Core Undergraduate Learning Experiences (CULE) Minutes for
September 9, 2014, 8:30-9:30, Arikara

Present: Cole Davidson, Noah Engels, Marion Harris, RaNelle Ingalls, Rajesh Kavasseri, Andrew Mara, Lisa Nordick, Larry Peterson, Seth Rasmussen, Susan Ray-Degges, Kent Sandstrom, Carolyn Schnell, and Amy Rupiper Taggart

Recorder: Kelly Hoyt

Unable to attend: Cynthia Naughton, Herbert Snyder, and Beth Twomey

1. The minutes from 05/06/14 emailed on 05/12/14 were approved.

2. Reports from subgroups – Larry and Amy discussed the possibility that certain subgroup reports can be pulled out and presented to Senate for approval or notification separately from the whole package. Examples are Administrative Guidelines & Procedures and Course Approval/Re-Approval and Coordination Process. That way the Senate won’t be overwhelmed with so much at one time.

   • Course Approval and Coordination Process (Amy & Larry) – want this to be reasonable for faculty, not burdensome as that would be met with resistance. At the same time, we want to make sure that the courses meet the GE outcomes.
     ➢ Amy explained that we would have a Bison Core Committee (what the GE committee is now) and then there would be sub committees to review courses prior to coming before the Bison Core Committee.

     ➢ They hope there will be some type of electronic submission system for the GE course approval process. Possibly Course leaf (this is being used by Registration & Records).

     ➢ They suggested having a fast track approval for courses that are presently approved and easily fit into one of the new learning outcomes. It would require only a syllabus and a short form to be completed for review.
       o RaNelle asked if the Bison Core Committee would be doing the paperwork for the fast track approvals or if the college would be involved in that to say, yes, we continue with our stamp of approval and we want to continue on with that course. Amy said since it would have already been approved in the system, it would just need to be done for GE and that would be handled by the Bison Core Committee.
       o RaNelle is concerned that departments might want to opt out at this point if they want to drop a course.

     ➢ Unifying courses across campus – have an annual learning community meeting that would include professional development. Have an annual assessment of 1-2 of the outcomes with a 4 year cycle of the program.
       o Larry explained that a faculty member who has a great exercise, for example, to promote critical thinking could be asked to come and share that information with the people who attend the learning community meeting.
       o Kent asked if students would be involved in this.
         ▪ Larry suggested having student focus groups discuss the outcomes and then feed that information into these learning communities.
- Noah thought this would be a great idea as it would be beneficial for students to discuss the outcomes and give feedback.

- Amy created a flowchart that is included Course Approval and Coordination Process document sent out earlier to committee members. Subcommittees of 4 people from the Bison Core committee would review the proposals first and return to the submitter if more clarification was necessary. Once subcommittee felt the proposal was complete, then it would be brought to the whole committee (Bison Core committee) for discussion.
  - Marion felt it should be up to the colleges to check that all their items are included before it can be submitted electronically.
  - It would be beneficial if the electronic submission system would flag the item that was missing or needed to be addressed before it could be submitted.
  - Kent suggested that chairs of the curriculum committee should be informed about what is needed before submission so they can look for it as they move through the process.
  - Lisa suggested having a larger electronic system that would tie GE and Academic Affairs approvals together.
  - Amy asked RaNelle how far away are they from trying the system for course approval process. RaNelle said they are close, but the catalog has to get published first, and then the set-up has to be done. She figures it would be at least a semester to identify the forms, and all the “front end” work that has to be done yet to get it set up. Piloting Course leaf for academics is at least 1-2 semesters away.

- Kent asked who the Course Approval and Coordination Process document would be sent to or if it would be posted on the web.
  - Amy explained that even though our committees and processes don’t have to be approved by the Senate, it would be a good idea to present it to them so they are informed since they are the ones who it will affect. We can take away any valuable information or suggestions they may have in how things might work or what we could do so it works better.

- Andy suggested having some sort of comparison “table” showing the current process and the proposed process so everyone can see what isn’t working and how the proposed process will fix these areas.

- Committees and their makeup
  - Lisa recommended that we keep in mind that the course delivery method is not noted in this document and that we should try to delineate between a traditional course, a hybrid course, and an online course. For example, when we look at contact hours, distance courses don’t have seat time, but faculty still need to make sure it is equivalent to a face-to-face course. Faculty need to be prompted to distinguish the delivery method.
  - Amy asked if Lisa had a list of different things that would need to be addressed in regards to this. Lisa stated that on their webpage under the syllabus template they have incorporated several different components that need to be addressed for a course.
Amy suggested adding wording to the Course Approval document and then linking to the documents on Lisa's webpage.

Amy pointed out the call for a transition subcommittee. It would just be in place to work through the initial period until everything is moved into the new model/process, and then it would disband.

The Student BC appeals committee would be a consistent group made up of the GE Director, Registration and Records rep, Associate Dean or Dean’s rep from College of AHSS and College of Science and Math since most of the petitions are likely to involve courses in their colleges. Having these individuals always on the subcommittee would provide for more continuity because they would know how previous decisions have been made for certain appeals.

Cole noted that the deadline for appeals is actually Nov. 15, not Dec. 1 for fall semester. Amy will correct that in her document.

Lisa asked if we had a timeline for this transition and if it would be on a first year cycle of a four year plan, or what the strategy is. Will we be running two different models for students?

Larry said he thinks fall of 2016, first year students will come in under the new program and it will have to be rolled through. Student who are under the old GE plan, will have to opt in or out of the new model and won’t be able to mix and match between the two.

Amy asked if she needed to bring this back to the committee with her changes for any further discussion.

Larry said this doesn’t need to be presented to the Senate any time soon so let’s make sure there is no further discussion that might change what the process is in this document before presenting to the Senate. Amy will send out to CULE members to review the changes.

Andy asked if a course was approved for GE, will colleges be able to limit who can take the course.

Larry said they might have restricted enrollment because there are likely to be critical thinking courses in the majors that require significant previous knowledge.

Marion asked what the Provost’s thoughts were on this model.

Larry indicated that the Provost was really quite pleased with the work that was done so far and encourages the committee to continue to work on it and bring it forward to the university. But she also wasn’t very encouraging that there would be a lot of money to develop the 2 credit critical thinking courses unless they were going to be for lots of students (not 20 student sections).

Marion asked if there is no money for those courses do we need to go back and revisit that.

Larry said he thinks that the question is how are they going to be taught? If they are going to be direct links to 189, if 189 continues to be small, then it’s not going to be enough money to develop the courses.

### 3. Questions, concerns, issues, or brainstorms about our journey
English 110 – should it be dropped from the GE model
  ➢ Most students test out of it.
  ➢ Academic Affairs Council seemed to be ok with dropping it.
  ➢ Cole feels that we need to make sure other institutions are made aware that we are dropping it from our GE model, just so they aren’t taken by surprise.
  ➢ If we drop it from the GE model, we still need 36 credits so there are 3 that need to be included in another category.
    o The Upper Division Critical Thinking course could be a 3 credit course rather than being rolled-in or embedded.
  ➢ Think about this for the meeting next week, it will be put on the agenda for discussion.

Next meeting is Tuesday, September 16 at 8:30 am in Arikara