

CUE Minutes- October 17, 2014
Witherspoon Student Center 201
Call to Order: 1:33pm

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members Present (Quorum Present:13): Chair McGowan, Sarah Ash, Ted Emigh, Cynthia Hemenway, Karen Keene, James Knopp, Andy Nowel, Kim Outing, David Parish, Aaron Stoller, Candace Vick, Karen Young

Ex-Officio Non-Voting Members Present: David Auerbach, Stephany Dunstan, Catherine Freeman, Michelle Johnson, Barbara Kirby, Melissa Williford

Members Absent: Chris Ashwell (E), Timothy Buie (E), Peggy Dominuge (E), Helmut Hergeth, Nathaniel Isaacson (E), Adam Rogers (E; proxy: Cynthia Levine), Ingrid Schmidt (E)

Guests: Deborah Acker (*Shelton Leadership Center*), Gary Blank (*Forestry & Environmental Resources*), Kasey Harris (*Academic Programs & Services*), Cynthia Levine (*proxy for Adam Rogers, NCSU Libraries*), Page Midyette (*Graduate Intern-East Carolina University*)

WELCOME and INTRODUCTIONS

Welcome and Introductions from Chair McGowan:

Chair McGowan welcomed the committee to the meeting. She encouraged members to partake of the food. Chair McGowan welcomed the guests in attendance: Deborah Acker (*Shelton Leadership Center*), Gary Blank (*Forestry & Environmental Resources*), Kasey Harris (*Academic Programs & Services*), Cynthia Levine (*proxy for Adam Rogers, NCSU Libraries*), Page Midyette (*Graduate Intern-East Carolina University*).

Remarks from Associate Vice Provost Academic Programs and Services, Barbara Kirby

Dr. Kirby also encouraged the group to enjoy the food. She noted that Dr. Mike Mullen was unable to attend the meeting due to a scheduling conflict, but he did provide for the lunch. Dr. Kirby noted that the *GEP Rubric Subcommittee* was wrapping up its charge, and will be moving into a new phase of discussion with data. She explained that Page Midyette (*Graduate Intern-East Carolina University*) will be working with the review of the GEP models used by other institutions. Dr. Kirby explained that the *GEP Rubric Subcommittee* would be looking at the differences between the lower and upper level courses on the GEP lists.

Approval of Minutes from September 5, 2014 Meeting: A motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes as presented. Without discussion, the motion was **APPROVED**, with 12 in favor and 1 abstention.

Chair Elect Nominations

Chair McGowan noted that Chris Ashwell had self-nominated for by email for CUE chair for the 2015-2016 academic year. Chair McGowan asked if there were any other nominations. Hearing none, she asked for a motion to close nominations. A motion was made and seconded. Chris Ashwell was **APPROVED** as chair elect unanimously.

OLD BUSINESS

Courses for GEP Category-Review

- MUS 300 Music Drama-VPA, GK-APPROVED unanimously without discussion.
- MUS 350 Music of Asia-VPA, GK-APPROVED unanimously without discussion.

Courses for GEP Category-New Additions

- HON 310 The Creative Process in Science: Analysis, Comparisons, and Cultural Perceptions-USD-TABLED, 13 in favor, 1 abstention.

