
Access through the JSTOR database at Brandel Library

Pratt, D. (1997). Reconceptualizing the Evaluation of Teaching in Higher Education. *Higher Education*, 34, 23-44.
Access through the JSTOR database at Brandel Library (**Optional**)

Schray, Vickie. (2006). Assuring Quality in Higher Education: Key Issues and Questions for Changing Accreditation in the United States. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC.
Access at <http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/schray.pdf>

Discussion board posting assignments

- Week #6 Discussion Forum (respond to week's questions)

Date/time Due (all times CST)

Throughout week. Board closes on Sunday, 2/23 at 9 p.m.

**Week 7: February 24 – March 2 Administration of academic plans
Strategies for Curricular Change**

Student Learning Objectives

By completion of this week's module, you will understand the administrative process and best practices for developing and implementing academic plans and possess a broader and deeper understanding of issues related to management of the curriculum. Specifically, you will evaluate curricular leadership and administrative roles in academic planning, how shared governance in higher education impacts the planning process, and how to effectively align teaching, learning, and academic goals.

Required Readings

L&S: Chapters 9 and 10

C&J: Arnold, Gordon B. (2004). Symbolic Politics and Institutional Boundaries in Curriculum Reform: The Case of National Sectarian University

Awbrey, Susan M. (2005). General Education Reform as Organizational Change: Integrating Cultural and Structural Change.

Hubbal, Harry and Burt, Helen (2004). An Integrated Approach to Developing and Implementing Learning-centered Curricula. **(OPTIONAL)**

Palmer, Parker (1992). Divided No More.

Discussion board posting assignments

- Week #7 Discussion Forum (respond to week's questions)

Date/time Due (all times CST)

Throughout the week. Board closes on Sunday, 3/3 at 9 p.m.

Written deliverables

- Final project due
- Professional Assessment Commentary

Tuesday, 3/4 at 8 a.m.

Monday, 3/3 at 8 a.m.