

## Guidelines for Proposals to Revise Hamline Plan Requirements

CONTEXT: On December 12, 2011, the Vice President for Academic & Student Affairs announced a comprehensive initiative to revise the Hamline Plan, with an ambitious timeline for this process. Because multiple components of the Hamline Plan will be under review/revision simultaneously, consistency in proposals for revising Hamline Plan components is important. The Undergraduate Curriculum Committee has developed guidelines (below) to support the work of revision task forces. In addition to these guidelines, UCC will support each task force's work in more interactive ways. UCC will meet with any task force and will facilitate CLOA participation. UCC asks that each task force provide a brief update on its work each month.

### Part One - Hamline Plan Designation

- 1) Does the current HP designation have clearly articulated learning outcomes (LO)? That is, the LO for that designation, not unit, etc. If so, include those LO. If not, develop and clarify the proposed LO for this HP designation and include them in your report.
- 2) Align the HP LO with the appropriate institutional LO.
- 3) Does a bulletin description of the HP designation currently exist? If so, please include the current designation.
- 4) If there is no current description of the HP designation, or if the description needs to be revised to be consistent with the proposed LO, please draft a proposed description for the revised HP designation.

### Part Two - Supporting the Revision Proposal

- 1) *General rationale for the proposal:* What are the arguments for and benefits of revising? Address reasons anchored in global and national contexts, higher education and workplace-related shifts, as well as reasons that are Hamline-specific.
- 2) *Specific grounding for the proposal:* Identify underlying principles that anchor the proposal (whether different from or similar to current grounding). How does the proposed revision distinguish Hamline or move Hamline into line with other colleges and universities (broader pool as well as comparator schools)?

### Part Three - Implementing the Revision Proposal and Assessing Learning Outcomes

- 1) Barriers: Identify potential barriers to implementation and strategies for dealing with those barriers. Identify any existing campus programs where exemplary practice similar to proposed revision is already happening (how might implementation build upon these?).
- 2) Transition: What is the plan for making the transition from current practice to proposed revision? Include timeframe and scope (pilot effort in a few units vs. all units simultaneously?) as well as who is responsible for implementing revision.
- 3) Assurance of Learning: How will "quality control" be assured?
  - a. Address necessary faculty development, course redesign and review.
  - b. Address assessment and approaches to measuring student LO. **Attach, as Appendix A, sample proposed rubrics to use in assessing the LO of the designation.**
- 4) Resource implications: What resources does the proposed revision require in terms of staffing, faculty development, library acquisitions, studio or lab space, equipment, new funding, or other costs?