Undergraduate Curriculum Review Committee (UCRC) Minutes for December 3, 2010, Mandan Room, Memorial Union

Present: Marion Harris, Robert Harrold, RaNelle Ingalls, Kevin McCaul, Charlene Myhre, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Carolyn Schnell, Herbert Snyder

Absent: Rajesh Kavasseri, Andrew Mara, Cynthia Naughton, Lisa Nordick, Brock Schmeling

1. The meeting was called to order at 12:00 pm and the minutes from meeting of November 8, 2010 were approved as distributed.

2. Members reported on meetings with colleagues

Seth met with the Science and Math chairs on November 18 to give them a quick update on our charge and our progress. He has already had requests for future meetings from some of them.

Susan made a presentation at the Human Development and Education college faculty meeting two weeks ago. The biggest question was about the timeline. Susan also used the Group Decision Center for a very productive discussion with her department about the qualities of the ideal NDSU graduate. She will post those results on Blackboard. She thought it worked really well. They were able to identify the top five most important things and it took only 30 minutes. It’s like an electronically driven focus group.

Larry summarized the meeting he and Andy had with Arts, Humanities and Social Science chairs on December 1. They tried to set the stage by describing getting input from faculty as a three stage process: 1) exploring what the ideal NDSU graduate should know and be able to do; 2) evaluating various models that the Committee will have created; and 3) discussing how to implement the final model as smoothly as possible, including matters of how to improve the processes of regular revalidation of courses and assessing student learning. They had a lively discussion for over an hour.

Marion met on November 18 with the College of Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Food Sciences Curriculum Committee and on December 1 with the Curriculum Committee from the School of Natural Resources. Both groups had some worries about how much change there will be and when it will happen. It would be good to get information from the professional advisors in the various colleges about student perceptions about GE courses.

3. Thursday evening was the only time that worked for those present for a retreat next semester.
4. Reports from Task Groups

- **Timeline (RaNelle Ingalls, Marion Harris, Susan Ray-Degges)**
  Susan distributed a proposed timeline. One of the big question marks is when the statewide GE revision will be completed and what it will be. We talked about integrating some of the tasks from the Guide to the Complexity of Change chart. Susan posted a St. Olaf survey for first year students on Blackboard. The Timeline group thought we might use it to get a baseline of our incoming students. We could pilot such a student survey in Spring 2011 and then survey all 189 students in Fall 2011.

- **Students (Brock Schmeling, Rajesh Kavasseri, Andrew Mara)**
  No report

- **Faculty (Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Cynthia Naughton)**
  Larry and Seth reported they discussed developing a faculty survey. We might encourage faculty to respond by giving a student scholarship to the college with the highest proportion of responders. Larry contacted the Association for General and Liberal Studies list serve and has received surveys from nine schools such as San Jose State, Northern Arizona, Washburn, and James Madison. Kevin noted that whatever we do should be short and online. Kevin also suggested that the faculty survey could include the AACU Essential Learning Outcomes and ask faculty to evaluate how well they think our students are doing in meeting those. The Faculty group also discussed how to meet with departments. Seth noted we should provide a common script with some open-ended questions and that the group suggested that we go in pairs (one from college and one from committee). We need to get faculty survey out early to get people thinking and talking. Susan is willing to help. She suggested using the GDC as a Committee to get a feel of it.

- **OIRA (Herbert Snyder, Marion Harris, Kevin McCaul, Robert Harrold)**
  Bill Slanger has been gone recently. They’ll meet with him next Wednesday at 1:00. Bob recommended looking at the NSSE results on how much time students are spending preparing for class.

- **Employers/Alumni (Carolyn Schnell, Lisa Nordick, Char Myhre)**
  Char said their first meeting raised more questions than answers. They looked at the LEAP survey of employers and wondered if any employer survey should use similar questions to those used by our other groups. They also have not checked with OIRA to see what information they already have. Kevin asked if we will learn anything new from surveying employers, considering the existing surveys. He suggested redoing alumni survey from 1992.
5. We had no time for any discussion of the previous action items listed below.
   - Degree Qualifications Profile (Lumina Foundation) (emailed 11/12/10)
   - University Minnesota New Liberal Education Requirements (posted on Blackboard on 11/12/10)
   - Timeline of Previous GE Revision Committee, 1991-93 (emailed 11/24/10)
   - Alumni Survey Instrument from Previous GE Revision Committee, 1992 (emailed 11/24/10)
   - Advisory Boards (Rajesh & college representatives)
   - Electronic Communication: Homepage & Wikis (Andrew and Lisa)
   - Finding a different name than UCRC

The meeting adjourned at 12:58 pm.

Submitted by Larry Peterson