

**ANNUAL REPORT**

University Standing Committee: Council on Undergraduate Education

Academic Year Covered by Report: 2015-2016

Date Report Submitted:

Report Submitted by: Dr. Chris Ashwell

Number of Times Committee Met: 9 out of 12 Scheduled Meeting Times

Link to Minutes: [2015-2016 CUE Minutes](#)

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION ITEMS/ACTIVITIES OF COMMITTEE**

The following tables reflect actions taken by the Council on Undergraduate Education in the 2015-16 year.

The Council on Undergraduate Education met nine (9) times for 1-2 hours each session during the 2015-016 academic year. The committee had appropriate representation to carry out its charge with voting members that included:

- 1 member from each College and 2 from the largest colleges (CALs, CHASS, COS).
- 1 member each representing Office of International Affairs, University Libraries, and Faculty Senate.
- 1 student member representing the Student Senate

The membership and its quorum (minimum of 10 voting members) worked diligently each meeting period. In the 2015-16 academic year, a total of 119 actions were considered and processed. **Table 1.1** indicates a breakdown of these actions.

**Table 1.1**

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>CUE 2015- 2016</b>
Courses new to GEP	29 (Non-Special Topic/ Honors Shell)
Courses reviewed for GEP	38
Courses dropped from GEP	17
Courses new and reviewed	2
Courses new and dropped	0
Courses reviewed and dropped	0
Special Topics Shell Courses	13
Honors Special Topics Shell Courses	20

There is still work to do in the review of courses that made the transition from GER to GEP. **Table 1.2** gives a layout of these courses as of 5.25.2016.

**Table 1.2**

	HUM	GK	SS	IP	HES	MS	NS	VPA	USD	Totals:
# of courses in GEP (new and existing) since 2009 (currently active)	267	227	82	112	79	22	102	70	75	<b>1036</b>
# of courses to be reviewed/validated	201	9	57	25	0	0	65	28	6	<b>391</b>

Two subcommittees met during the Summer, Fall, and Spring terms of the 2015-2016 academic year. **Table 1.3** outlines their chargers and summarizes their recommendations/responses.

**Table 1.3**

<b>CUE Subcommittees</b>		
<b>USD Report</b>	Subcommittee Charge	Consider in-depth the impact and implications of the delivery of USD GEP category learning/courses through co-curricular activities/academic courses.
	Number of Meetings	2
	Notes	<p>Due to the variety of issues discussed in this document, the subcommittee feels that it is time for the university to commission a more formal review of the general education program components at NC State, particularly the USD co-requisite. Changes to this requirement could merit further review of other categories and the distribution of credit hours across categories. However, it should be noted that, after reviewing the general education programs of peer institutions from the UNC system and from across the country, the NC State GEP has many strengths overall.</p> <p>This is a particularly important time for CUE and/or a university task force to involve the university community—including students, faculty and other staff leaders—to consider the best approach to insure that diversity and inclusion are a meaningful part of our curricula at NC State. It has been several years since the GER Task Force developed our current system, and the</p>

		needs of our students have changed since then. As stated in its strategic plan, NC State is committed to “continuously evolving... to keep pace with the challenges and opportunities faced by an increasingly diverse citizenry in an increasingly interconnected world.” We think it is time for the general education program at NCSU to be examined to determine how it should best evolve to serve the needs of our students and our university community.
<b>GEP Review</b>	Subcommittee Charge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Discuss the purpose of the USD GEP Category</li> <li>- Consider the consolidation of the GK and USD GEP categories</li> <li>- Status of the co-requisites - should they become credit bearing and with what resulting impact?</li> <li>- Other routes to achieve USD through co-curricular workshops/guided experiences.</li> </ul>
	<b>Number of Meetings</b>	2 Face to face; reports reviewed/edited online
	Notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Data shows a shortage of seats in USD courses. Possible incentivization of development of USD courses as was done for IP?</li> <li>- Possible first year common course on USD.</li> <li>- Discussion of “experience” versus “scholarship.”</li> <li>- Discussion of faculty expertise in USD.</li> </ul>

Other business included:

- Peggy Domingue was elected Chair-elect for 2016-2017, and shall serve as Chair for 2016-2017.
- During this term, courses seeking the Interdisciplinary Perspectives GEP attribute were discussed at length. Members discussed the difference and appropriateness of the designation of the attribute to courses that are more “multidisciplinary” rather than truly “interdisciplinary.” Moving forward, a clear definition of what an ideal IP course looks like would benefit members of the committee.

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- **Implement Agenda Structure Changes:**
  - The committee requested that the agenda be simplified and clarified so that reviewers could be sure of what was under review. The agenda was simplified to include only items and information that was not in CIM, and a new format was introduced to separate out courses new to the GEP, existing GEP courses being reviewed due to changes, and courses only undergoing GEP review as a continued part of the GER - GEP transition.
- **Findings/Recommendations of the USD Subcommittee Report:**
  - The committee heard and brought back to their college committees the report from the USD Subcommittee Report, which discussed the availability and variety of USD GEP courses. Discussions on this topic included:

- Whether USD should become a credit-bearing GEP requirement, which would require the movement of other GEP requirement hours.
- Whether USD-designated courses should include only 3-credit courses.
- Whether USD-designated courses should be taught only by faculty with a particular background/experience.
- What sorts of academic and non-academic experiences could be encouraged/implemented in order to further the intent of the USD requirement.
  - The committee received responses to the report from colleges. These responses will be sent forward.
  - **Recommendation: Due to the variety of issues discussed in this document, the subcommittee feels that it is time for the university to commission a more formal review of the general education program components at NC State, particularly the USD co-requisite. Changes to this requirement could merit further review of other categories and the distribution of credit hours across categories.**
- **Recommend including all GEP Review Information + the Syllabus in CIM:**
  - The committee passed a motion requesting that when a course is put forward for GEP review, that all portions of the GEP fields in CIM be filled out. If a course has been reviewed for MS, but is being reviewed now for NS, both sections of the GEP short form in CIM must be filled out to reflect that information. The agenda will clarify which GEP item is under review.
    - As an amendment to this motion, the committee requested that the syllabus for all courses be brought forward for GEP review as well.
- **Role of Administrative Office (OUCC & AS) alongside faculty governance in committees**
  - DASA (VCD Mullen & AVP Kirby), the committee Chairs, and the Academic Policy Committee discussed the roles of the Office of Undergraduate Courses and Curricula and Academic Standards and the Council on Undergraduate Education.
  - They agreed that the structure of the two committees made up of faculty and facilitated by an administrative office like OUCC & AS is a common one among higher education institutions.
  - Faculty on the committees maintain ownership of the courses and curricula - OUCC & AS facilitates the process.
  - The APC agrees on the importance of a continuity of membership between CUE and the College Curriculum Committees to facilitate smooth and efficient processing of courses and curricula.
- **Recommendation: delay changing committee structure but review member qualifications.**
  - DASA, the committee Chairs, and the Academic Policy discussed the roles, charges, and work of the CUE and UCCC committees.
    - The roles and charges of UCCC and CUE are different. The two committees may be combined in the future but due to the backlog of work for CUE at this time (regarding GEP review from 2009), **combining the two committees is not feasible at this time.**

- **The Chairs of UCCC and CUE recommended characteristics of the ideal UCCC/CUE member to APC as:**
  - Experienced with course and curricular actions in their college
  - A member (voting or regular guest) of their college courses and curricula committee
  - Able and willing to commit to committee-related work for 3-5 hours a week
  - Experienced in building consensus
  - **Are nominated by their college or that above experiences serve as a requirement of placement on the committee**