Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for September 7, 2012
12:00-1:00, Mandan Room Memorial Union

Present: Marion Harris, Rajesh Kavasseri, Charlene Myhre, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Kent Sandstrom, Carolyn Schnell

Absent: RaNelle Ingalls, Andrew Mara, Lisa Nordick, Herb Snyder

1. We approved the minutes from 06/19/12 as distributed by email on 06/20/12.

2. Members introduced themselves and welcomed Dean Sandstrom.

3. Susan and Cindy reported on the summer pilot test of instrument they did with Char to evaluate the DQP capstone data. Larry then explained how he tried to answer some of their questions on the spreadsheet he emailed earlier in the day. We had a lively discussion which seemed to reach the following conclusions:
   - Because CULE’s main task is revising GE, it could derail us if we began to examine student artifacts from the capstones in order to assess to what extent those artifacts met the program’s learning outcomes.
   - Examining student work from the capstones may be something the GE committee could do.
   - In his Assessment role, Larry will ask each of the chairs for an electronic copy of the learning outcomes for each major.
   - At some point, we need to do a better job of helping some faculty better understand the difference between course and program learning outcomes.
   - Cindy will draft a Survey Monkey to send to the instructors of the capstone syllabi we received. It will have questions such as:
     - Have you revised or are you revising your capstone since you submitted a syllabus in January or February 2012? If so, please email a revised copy to larry.r.peterson@ndsu.edu
     - Does your capstone require research? (yes or no)
     - What is the end product of your capstone? (check boxes)
     - Do you use a rubric to evaluate the student work in your capstone? If so, please email a copy to larry.r.peterson@ndsu.edu

4. Marion and Larry distributed the draft framework of the Student Learning Outcomes that they developed this summer with Andy and Rajesh (clean copy attached). It is organized by five big questions rather than by traditional categories such as course content or learning outcome categories such as skills, etc. Four points were raised in our brief discussion:
   - Should there be a personal dimension for students as individuals in these questions, e.g. “How should I solve the world’s problems?”
   - The heading “What do we think is worth keeping?” is somewhat confusing.
• Should the category of “what do we think is worth keeping?” also include the contributions of the sciences?
• Maybe we should be less post-modern and contextual and revise the big questions to ask “How does the world work?” rather than “How do we think the world works?”

5. We decided to try to reschedule the rest of our meetings for the fall for Wednesdays from 2:30-3:30. Larry will contact room scheduling.