Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for January 29, 2013, 9:00-10:00, Hidatsa Room

Present: Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Rajesh Kavasseri, Andrew Mara, Charlene Myhre, Cynthia Naughton, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Kent Sandstrom, Carolyn Schnell. Guest: Mike Christoffers  Recorder: Kelly Hoyt

Unable to attend: Lisa Nordick and Herb Snyder

1. Members approved minutes from 01/15/13 emailed on 01/16/13.

2. Next steps on Six Core Questions and preparing for Faculty Senate vote
   - There is a meeting scheduled with the College of Science and Math for February 12 in the Hidatsa room at 10 am. Peterson encouraged committee members to attend if able.
   - Peterson hopes we can also have meetings with the colleges of Business and Engineering and Architecture on the SCQs.

3. Erika Beseler Thompson (Orientation and Student Success) is looking for a project analyzing qualitative data and is willing to help with our project.
   - It was suggested that maybe she could analyze the feedback from the open forums and the college meetings on the SCQ’s.

4. Reports from Working Groups (see attached documents submitted by each person/team)
   - Scope and Impact
     - 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
       - They asked for clarification on goals. Peterson will check into.
     - Evaluate what worked and what did not during implementation. – Marion Harris and RaNelle Ingalls
       - They asked for best practices and for committee to send any comments (positive or negative) or unexpected benefits or outcomes, to them to be added to the list.
     - 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
       - It was suggested to include information from the Survey Monkey.
     - 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

• 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.—Cynthia Naughton
  • Describe the most important points learned by those involved in the initiative. – Herb Snyder

• Resource Provision
  • Explain the human, financial, physical, and technological resources that supported the initiative.—Cynthia Naughton

• Plans for the Future
  • Describe plans for ongoing work related to or as a result of the initiative.—Larry Peterson
  • Describe any practices or artifacts from the initiative that other institutions might find meaningful or useful.—Larry Peterson

5. Harris asked if it might be helpful to examine SROI results for the capstones as an indicator of student perceptions.

6. Peterson asked everyone to email their sections to the committee for review to make sure nothing was missed and see if there is any overlap (these are the attached documents as listed above).

**NEXT MEETING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 5TH, HIDATSA ROOM AT 9:00 AM**