Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for
April 8, 2014, 9:00-10:00, Peace Garden

Present: Cole Davidson, Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Andrew Mara, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Amy Rupiper Taggart, Kent Sandstrom, Carolyn Schnell, and Beth Twomey

Recorder: Kelly Hoyt

Unable to attend: Rajesh Kavasseri, Cynthia Naughton, Lisa Nordick, Herbert Snyder, and Kevin Walsh.

1. The minutes from 04/01/14 emailed on 04/01/14, were approved.

Housekeeping:
- Larry met with the Senate Executive Committee yesterday. They would like to put the revised university learning outcomes from CULE on the agenda for the April 14th meeting.
  - Amy has volunteered to present the outcomes at the meeting since Larry will just be returning from HLC that afternoon.
  - Larry asked if others could attend for moral support.
  - Amy also mentioned that she has a candidate on campus that day for a search the English department is doing. She doesn’t suspect it should interfere with her being at the meeting but asked if someone could attend as a backup just in case she’s unavailable.

2. Continue to revise the draft BC/GE Model
- Larry reorganized the chart that displays the outcomes, components, credits, etc. so that it was a little cleaner and clearer.
- He asked the committee if it appeared to reflect the correct information on the decisions we’ve made up to this point.
  - RaNelle wanted clarification on the optional minor or certificate category.
    - Larry explained that this is an option for students to complete a minor or certificate in certain new areas (sustainability, innovation, etc.) by taking the appropriate GE courses. Students could complete an additional credential by completing certain courses. This will help create a more coherent GE for some students and will be a “value-added” option.
    - Marion asked if we wanted to include this with the rest of the GE model since it is raising questions just among our committee members of how it is going to be implemented and affect students.
      - Larry thought it should be included in the GE package because it’s an interesting new thing that students can complete and get a minor in and/or satisfy GE requirements at the same time.
      - Amy suggested that when we present the GE model we can separate this section.
    - Andy asked who is going to control this. Do the courses have to be all GE courses?
      - Larry explained that they do not have to be all GE courses. GE courses might be the majority of a minor or certificate.
There would have to be a coordinator of the minor/certificate that would inform students about this option and what courses are available to take to get the credentials of the minor or certificate.

Marion asked how you would manage the number of students that want to take these courses to get the minor/certificate if it becomes a popular thing students want to engage in.

Andy felt that the enrollment in the courses would be the control mechanism.

Marion suggested calling it the GE based optional minor/certificate for clarification and moving it to the bottom of the chart under Upper Division as a standalone category.

Larry thinks that there can be a better way to show this model than just his boxes, to make it look more appealing.

Kent suggested emphasizing that even though some areas look like they will have fewer credits required, that in reality students may still be earning credits in those categories depending on the courses they decide to take in the Diversity and Global Perspectives or Personal and Social Responsibility categories.

RaNelle reminded the committee that reason we came up with the model looking this way came from the survey we did asking alumni, employers, faculty, staff, and students what they felt was important.

Marion suggested coming up with a better term for Horizon Expander.

RaNelle asked if we even needed this descriptor anymore or if we could just move each of the categories over (Diversity and Global Perspectives; Person and Social Responsibility). Everything else listed in the left column are learning outcomes and these two categories are now learning outcomes as well.

Susan thinks using a graphic will help illustrate this idea.

Larry wondered if it would be helpful to have what he referred to as a crosswalk, to show how this is different from and similar to the existing general education. Would it be helpful or would it be confusing?

Committee members had mixed feelings on this. They could see pros and cons to doing this.

Andy suggested being prepared to have discussions with people about this, because they will probably be asking, how is this different from what we are doing now?

Susan suggested using a color coded graphic for the old model and the new model so people could see the different categories.

Seth said he wasn’t sure how much that would help because people might ask why are you doing this. Why are you changing it, if the categories are going to be the same? Is my course going to disappear?

Amy suggested using the survey data to show each portion of the model was based on it.

Larry agreed that this would beneficial to take information from the survey, the meetings that have taken place, and the OIRA
compilation to show how we are incorporating that into the GE model.

- Andy thinks people are going to be thinking about what they are might be losing and asking why we should do this. What are the benefits of this model? What’s different about this? Focusing on the benefits will help counteract people who are concerned about what they are losing. Students will benefit by increased emphasis on communication and critical thinking. We have a more coherent GE for which the Core Questions provide a purpose.

