Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for
May 6, 2014, 9:00-10:00, Peace Garden

Present: Cole Davidson, RaNelle Ingalls, Andrew Mara, Cynthia Naughton, Lisa Nordick, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Amy Rupiper Taggart, and Carolyn Schnell

Recorder: Kelly Hoyt

Unable to attend: Marion Harris, Rajesh Kavasseri, Kent Sandstrom, Herbert Snyder, Beth Twomey, and Kevin Walsh.

Housekeeping:
- Cole said he looked through policies, state publications, GERTA, everything related to transfer and GE and couldn’t find anything stating that we had to have ENGL 110 as part of our GE program. He contacted Lisa Johnson our State Director of Articulation and Transfer to see if she could advise him on this. She confirmed with Cole that there is nothing stating that we have to include this course.
- Lisa suggested discussing NDSU’s possibility of taking ENGL 110 out of the GE program at the State Academic Affairs Council phone conference taking place today (May 6, at 2:45 pm). Cole said this will be presented as a possible revision for feedback. Cole and Larry will be calling in to the meeting and Amy will join when she is done with class.

1. The minutes from 04/22/14, emailed on 04/25/14, were approved.

2. Reports from subgroups
   - Revising the Technology outcome bullet (Andy and Rajesh)
     - Andy and Rajesh have not been able to meet yet.
   - Creating an aesthetically pleasing version of the model (Andy and Susan)
     - No Report
   - BC Administrative Guidelines & Procedures (Cole, Larry, & RaNelle)
     - They are reviewing the existing administrative policies to see how these will change given the model we have come up with and how we can improve them.
     - They decided they can’t complete their revisions until the ENGL 110 situation is resolved. One of the longest items in the current guidelines is the transfer of communication credits, especially from Concordia, because they transfer in fewer credits, but they have met the required classes. If ENGL 110 is dropped as a GE/BC course, then we need to revise that policy.
     - They agreed that we need a new policy for the GE/BC minors and certificates.
     - They may also want to lay out how this model will work with the existing GERTA. RaNelle noted we will need to map how GERTA courses will transfer into our outcome model.
   - BC Course Approval and Coordination Process (Amy & Larry)
     - They want to make this process easier and more effective.
     - Larry mentioned UND’s model—they approve all the GE courses in a department at once. The advantage of this is that the people in the department can talk about how their GE courses fit together. A liaison from their GE Committee works with them to prepare their report. This method might be a disadvantage is for departments (like English) that have many GE courses.
Another model that Larry mentioned is done by Maryland College Park, Mass. Dartmouth, and James Madison University. They call them faculty boards, colleague groups, or learning groups. People who teach in each of the Learning Outcomes review if courses meet the bullets within that outcome.

Amy and Larry suggest that if we use this model, we will want to add not only the faculty that teach the course, but some faculty who are “consumers of the course” on the committee that would review the courses. We would also want to get students involved in the review process. The GE committee would then be made of liaisons from each of those colleague groups.