Discussion: The presenter gave an overview of the course, noting that the class has been offered under the IP category for quite a while. The course works with inquiry and creativity with the scientific process. The course looks at how women have been a part of this process. One example is with Rosalind Franklin and her contributions to the double helix and DNA. The presenter explained that a week is devoted solely to women in science. One member noted that the primary measure for the outcome seems to be posting on the website and discussion via Moodle. She asked if that would be enough information for the measure. One member explained that typically this would not be enough information as the council would want to know more details about the questions and what expectations the students need to meet. Another member suggested doing a web posting with a grading rubric. If the grade is solely contingent on the students submitting information, then this may not be appropriate as a measure. Another member found that the grading for each posting is 0-2 points. She concluded that there couldn't be much discrimination in the grading. Dr. Kirby asked if it would be possible to ask Dr. Blanton to provide a rubric or details on how the postings are evaluated. She noted he could provide what he is looking for in the discussion. Because the students are in the Honors program, she explained that the students should be able to talk in various ways about discrimination and diversity. One member noted that there was no textbook. Another noted that while there was no textbook, there were readings assigned. One member had concerns about the use of Rosalind Franklin; he felt that the scenario might not be gender related at all. He felt it could be viewed as an academic and research integrity or an ethics focus. He noted that there are better examples available in science, such as Marie Curie. Additionally, he noted that the Rosalind Franklin scenario occurred in England, not the United States. He asked if this could truly be considered in the spirit of the USD category. Chair McGowan said that she had once heard the co-requisites described as follows: Global Knowledge centers on the idea that Americans are minorities in the global world while USD focuses on the majority examining their privilege within the U.S.. In this sense, perhaps an example about females as a minority in science would still be consistent with the spirit of Diversity, even if it did not take place in the U.S. Dr. Kirby suggested having the instructor attend the CUE meeting; Dr. Blanton would be able to explain his means of evaluation. One member explained that she felt it boiled down to two issues: 1. Does the course fit the USD category? She explained that Objective 3 and 4 both end in the United States. 2. If one focuses on the text, then it is not meeting the USD category, but rather the GK category. Another member asked if more rubrics should be provided, to see what the instructor is addressing and evaluating. The presenter explained that he was not at CUE when the first course action for the course was tabled, so he could not speak to the suggestions made at the previous review. However, he felt confident that the previous concerns had been addressed and that Dr. Blanton did his due diligence to meet the council's expectations. Chair McGowan explained that the previous concerns were addressed, but that the committee has a separate list of concerns. She also expressed concern over the restricted seats section of the *GEP Course Submission* form. While University Honors Program students come from across various disciplines, the seats are restricted. Non-UHP students can only register after UHP students have registered, and with departmental approval. Chair McGowan noted that the seats open should state '0%' rather than '100%'. One member asked if reserving seats for freshman was considered a restriction. Catherine Freeman explained that this would not be considered a restriction. Chair McGowan noted that the subject matter is good, but the Honors courses need to be clear. The *GEP Course Submission* form

provides numbers, and these numbers should mean the same across different forms and classes. There are certain expectations to the restriction that are okay. '100' means that anyone could take the course. The number is intended to give CUE honest information. A motion was made to table and was seconded. The action was **TABLED**, 13 in favor and 1 abstention.

NEW BUSINESS

*Courses for GEP Category-**New Additions***

- SLC 250 Critical and Creative Decision Making Models-IP-**APPROVED** unanimously with friendly suggestion.
Discussion: The instructor explained that this would be the second offering of the course; it was previously taught as a special topics. She noted that the current class has forty students from eight colleges, with four faculty guests from across campus. One member noted that it looked like a good course. He made the friendly suggestion to change a discipline from *Management* to *Organizational and Developmental Management*. The instructor thanked him, and noted that faculty will change from semester to semester. One member asked if anything had changed substantially from the previous special topics offering of the class. The instructor stated no. Without any further discussion, the action was **APPROVED** unanimously with friendly suggestion.
- HON 311 Words Through Space and Time-GK, IP-**APPROVED**, 12 in favor, 1 abstention.
Discussion: One member noted that the course had an issue with the restricted seats percentage. The presenter noted that all of the Honors courses would have this error; he misinterpreted the question on the form. One member noted that the committee appears to be serious about the assessment part of the form. She noted that the assessment seems the same for each measure. She noted that the committee may need to remind those filling out the form to be more specific. Catherine Freeman noted that the language could be altered on the form. Another member noted that in her college, they have their own standard they follow. She noted that it is up to CUE to decide if they want more information for the measures: if yes, is it a best practice, which is nice but not essential, or should it be required every time. Another member noted that the committee does not want the process to be onerous for faculty. He explained that he had a question about the synthesizing project, and had emailed the presenter, who emailed the instructor. He wondered if having the instructor present at the CUE meetings would be helpful; someone would be present who understands the course. Another member noted that he liked the course, but that he had noticed a small typographical error¹ in the third sentence. Without any additional discussion, the action was **APPROVED**, 12 in favor and 1 abstention.
- HON 352 Self, Schooling, and the Social Order-SS-USD-**APPROVED**, 11 in favor, 2 abstentions.
Discussion: One member noted that the Honors courses should be held to the same standard as other courses up for CUE review. He felt that the Honors Special Topics Shell Offerings had been given slack. Dr. Kirby asked if the Honors courses should be sent back. Chair McGowan encouraged specific questions or prompts be included in the measures, but asked if the concern was due to the coursework. Another member asked if the final assignment was to write an essay, the committee should see an example of the essay question. Without this information, she found it really hard to review. The presenter asked if the assignment was not reflective of the GEP category. He did not see how the measures do not map to the outcome. A different member asked, 'Don't we trust the faculty to have the expertise to evaluate in the category?' Chair McGowan noted that standards of review should not be changed once a course action has been submitted to the committee for review. She

