Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for January 10, 2012
2:00-2:50 pm, Peace Garden Room, Memorial Union

Present: Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Rajesh Kavasseri, Kevin McCaul, Lisa Nordick, Larry Peterson, Susan Ray-Degges, Carolyn Schnell, Herbert Snyder

Absent: Andrew Mara, Charlene Myhre, Cynthia Naughton, Seth Rasmussen

1. We approved the minutes from 12/12/11 which were emailed on 12/13/11.

2. Members from colleges who have advisory boards or committees should send the name of the person who is the contact in the department or college for those boards to Larry as soon as possible.

3. Larry will ask Karen Braun to send a reminder to Heads and Chairs about the Question and Answer session with Paul Gaston on Thursday.

4. Susan, Herb, and Kevin reported on the meeting with the Deans on January 5.
   a. The Deans are very supportive of CULE’s efforts to revise general education, but are worried we might be losing our focus by taking on the accreditation process. Kevin suggested that we might focus our energies in the next few months on the accreditation process because the Maximizing Efficiencies initiative from the SBHE might affect how innovative we can be in our revisions.
   b. At the meeting, Dean Wittrock asked us to consider revising our template to survey the capstone experiences in graduate professional programs also. We discussed this option, but made no decision. On one hand, this seems to be taking our focus away from revising General Education. On the other hand, there are not that many graduate capstones.
   c. Provost Rafert discussed his plans for covering Bob Harrold’s responsibilities in Assessment and Accreditation and for creating a half-time position in General Education. Larry described what he knew about the genesis of these plans. Position announcements will apparently be forthcoming soon.

5. Lisa and Carolyn, Herb and RaNelle, Kevin and Marion, and Larry discussed some of the conclusions their teams had drawn in analyzing the GDC survey data.
   a. We were all concerned about the low number of employers who responded and the high number of non-responses, especially in that group. We hope that surveying the advisory boards will generate more responses that we can fold into this group. We also wondered if we could pull out the employers from the alumni who responded.
b. In general, alumni and employers seem more satisfied with how well our present graduates are prepared. Faculty and staff are the least satisfied.

c. Marion completed a content analysis of the open-ended comments. She reported that a high percentage of respondents made comments and there are some interesting patterns. She hopes others will do a similar analysis so we do not just depend on her work.

d. Marion and Kevin will compare the demographics for the responses from students and faculty to see how representative the respondents were.

e. We agreed with Kevin’s suggestion that each team’s data analysis for our next meeting should use the means for each group of respondents for each question the team is analyzing.

f. We also agreed with Kevin’s suggestion that each team should come with 2-4 key points from their data for the next meeting.

Submitted by Larry Peterson

NEXT MEETING, 2:00, MONDAY, JANUARY 23, PEACE GARDEN ROOM