Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for October 3, 2012,
2:30-3:30, Arikara Room

Present: Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Andrew Mara, Lisa Nordick, Larry Peterson, Susan Ray-Degges, Kent Sandstrom, Carolyn Schnell, Herb Snyder  Recorder in training: Kelly Hoyt

Absent: Rajesh Kavasseri, Charlene Myhre, Cynthia Naughton, Seth Rasmussen

1. Because of Kent’s schedule we began by discussing his model (based on Carolyn’s suggested edits of 09/18/12) of the Core Questions. Kent added an additional question, “Who am I and how did I become that person?”
   - We generally supported Kent’s model, but agreed with Lisa’s suggestion that technology needed to be included.
   - We agreed that students needed to both understand the implications of technology for society and to use technology appropriately and effectively to solve problems, find information, communicate, etc.
   - Andy and Lisa will revise Kent’s model before our next meeting to incorporate technology.

2. There was no report from Cindy on revisions to and implementation of the Survey Monkey to get more information from the instructors of the capstone courses. RaNelle reported that her office just sent Cindy data on the capstone courses. Who was the instructor? When was the last term a course was taught? Is there a pre-requisite for the course?

3. We discussed the spreadsheet on grades for GE courses from OIRA and the Provost’s concern about the relatively high percentage of Ds, Fs, and Ws for some courses. According to the Gardner Institute, a combined D,F,W rate of more than 30% is the generally accepted national standard for a “killer” course, although they note this varies by institution. There were sixteen courses at 30% or higher on this spreadsheet.
   - CULE will respectfully decline the Provost’s request that it “analyze, inform, and propose action to him” because it needs to keep its focus on general education revision.
   - CULE members offered a number of excellent suggestions for information that Larry can get from the OIRA to begin the analysis.
     - Focus on classes with large numbers of Ws, rather than the highest percentage of Ws.
     - How many credits did these students have before and after they withdrew from these classes?
     - How many credits had these students completed before this semester?
     - When were these students admitted? (Were they late admissions who registered right before classes began for any class they could find?)
     - Were these courses delivered online or face-to-face?
• What was the major of each student and did the student change majors after dropping the class?
• How are our drop dates dictated by factors outside our control such as the federal funding reporting date for student loans and SBHE policy setting common drop dates to encourage collaborative students?

4. We decided to invite Kristi Wold-McCormick, Virginia Clark Johnson, and Bob Harrold to a future meeting to give us a brief description of the 2003-05 capstone review project and to give us their advice on our current work on the DQP.

5. We forgot to approve minutes from 09/12/12, emailed on 09/12/12.

Submitted by Larry Peterson with assistance from Kelly Hoyt

NEXT MEETING: WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 2:30, ROSE ROOM, MEMORIAL UNION