Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for
March 10, 2015, 9:00-10:00 am, Lark

Present: Noah Engels, RaNelle Ingalls, Andrew Mara, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Carolyn Schnell, and Beth Twomey

Recorder: Kelly Hoyt

Unable to attend: Marion Harris (in France), Rajesh Kavasseri, Cynthia Naughton, Lisa Nordick, Susan Ray-Degges, Herbert Snyder, and Amy Rupiper Taggart

1. The minutes from February 17, 2015 were approved.

2. Quick Updates
   - CULE/QUEST Faculty Survey
     - Larry emailed deans and reminded faculty at the senate meeting to complete the survey. It closes at midnight on March 11th. The survey was sent out to 771 people. So far we have about 250 responses and 109 comments.
       - 43 Ag
       - 54 Humanities
       - 10 Business
       - 21 Engineering
       - 43 HDE
       - 22 Pharmacy
       - 52 Science & Math
   - CULE/QUEST Website
     - Larry has made the following additions--email feedback, meeting notes, GE at peer institutions
   - WICHE Interstate Passport Initiative Phase Two Draft Learning Outcomes
     - Knowledge of Changing Human Cultures
     - Knowledge of Physical and Natural World
     - Larry emailed these for CULE’s information. We need not act on them. He has sent them to appropriate department chairs for their feedback.

3. Complicated Update
   - Resources & Budget
     - Larry said things at this time are unclear. He has a meeting with the Provost this week to discuss resources and budget.
     - At the Senate Exec Meeting Dave Wittrock suggested breaking the decision into two parts. We would have a vote on the model contingent upon feasibility study. (This is similar to a proposal from Amy.) Then once we find out what the budget is from the legislature, we can bring the budget to the Senate for a vote.
     - Larry met with Kent Rogers, chair of Faculty Senate Budget Committee. He thinks we should meet with this committee and present a budget before the model goes to the Senate.
Larry said the days when they meet that we could actually be there are very few this spring.

Larry’s sees 3 big pieces for the budget.

1. Professional Development – one time money; not making long term commitments. People could be paid quite generously, like $5K, to work on revising or creating a new course. You could have cohorts of 10 people working over the summer. This amount of money seems fairly feasible. This could link with things that Paul Kelter is doing in the STEM building. People need to know how to use problem based learning or active learning in order to have class there.

2. Applied communication – long term money. Could cost around $120-150K for this tenured position, a graduate assistant and professional development money for faculty to work on how to blend applied communication with their classes. This is not getting a lot of support on the faculty survey right now.

3. Critical thinking – At the Senate Executive Committee the Provost threw out a figure of $750K. Larry got a sense that neither the President nor Provost are saying that the model is a priority and that we’re going to do this. At best, they are saying, if this is approved, we’ll find the money, but it will come out of everybody’s budget. It would be nice if the President would say, this is a high priority and I’m dedicating university resources to this.

Larry said he would be very surprised, if given the legislature, that the Provost or anybody would say we can commit to this because we keep hearing pessimistic reports about funding from this session.

4. Revising Learning Outcomes
   • Technology Outcomes (from Andy & Rajesh)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROPOSED TECHNOLOGY OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• use technology to enhance understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identify the social, aesthetic, and ethical implications of technological decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• analyze how technology evolves and shapes human experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• apply technology to demonstrate creativity and solve problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• demonstrate how technology augments our experiences and understandings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present TECHNOLOGY Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• apply technology to demonstrate creativity and solve problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• use technology to enhance understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• analyze how technology evolves and shapes human experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• identify the social, aesthetic, and ethical implications of technological decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• analyze how technology shapes, limits, and augments our experiences and understandings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee voted on using the proposed technology outcomes as the new outcomes for this category. Passed unanimously.

• Personal and Social Responsibility (Wellness) (distributed by Susan on 02/16/15)
  • Andy suggested rewording HDE’s proposed bullet number 3 to read ...appropriate and healthy standards of personal and professional behavior.
The fourth bullet will stay as it is, because the parenthetical wording they added is what stewardship is.

The fifth bullet will be changed to read Analyze how personal choices impact communities and the world.

They suggested an additional bullet at the end and this doesn’t seem to really fit into this category.

- Andy motioned to accept the wording above, RaNelle seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

- Natural and Physical Worlds
  - Larry motioned to change the title of this outcome Natural and Physical Worlds to Natural and Physical Sciences. Seth seconded. One nay. The motion passed.

- Diversity and Global Perspectives (should we remove the science bullets?)
  - These bullets will remain as they are.

*****Next meeting is Tuesday, March 24th at 9 am in Lark*****