Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee (UCRC) Minutes for October 1, 2010, Minard 204

Present: Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Rajesh Kavasseri, Andrew Mara, Charlene Myhre, Cynthia Naughton, Lisa Nordick, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Carolyn Schnell, Herbert Snyder

Absent: Robert Harrold, Kevin McCaul, Charlene Myhre, Brock Schmeling

1. The minutes from meeting of September 24, 2010 were approved as submitted by Marion and Larry.

2. Marion suggested that we begin by having some common readings, such as case studies, before we divided into working groups. Committee members agreed. Larry noted that our Blackboard includes notes that he and Betsy Birmingham took when they interviewed faculty from MSU and UND about their recent general education revisions. For our next meeting(s) we will read several items. We will begin with a report from the Association of American Colleges and Universities that set the framework for much of the current general education discussion, AACU, Greater Expectations: A New Vision for Learning as a Nation Goes to College (2002) http://www.greaterexpectations.org/. We will follow that by reading three articles published in the Journal of General Education about the previous general education revision at NDSU and two book chapters on recent general education revisions at University of Nebraska-Lincoln and the University of North Dakota (in Susan Gano-Phillips and Robert W. Barnett, eds. A Process Approach to General Education Reform). Larry will get copies of the articles and chapters distributed to committee members.

3. Carolyn asked Larry to provide a history of general education at NDSU. He agreed to do that.

4. Members discussed possible working groups
   - Groups which should last less than one academic year
     - Larry volunteered for Internal Data (OAIR) and urged someone with a statistical background to join this group. (Depending on what we learn, we may want to survey faculty, etc.)
     - Our common readings and discussions (Item 2) should cover some models of recent revisions at similar campuses and national trends. (We may want to explore other models and certainly need to look at accreditation standards.)
   - Groups that may last until we are done
     - Lisa suggested that we need to connect with future, as well as present, students. She suggested using focus groups and Susan noted we’d need to file for IRB approval. We left other aspects of Students: Getting Input from and Communicating with Them for the future.
     - Rajesh volunteered to work with Employers, Advisory Boards, and Alums: Getting Input from and Communicating with Them. Members agreed with
Susan’s suggestion that each of us should collect any college, department or unit information from our home area and bring it to the Committee. We’ll especially need the names of advisory boards and information on how to contact the members.

- Andrew and Lisa volunteered to work on the electronic aspect of Campus-Wide Input and Communication (Brownbags, Open Forums, Press Releases, College Meetings, Pedagogical Lunches, etc.) When Andrew was at the University of New Mexico he worked on the website for their accreditation visit. Lisa volunteered staff time for this and will see about getting a URL connected to the NDSU homepage. Lisa noted that we need to think about what we want a website to accomplish. Susan and others noted we should probably think about a creative name (a “brand”) that is obvious to people looking for our information on the NDSU homepage.

- We did not discuss Departments: Getting Input from and Communicating with Them (which we may want to divide by college) and Student Affairs: Getting Input from and Communicating with Them

5. We concluded with a broad discussion of the Committee’s charge.
   - Should we be focusing on the co-curriculum as well as the curriculum?
   - Because so many of our students have extensive responsibilities with work or family, can virtual experiences be an option for co-curricular activities?
   - Should we be teaching students to use social media responsibly?
   - Whatever we do needs to be rooted in NDSU’s culture (which is different than being bound by that culture).
   - Do we need to think about building in more “high impact educational practices” in addition to our goal of student learning outcomes?
   - How do we address the changing needs of employers and the changing motivations of new generations of students?
   - Does having a new president give us more options for setting new directions?
   - Our final recommendation needs to be self-correcting and self-improving because of the continuing changes in higher education and in our students.
   - How can we think both creatively and expansively about the right educational outcomes for all of our students and yet be practical enough to have a plan adopted?

6. The meeting adjourned at 12:50 pm.

Our next meeting will be Monday, November 1, location TBA

Minutes submitted by Marion Harris and Larry Peterson