¹ Pg. 59

noted that CUE should have a discussion to make standards. Without any further discussion, the action was **APPROVED**, with 11 in favor and 2 abstentions.

- HON 353 Code Breakers: Unlocking the Mysteries of One Human Language-SS, GK-**APPROVED** unanimously without discussion.

Courses for GEP Category-Review

- ANT 371 Human Variation-GK-**APPROVED** unanimously
Discussion: The presenter noted that she will ask if the department wishes to retain the SS GEP categorization for the course. Dr. Kirby asked if the pre-requisite listed is enforced. The presenter explained that she was not sure but would follow up with the department. The presenter explained that the course focuses on how physiology changes as people move around the world. People change due to geographical migration and the course looks at this in a compare and contrast method. One member asked if biological differences could be considered in the spirit of Global Knowledge. The presenter explained that she doesn't think that the GK list is an exhaustive one, and biological markers are often used to define race. Chair McGowan noted that the course almost read as a USD rather than a GK. She noted that the instructor's example focuses on African Americans. The presenter explained that the second question on Measure I is one question with multiple attributes. She explained that slaves were not sent to just the United States. Different countries had similarities and differences with the various constructions of race. The focus is on Global Knowledge, not only the United States; however because it is a global focus, it will include the United States. To not include the United States in this would be negligent. Chair McGowan noted that she was concerned when reading the paperwork, but the verbal discussion makes the course much clearer. One member felt that the instructor should be embarrassed to submit the questions provided for Measure I. He noted that the course seems okay, but that Measure I seemed negative on the Bloom's Scale. The presenter explained that the answer to the question would maybe surprise him. If everyone's expectations were wrong, she noted that it could prove interesting. Without any additional discussion, the action was **APPROVED** unanimously.

Courses for GEP Category-GEP Special Topics Shell Request

- IPUS 295 Diversity and Environmental Justice-IP, USD-**APPROVED** unanimously.
Discussion: The presenter explained that this class was being put forward as an experimental course that hopefully would become permanent. One member asked if under the measures it was acceptable to list quizzes, or should the instructor provide examples. Chair McGowan explained that many courses come forward with only one question and other provide more specific examples. CUE has seen successful versions of both come forward for review. The instructor, Dr. Gary Blank, explained that students will work in teams investigating reports, and will be assigned tasks and questions regarding the topic. These will be composed of series of self-evaluation. Students will see how their personal background affects how they view issues. The goal is to get students to engage and to determine who the stakeholders are. This will help students to see who they are in relation to a specific controversy. The presenter explained that this course is an experimental one, and had not gone forward to UCCC for review. Once the course has been taught, more information will be provided. One member noted that she liked the idea of the course and saw it as a great area of conversation for a STEM campus. She asked for some clarification on what environmental justice entails. She asked how it connects to the outcomes. The instructor of the course explained that the course will be team-taught course with at least two guest speakers listed. One of the lecturers is from the National Park Service, and focuses on diversity. The course is designed to illustrate how environmental justice interacts with diversity. Dr. Blank pointed out that each week students will spend time with an expert or a person who has studied the topic for the week, corresponding with the