- BC Minor/Certificate Coordination/Responsibility/Process (Lisa, RaNelle, & Marion)
  - They want to have a plan of how this is going to map out so it isn’t chaotic.
  - Lisa presented handouts including: GE Based Minor/Certificate Plan Outline with Appendices A-D.
    - Plan Outline: suggests five steps for establishing these options.
    - Appendix A: presents possible GE courses (with generic labels), showing the number of credits earned, the learning outcomes aligned with each course, and the core question for each course.
    - Appendix B: shows possible GE minors (technology’s role, sustainability, European Studies) and the generically labeled courses (with their outcomes) a student must take to obtain that minor. It shows examples with and without a required GE core for each minor.
    - Appendix C: shows a matrix template for certificates/minors and points out the opportunity for course overlap.
    - Appendix D: Bison Core Outcomes model attached to Appendix B to show what students might see and how they could put them together.
  - Lisa and RaNelle wanted to stress the importance of vetting courses that may not be appropriate for the whole student body to take as GE, but for the credential purposes it makes sense to vet them as GE. It would be similar to the GE Equivalent Courses that we have now.
  - Lisa stated that there are different ways to go with this minor/certificate option. It could be very prescriptive or there could be options. She thinks the administrative policies/guidelines need to be completed before a model can be laid out.
  - RaNelle thinks that the model could be completed first and then followed by the appropriate policy. She would like a department to draft an actual model (showing which courses would need to be taken and how they would fit into the GE/BC model to meet the minor requirements). It could be a guide for others that want to create a GE/BC minor. We could then possibly determine if core courses are going to be needed or not.
    - Larry said when GE was done in the 90s, departments were asked to draw up sample GE courses. We might have to do this with the minors and certificates as well. We could solicit people to draft possible minors in Innovation Studies or Women and Gender Studies.
  - Larry said he thought that if there were not a core, there should at least be a minimum number of GE credits since it’s a GE minor. The committee agreed with this.
  - Larry noted his concern about assessment. The more courses that are GE/BC equivalent, the more difficult it is to assess the student learning in these courses.
  - Larry also mentioned that the Deans suggested having a simpler model for students to look at and the more options you have, the more complex the model becomes.
Amy thinks the minors could be a late phase option. We should get Bison Core up and running and see what courses get approved for it. She doesn’t think the departments are going to take the initiative to create the minors. But maybe the Bison Core people could look at the courses that are approved and make the suggestion of offering a minor with certain courses.

- Carolyn said an advantage of just developing the basic guidelines and credit requirements now, is that the more difficult it looks to implement, the more resistance there might be from the Deans. Going this route might minimize that.
- Ranelle said another advantage to this is that students who come to NDSU undecided on their major could get a credential and might also figure out what they want to go into.

Larry said he likes presenting this option as a “track” that we could provide some integration or meaning for the courses a student is taking.

- Critical Thinking Two-Credit Class (Carolyn, Herb, & Seth)
  - No Report
- Additional Critical Thinking Requirement (Beth, Cole, and Susan)
  - No Report
- Applied Communication (Kent & Andy)
  - Andy asked what his focus should be when meeting with people, such as Mark Meister.
    - Larry explained that the conversation with Mark is really an implementation plan for the Communication Center. Andy should be asking questions about what this will need to succeed. How much money, how much space, how many staff?
  - Andy asked if he supposed to be writing this information down or does it just need to be “in Mark’s head.”
    - Larry said we need to have a plan so we can present it to the new Provost. If Mark could use his contacts to get some start-up cost information and then try to determine how much it would cost to implement it here. We need to know about expenses such as how many part time/full time faculty, graduate assistants, etc.
  - Lisa said we have a couple different center models that might be helpful to Mark in trying to come up with a plan. She volunteered to reach out to him to see if he would be interested in seeing these.

- Capstone (Cynthia, Susan, and Carolyn)
  - Cynthia asked for clarification on what they are supposed to be doing with the capstones.
    - Larry explained that the subcommittee should be determining how the model/decisions we’ve made about this will work. Will the GE committee approve capstones or should there be a colleague group to review courses?
    - Larry said it should be include the implementation details. These might be similar to the plans that we reviewed last fall from other land-grant universities. The subcommittees are developing a draft plan that eventually will be presented to the campus.
  - Cynthia asked if they needed to come up with a budget.
    - Larry said no, only people that have to come up with a budget would be Applied Communication and Critical Thinking Two Credit Class.
3. CULE plans for rest of semester and for summer?
   • Subgroups will meet over the summer and prepare a solid report suggesting how their task might be implemented. Those should be ready for September when we meet again. We may meet before then to discuss the ENGL 110 issue.
   • Amy and Larry will meet with some of the Deans to find out what some of the obstacles were for them with the present model.

   Next meeting will be Fall 2014