Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for January 15, 2013, 9:00-10:00, Peace Garden Room

Present: Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Andrew Mara, Charlene Myhre, Lisa Nordick, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Kent Sandstrom, Carolyn Schnell, Herb Snyder. Guest: Mike Christoffers Recorder: Kelly Hoyt

Unable to attend: Cynthia Naughton and Rajesh Kavasseri

1. The minutes from 12/05/12 emailed on 12/05/12 were approved.

2. Next steps on Six Core Questions and preparing for Faculty Senate vote
   - Larry asked faculty to please schedule SCQ meetings with all colleges and/or college chairs/heads groups if they have not already been held.
   - The last two SCQ Open Forums will be at 1:00 pm on 01/17 and 01/28

3. Larry gave an overview of materials members had requested for organizing our DQP Capstone Review Project report and we discussed them.
   - HLC Quality Initiative Report Panel Review and Recommendation Form
   - DQP Capstone Proposal sent to President Bresciani on August 12, 2011 - Peterson thought the information that was proposed in the letter has been followed.
   - NILOA DQP in Practice at NDSU – Snyder went through the comments on the DQP.
   - CULE DQP Capstone Survey Monkey Results – Peterson and Naughton tracked down people who had not responded previously and got responses from them.
   - CULE DQP Applied Learning Template Results – The results indicated that that how people did in the capstone courses fit in line with the Survey Monkey results.
   - CULE DQP Applied Learning Summary Information
   - CULE DQP Examples and Possible Best Practices – Provost is interested in the possible best practices. Sandstrom asked if this document was something that could be shared with Chairs or Deans. Peterson said yes.
   - CULE DQP Applied Learning Template Feedback on DQP
   - 2005 GE Committee Report to Senate on Capstone Review
   - 2005 GE Committee Capstone Review Matrix

4. We also discussed possible additional materials such as tracking the capstone courses in assessment reports or comparing the present syllabi with those covered in the 2005 capstone study. Members agreed with Larry’s recommendation that while this might be interesting and provide some insights, it was not the best way to spend our time.

5. We agreed to divide into the following working groups for the DQP Capstone Review Project report.
   - Scope and Impact of the Initiative (2 people each). In the end, each bullet should have summary of approximately 500-750 words.
• On January 29, each group should have an outline or list of bulleted points to discuss.
• A draft of the presentation will have to be completed by February 19 for Herb Snyder and Mike Christoffers to present.
  • Explain in more detail what was accomplished in the Quality Initiative in relation to its purposes and goals. (If applicable, explain the initiative’s hypotheses and findings.) - Susan Ray-Degges and Char Myhre
  • Evaluate what worked and what did not during implementation. – Marion Harris and RaNelle Ingalls
  • Evaluate the impact of the initiative, including any changes in processes, policies, technology, curricula, programs, student learning and success that are now in place in consequence of the initiative. –Rajesh Kavasseri and Seth Rasmussen
  • Explain any tools, data, or other information that resulted from the work of the initiative. Lisa Nordick and Carolyn Schnell
  • Describe the biggest challenges and opportunities encountered in implementing the initiative. – Andy Mara and Kent Sandstrom

• Team of three for the following: Herb Snyder, Larry Peterson, and Cynthia Naughton
  • Commitment to and Engagement in the Quality Initiative
    • Describe the individuals and groups involved at stages throughout the initiative and their perceptions of its worth and impact.
    • Describe the most important points learned by those involved in the initiative
  • Resource Provision
    • Explain the human, financial, physical, and technological resources that supported the initiative.
  • Plans for the Future
    • Describe plans for ongoing work related to or as a result of the initiative.
    • Describe any practices or artifacts from the initiative that other institutions might find meaningful or useful

6. Questions, concerns, issues, or brainstorms about our journey
• Lisa Nordick asked if it was necessary to recruit or assign new members since there is the possibility of this committee lasting another 1-2 years. She expressed her concern about other professional time constraints that may interfere with her ability to give 100% to this committee in the future.
• Larry noted it would be unfortunate if anyone was not able to continue, but we had to recognize that personal and professional commitments change. Larry reminded members of the original selection process and concluded that a similar process would be followed to replace any members who needed to step back.