- Marion suggested that the committee start thinking about those who might to object to the new model and start preparing for discussions with those people or departments. She feels that the sooner we can talk to those people about this, the smoother it might go.
  - Susan brought up the fact that certain departments feel like they have to keep their numbers up.
  - Larry expanded on this that people are concerned with two things, FTEs and DCE funds. Some departments, such as Music, totally fund their graduate program with DCE courses. This is something we will have to speak with John Miller about how this might work. Other departments may be in a similar position with some positions totally funded by DCE revenues.
  - Susan suggested that we should talk about transforming rather than losing classes.
  - It appears that there are a number of courses that could fit into different categories. Kent asked if World Music could fit under Global Perspectives. Others suggested maybe Human Societies.
  - Larry said that when he and Kent met with the deans, the deans (particularly Scott Wood) said that departments need to free themselves from the idea that everyone needs GE courses, because generating additional FTEs doesn’t bring additional funds.
  - Kent reminded us of the No Harm clause the Provost had mentioned previously. But new Provost, or someone, needs to sign off on it.

- Larry noted that he and Amy discussed making the course approval process go more smoothly. There might be a short approval form for existing general education courses that clearly meet the new outcomes.
  - They were thinking about the future work load of the faculty and the Gen Ed committee.
  - It would be good to have some examples to show people that this out it isn’t going to be as painful as they have anticipated it might be.

- Larry asked if the committee was ready to vote on this or if they wanted it to be revised and have things in the right places before voting.
  - Kent asked if 189 and critical thinking are going to be combined or separated or is that still to be determined.
Larry said it’s going to depend upon the college. There might be courses that are going to need critical thinking to be taught separate from 189 but in some courses it could be conjoined. It will have to work right for the staffing and college.

Carolyn thinks it will depend on funding too. Her college has a lot of students and they are tapped.

Larry said this is going to require some new resources and some resource allocation.

Amy moved to approve the 3 remaining outcomes (Technology, Natural and Physical Worlds and Human Societies) as written.

Marion seconded it.

The motion was approved unanimously.

It was noted that the model is done at this phase; it’s a big day for our committee to have made such progress and finally come up with a completed model to be introduced to others on campus for input and feedback. Larry congratulated the committee for their hard work and decision making.

Carolyn asked what the timeframe was for implementation on this model is.

Larry explained that after it’s approved by the senate, the Gen Ed committee will ultimately be responsible for the implementation. He thinks if the model is approved by the Senate in Spring of 2015, then implementation would be, at the earliest, Fall of 2016.

Amy asked if he thought a Phase 1, partial implementation could be done sooner and he said he didn’t think so.

The committee started asking if it would be possible to have the model approved sooner than Spring of 2015, possibly late Fall of 2014.

The model can possibly be approved by end of Fall 2014, but everything still has to go through the Gen Ed committee and they will be responsible for implementing it, so will probably still take until the Fall of 2016.

Larry suggested thinking about doing something celebratory for all of our hard work.

Larry commented that he, RaNalle and Cole still need to work out some administrative things on the Registration and Records end and on the GE committee end. Such as how will course approval really work? We have talked about making it more decentralized, but we need to develop a more detailed plan.

Kent mentioned that he thinks people are going to be wondering if they can still teach their GE courses and we will have to address that.

Marion suggested letting people know as soon as we can what direction we are going and let them know that this isn’t really such a big change (like they might be thinking it will be) people will be able to change their courses or make modifications to their courses to fit into the GE model.

Larry feels that we are asking people to up the scale in terms of critical thinking and it isn’t going to be the same old course.

Andy said that that some faculty complain that they can’t grade the way they want to. This is a way to challenge students to meet higher standards by retooling their classes.
Marion suggested creating a resource group of people that would be willing to meet with people who are worried about their courses no longer being taught.

Amy suggested having a couple of examples early in the presentation of the model. Such as “you might be wondering how a course might fit in. Here’s an example from the Humanities, here’s one from the Arts, here’s one from the Sciences. This is how we see them fitting in.”

Andy thinks it can create conversations and suggest faculty might use the more interactive classrooms in the new STEM building.

Marion suggested maybe even having someone in the sciences generate these types of conversations rather than CULE members.

3. Questions, concerns, issues, or brainstorms about our journey
   - Larry explained that he sees the plan for the summer involving one-on-one meetings with the deans of the Colleges to explain our model to them and see if they think it will work. If they don’t think it will work, then it’s not going to happen. We should also have one-on-one meetings with people on the Senate Executive Committee and influential department chairs.
   - In the fall, members will report on the feedback from their meetings and we can make any necessary changes.
   - Open forums can be scheduled later in fall semester to present the model to the campus.

Next meeting is Tuesday, April 15th at 9 am in Hidatsa