readings and assignments. He noted that individuals from different economic and sociopolitical backgrounds use the wilderness differently. These lead to predispositions to use resources in specific ways. One member asked if the course would come back for further CUE review if the course becomes permanent. Catherine Freeman confirmed that the course would be reviewed by UCCC and CUE. The presenter noted that the course is intended to help students across CNR disciplines address common issues. The topics and approach would interest CNR students and draw them together. Dr. Blank noted that CNR wants their students to take the course, but the course would also be of great interest to students outside their college. Chair McGowan recommended for the permanent offering that the diversity should be more defined, and the action should have more specific examples. Dr. Blank thanked the council for its hard work, and noted he appreciated their effort. Without any further discussion, the action was **APPROVED** unanimously.

Courses for GEP Category-Fall 2014 GEP Honors Special Topics Shell Offerings

- A motion was made and seconded to approve the following actions as a package. The package was **APPROVED** unanimously.

Course	GEP Category
HON 290 Sec. 002 <i>The Ides of March, 44 B.C</i>	HUM, GK
HON 295 Sec. 002 <i>A History of Economic and Financial Crises</i>	SS
HON 296 Sec. 001 <i>Freedom and the Self</i>	IP

- HON 290 Sec. 001 Frauds and Mysteries in History-HUM, IP, GK-**APPROVED**, 10 in favor, 1 against, 1 abstention.

Discussion: One member noted that he was troubled that the course might not fit the IP category. He noted that it looked like there were sub-disciplines under one discipline. He asked the question if his course uses mathematics, does it make it an Interdisciplinary Perspectives math course. He noted that he would argue no, the mathematics is just a tool. The member explained that the argument that the course offering is IP is weak. Another member mentioned that the course could be IP then solely on the History and Philosophy. Another member asked if History and Archaeology are truly different disciplines. A member noted that the methods are different. The instructor teaching the course is a historian. Dr. Kirby explained that CUE has had this question before, and they often look to see if there are separate publications, journals, and methods to a discipline. She noted that an organic chemist would consider themselves different than a physical chemist. A friendly suggestion was made to narrow the subjects down. Without any additional discussion, the action was **APPROVED**, 10 in favor, 1 against, and 1 abstention.

Courses for GEP Category-Drop

- A motion was made and seconded to approve these actions as a package. The package was **APPROVED** unanimously.

Course	Action	GEP Category
HI 438 <i>The Russian Empire to 1917</i>	Drop Course; Drop from GEP	HUM, GK
HI 439 <i>History of the Soviet Union and After</i>	Drop Course; Drop from GEP	HUM, GK

Discussion: One member asked what would happen to the students who took one of these courses for GEP credit after the class has been dropped. Michelle Johnson, from Registration and Records, explained that anyone who took the course when it was a general education course when it sat on a list would receive credit for the class.

ANNOUNCEMENTS and DISCUSSION

Chair McGowan asked the council to consider the assessment issue to bring their thoughts to the next CUE meeting. One member noted that the wording implies ‘*should*’; he was unsure if this meant should or must. Stephany Dunstan, from the Office of Assessment, explained to the committee that when she is reviewing assessment plans and she sees that it is listing a quiz or prompt, she asks for a specific example. The Office of Assessment can then tie the outcome to the measure. Dr. Dunstan stressed that there can be flexibility in this. Her office wouldn’t need to see the rubric of grading the question itself. One member noted that the council needs to be able to evaluate the objectives. Another member explained that in a perfect world, assessment would include questions. However, many courses brought before CUE are new courses. Instructors for these courses have not developed final exam questions. It is difficult for some courses to provide this information to CUE.

Chair McGowan urged the committee to discuss this at their college levels. Without any time remaining, the meeting was adjourned.

Meeting adjourned at 2:59pm.

Respectfully submitted by Gina Neugebauer