DRAFT AGENDA  
FEBRUARY 20 MPA CURRICULUM MEETING

Prepared by Fraidenburg, 2/14/20

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Line | Time (approx.) | Product (deliverable) From This Module | Activity | Notes |
| 1 | 11:00 (10 min.) | Welcome, orientation | Presentations by Mike C. and Mike F. | Post Ground Rules --- ask if we need any changes  Questions on agenda? |
| 2 | 11:10  (10 min.) | Group agreement on the end-of-meeting deliverable they want (at least a tentative agreement to start the meeting toward a concrete objective) | * Straw-person proposal from Mike F. (see Line 5) * Discussion * Negotiated agreement | I expect that the group will want a contingent agreement, leaving room to change their mind depending on what happens in the meeting.   1. Form a single workgroup to develop a final proposal: 2. Based on one of the two proposals 3. Based on elements of agreement from both proposals (identifying pros and cons to each proposal) 4. Revise and Resubmit: both workgroups take feedback from today and reformulate for next meeting |
|  | 11:20  (40 min) | Understanding of the workgroup proposals | * Presentations from each group * Discussion for clarifications only (no critiques, that comes next) * 20-minutes for each group | Use Student Planning Worksheets to help convey the elements of the proposal. |
| 4 | 12:00  (30 min.) | Analysis of the proposals | * Call-and-response feedback on the alignment of each proposal with the ‘key questions’ summarized by Cheryl (attached, FYI) | Can also seek feedback here on the identified outcomes: how well does each proposal align with the outcomes it identifies? That is, what are the advantages of the proposal? What are some of its potential drawbacks?  Identify points of consensus and of disagreement.  Do we have consensus on answers to Cheryl’s questions? |
| 5 | 12:30  (25 min.) | Proposed next step – implementation decision | * Call for a group member to propose a specific action for the way forward that is responsive to the above discussion and meets the needs of the group, at least ‘good enough’ * Project planning to implement this agreed, next step | Make a decision on homework for next time |
| 6 | 1:00 | Last words, and adjourn | * Mike F * Mike C – final word |  |

KEY QUESTIONS

* Should Capstone be part of Core or an additional class?
  + Yes, part of Core
  + No, additional class
* How many hours in Core?
  + 4 hours/quarter (24 Core hours, includes Capstone)
  + 4 hours/quarter + Path to Sovereignty + Capstone (32 Core hours)
  + 8 hours/quarter (48 Core hours, includes Capstone)
* How are cohorts structured?
  + Keep them the way they are; cohorts are related to location and/or concentration:
    - Tribal Governance
    - Oly PNAPP
    - Tacoma PNAPP
  + Location based cohorts, on when Core offered (common Core):
    - Oly weeknight
    - Oly weekend
    - Tacoma weeknight
* How are concentrations structured?
  + Keep the way they are, related to location and Core:
    - Oly PNAPP (weekday Core)
    - Oly TG (weekend Core)
    - Tacoma PNAPP (weekday Core)
  + Detach concentration from Core (common Core):
    - Oly weeknight (PNAPP or TG)
    - Oly weekend (PNAPP or TG)
    - Tacoma weeknight (PNAPP or TG)
* How many hours required for concentrations/how much choice will students have to shape their own degree through electives?
  + Each concentration has 2, 4 credit required concentrations courses (8 hours concentration courses – 20-28 elective hours, depending on Core)
  + Each concentration has 3, 4 credit required concentration courses (12 hours concentration courses – 16-24 elective hours, depending on Core)
  + Each concentration has 6, 2 credit required concentration courses (12 hours concentration courses – 16-24 elective hours, depending on Core)
  + Each concentration has no required courses (this is the 8 credit Core model, concentration specific info moves into Core – 12 elective hours)