Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for October 8, 2013,
8:30-9:20, Peace Garden Room

Present: Cole Davidson, Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Andrew Mara, Lisa Nordick, Larry Peterson, Susan Ray-Degges, Kent Sandstrom, Carolyn Schnell, and Beth Twomey.

Unable to attend: Rajesh Kavasseri, Cynthia Naughton, Seth Rasmussen, Herbert Snyder, and Kevin Walsh.

1. We approved the minutes from 10/01/13 emailed on 10/01/13.

2. We had a focused discussion of how each of us rated the criteria for each of the three land-grant schools we are looking at in more detail
   - University of Maryland, College Park – They have categories with learning outcomes elaborated for each one. Their program is organized into Fundamental Studies, Distributive Studies, I-Series, and Diversity.
     - Seth likes the I-Series but thinks it might be difficult to implement. He also likes the Scholarship in Practice. He thinks they might have too many GE credits. Lisa thinks this model seems more mature than the other ones. She also feels they have better tools that we could use. RaNelle thought the website was easy to navigate and find things on. She also noted that the I-Series seemed built to answer questions from parents and students about “why am I taking this course.” They have advising plans for each major on their GE site. There is some information about assessment in their Implementation Plan, and they have a Provost’s Commission on Learning Outcomes, but we could not find much information on how they assess their GE. There also seemed to be some systematic funding incentives to offer larger classes. Everyone gave the total # of GE credits low scores because they thought the 40-46 was too many. Everyone thought that the Faculty Boards were a good idea.

   - University of Nebraska-Lincoln – They a totally outcome-based system with ten ACE areas with a single three credit class in each. They did not seem to create any distinctive classes or components.
     - People thought it was hard to find information on this website, which wasn’t laid out as well as Maryland’s. RaNelle and others thought it did not give students a clear sense of the purpose of GE and it reinforced the “checklist” mentality. Kent thought it was hard to tell how much of the model was geared towards Arts and Humanities. Beth thought the courses in each area were too diffuse to foster common learning experiences. Although they allow co-curricular experiences to count for GE, the process seems unnecessarily cumbersome for both students and faculty. Larry thought the information for the assessment model was clear once you found it under Governance and Assessment. Their advising information seemed to be just distributing information to the advisors, not actually giving students and others an idea of how advising works. The ease of assigning transfer credits might be ok.
- University of Nevada, Reno – They also have outcomes with categories.
- Seth liked the idea of a core curriculum, but it only seems to apply to the Humanities. The recommended core courses vary depending on major and this could cause problems for people who change majors. The website was not user friendly; it was difficult to find things. Their planning documents were more informative than the existing website models were.

3. Decide on next steps – What did we learn by looking at these three models?
- The website is important. We need to make sure to include information in an interesting way that will keep students, faculty, and other readers intrigued. Don’t include a laundry list of things like some of the websites.
- Lisa asked who will be responsible for creating all the additional information about advising, transfer, governance, etc. and how we get the website set up with all this information (who is in charge of setting it up?) Larry stated that we will need to involve others in that part of the process.
- Andy felt that the faculty boards could be a useful tool both as we implement the new model next year and as courses are certified and reviewed. The Faculty Boards would be the logical group to assess those areas and courses. They could also evaluate the overall balance of courses in an area and possibly solicit new courses.

4. We decided to divide into small groups to work on a model to bring back and share with the whole committee. Each group should create a model that meets our six learning outcomes and fits within the framework of the aspirations we have for each of the criteria.
- Marion, Kent, and Susan
- Lisa, Carolyn, Beth, and Cole
- RaNelle, Larry, and Andy
- Cynthia, Rajesh, Herb, and Seth
- Kevin gets to choose which group he wants to join.

Submitted by Kelly Hoyt

Next Meeting: 8:30, Tuesday, October 15, Room of Nations