Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for October 29, 2013,
8:30-9:20, Peace Garden Room

Present: Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Rajesh Kavasseri, Andrew Mara, Cynthia Naughton, Lisa Nordick, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Kent Sandstrom, Carolyn Schnell, Herbert Snyder, and Beth Twomey.

Unable to attend: Cole Davidson and Kevin Walsh.

Larry distributed copies of the 2010 charge memo from Provost Schnell so we could review our responsibilities. We also reviewed the minutes from the first meeting that took place on 9/24/10. At that meeting we agreed that a “‘super-majority’ of two-thirds would be good for major decisions on models. . . . We left the possibility of anonymous voting open.”

Larry praised the committee for their work thus far in making decisions that look to the future and are best for the campus and for the students.

1. Larry noticed the date on the top of the minutes from the last meeting was incorrect, that will be changed. The minutes from 10/22/13 emailed on 10/23/13 were approved.

2. Staying rooted in what we learned from the face-to-face meetings and the surveys
   - We reviewed the table Larry prepared and distributed with the priorities from the on-campus meetings and the surveys of alumni, employers, faculty, staff, and students.
     - The table included the rankings for the average gap between present performance and future importance, the ranking for future importance, the rating from the OIRA summary, and what Larry saw in the notes from departments meetings.
     - The table began with the fifteen outcomes which had the largest average gap between present performance and future importance, but also included any others that were in the top 15 on future importance, all the “red” flagged outcomes from the OIRA, and some themes from the meetings that struck Larry as important.
   - The top outcomes from the survey seem to be in the approved learning outcomes, but the model needs to reflect those outcomes as well.
   - Marion and others think we need to expand what we mean by diversity. For example, it should include political, religious and cognitive diversity.
   - The perceived lack of rigor in some GE courses was a common theme in some of the faculty meetings.
   - We need to link reading with the communication outcome.
   - We discussed the importance of a second language, but concluded that is not feasible for a variety of reasons at this time.
   - Andy and Larry noted that at the Microsoft GE Summit, all the employers highlighted the importance of teamwork and communication for graduates.
     - We discussed the importance of teaching teamwork. It needs to be carefully structured and it might fit better in the major.
   - Cynthia suggested incorporating a course on interpersonal communication to teach students how to act and speak in public and on the job.
     - Andy noted that the faculty boards model from Maryland might be a mechanism for setting common standards for appropriate professional communication.
• Larry asked the committee to review the chart periodically during this model decision phase and make sure we are covering all the things that were at the top of the “list” as areas of concern.

3. At our next meeting we need to focus our work on the common features of the four models. We should begin with where we seem to have the greatest consensus: Communication and Capstone.
   • Communication – Larry suggested we start with this category at the next meeting. Bring suggestions to the next meeting. Will there be an Upper Division Communication requirement in addition to Upper Division Writing?
   • In addition to the capstone, there is agreement that there should be a 1st year course that everyone takes, but not sure what the focus of that course should be.

Next meeting Tuesday, November 5 at 8:30am in Peace Garden