

Council on Undergraduate Education 2015-2016

February 5, 2016
Talley 4140
Call to Order: 1:33 pm

Members Present: Chair Chris Ashwell, Herle McGowan, Andy Nowel, Karen Young, Nathaniel Isaacson, Karen Keene, Cynthia Hemenway, Ghada Rabah, Tim Petty, Erin Sills, Peggy Dominique, Cynthia Levine, Lianne Cartee, Sarah Ash, Kim Outing

Ex-Officio Members Present: Stephany Dunstan, Michelle Johnson, Li Marcus, Melissa Williford, Scott Despain, Sarah Howard

WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

➤ *Remarks from Chair, Chair Chris Ashwell*

Welcome. Dr. Kirby is absent while they are interviewing for a new Chair of Music.

➤ Approval of the Minutes from December 4th, 2015- **Approved Unanimously**

Discussion: Member suggests recording numbers for voting tally. Request in later section: USD—Young had suggested a strategy for implementation and there was no mention of that. She would like a sentence mentioning her suggestion.

NEW BUSINESS

Consent Agenda **Approved Unanimously**

Discussion: Members familiarized themselves with the consent agenda layout and approved it unanimously without further discussion.

GEP Review

➤ **ENG 382 GK (NEW) VPA Approved Unanimously**

Discussion: Looked good, no issues. Elective for that major, but open to all.

➤ **FLS 340, 341, 342, 343, 351, 352, and 353** were reviewed as a group and **approved unanimously**.

Discussion occurred for the following courses of that group:

- FLS 341— Discussion: Members discussed how the course said it wasn't part of the requirement for major, but this is a defect in CIM. Every course in catalog needs to be manually setup. Not correct in CIM. "No" is default.
- FLS 342— Discussion: Members wondered if the requisites and scheduling section had its learning outcome copy and pasted erroneously, but approved.
- FLS 352—Discussion: Members mentioned that the list of learning outcomes are actually the objectives, which refer to GEP as GER. This is repeated in various parts. Members suggest 2&3 should be deleted from Objective 1.
- FLS 353—Discussion: Global Knowledge Objective 2 mentions a comparison between two societies, but the members suggest this would work better in Objective 3 or 4. The societal comparison is unclear. Members suggested adding a list of societies compared on the GK form, like what is done for the IP form. Should be clarified.

- **FLS 360 HUM (rev): Approved Unanimously**
Discussion: Members addressed the course reference to GER, not GEP, but Scott Despain has revised them in the system. Members were also aware of the correspondence dated 2007, which Scott will remove once Li Marcus puts it back in his hands via CIM.
- **HI 252 HUM rev Approved Unanimously**
Discussion: Course was presented as longstanding course and mentioned plans to offer 254 more frequently.
- **MUS 315 GK VPA REVIEW Approved Unanimously**
Discussion: Members thought it looked good, but mentioned that the Global Knowledge aspect appeared focused on the US. However, the rest of the course fit the category.
- **MUS 320 GK VPA REVIEW Approved Unanimously**
Discussion: Members presented the course and mentioned it looked good. Course was approved without further discussion.

GEP New Courses

- **FLA 318 GK, HUM Approved Unanimously**
Discussion: Course was presented and approved without further discussion.
- **HI 337 HUM Approved Unanimously**
Discussion: Members expressed excitement for this course, and felt fortunate to have the faculty to teach it.

NOTES ON USD – PRESENTATION OF USD BY HERLE MCGOWAN

Discussion: CALS and Sciences have discussed it, but there has not been a lot of feedback from other colleges. If members have had a chance to discuss it with their colleges, have they had any feedback? Karen Young has an email she could forward to Herle McGowan with feedback. Members suggest a list or summary from colleges of their impressions and thoughts.

There has been some feedback, and objection from previous rubric subcommittee. The report included names of another committee, but removed them because it could be considered an endorsement by that committee.

Members discuss how that University must provide programming resources before members could discuss this issue in full. Chris Ashwell believes like this sounds like a type of response that the colleges should submit, as the colleges seem to like the USD idea, but require resources to make the idea practical.

Sarah Ash mentioned she has received no negative or positive feedback, but the USD Subcommittee is waiting on as much feedback as possible before moving onto the next step.

Members discuss possible next steps, such as updating the document, then sending to Mike Mullen, then beyond him. Members suggest adding an addendum, but assert that at some point it needs to go out into the community. The Deans and Provost need to weigh in. Members realize that the Provost is likely the final step. Some members discuss creating a new task force, or revisiting the GEP entirely. Members express urgency to collect as much data as possible before sending this on.

Meeting adjourned at 2:18 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Sarah Howard