

CUE Minutes- March 27, 2015
Witherspoon Student Center 201
Call to Order: 1:34 pm

ATTENDANCE

Voting Members Present (Quorum Present:15): Sarah Ash, Chris Ashwell, Timothy Buie, Peggy Domingue, Ted Emigh, Tyler Hatch, Cynthia Hemenway, James Knopp, Andy Nowel, Kim Outing, David Parish, Adam Rogers, Ingrid Schmidt, Aaron Stoller, Karen Young

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

Members Absent: David Auerbach, Helmut Hergeth (E), Nathaniel Isaacson (E-*Scott Despain as proxy*), Michelle Johnson (E), Karen Keene, Chair McGowan (E), Candace Vick (E- *Adrianna Kirkman as proxy*)

Guests: Larry Blanton (*University Honors Program*), Scott Despain proxy for Nathaniel Isaacson (*Foreign Languages & Literatures*), Adrianna Kirkman (*CNR-Dean's Office*), Lloyd McCarthy (*Interdisciplinary Studies*)

WELCOME and INTRODUCTIONS

Welcome and Introductions from Chair-Elect Ashwell:

Chair Elect Ashwell Welcomed the committee to the meeting. He extended a welcome to the guests in attendance: Larry Blanton (*University Honors Program*), Scott Despain proxy for Nathaniel Isaacson (*Foreign Languages & Literatures*), Adrianna Kirkman (*CNR-Dean's Office*), Lloyd McCarthy (*Interdisciplinary Studies*), and Sheila Smith-McKoy (*English*).

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

Dr. Kirby welcomed the council to the meeting. She urged members to look at the dates for CUE and UCCC course action submission dates as the end of the academic year approaches. Dr. Kirby acknowledged that the need for discussion on diversity and sensitivity in the university community continues. She noted that the GEP Review Subcommittee has met once, and some dates are scheduled for the remainder of the Spring 2015 semester. If subcommittee members are available during the summer, the subcommittee will continue to meet.

Approval of Minutes from February 20, 2015 Meeting: **APPROVED unanimously without discussion.**

OLD BUSINESS

Courses for GEP Category-New Course

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

Discussion: Aaron Stoller moved; David Parish seconded. The presenter introduced the instructor for the course, Dr. Larry Blanton. The presenter explained that he would like to add US Diversity to the course. He noted that it was the third time at CUE for USD. Dr. Blanton explained that revisions were made based on previous feedback. One example was related to Rosalind Franklin; a new section has been created for the course that deals with women in the sciences. It has an emphasis on society and creativity, which evolved through the reading. Dr. Blanton noted that the evaluation of the web postings has been expanded so that each is worth 10 points, with the number of points being

assigned depending on the quality of work. This allows for a more nuanced evaluation. One member suggested reworking the first learning outcome. She noted that the category focuses on the society and historical contexts that cause structural inequality. The outcome provided does not seem to focus on that, but after looking at the readings, it looks like this is being met. Another member noted that he was not convinced; he was concerned with the measures. He did not see how it would address the outcomes. He noted he would like to see something more specific to show. Dr. Blanton explained that specifics from the individual sessions and web posting. He explained that there is choice in terms of essay topics that students will make. Over the course of the class, the students would collectively demonstrate the outcomes. A member asked if this is graded. Dr. Blanton confirmed that they were graded, and that the points have been expanded so as to allow more nuanced grading. The member stated that it does not say how effectively how this would be done. Dr. Blanton pointed to the syllabus, where the web postings are described and defined. The member noted that if it relates to the measure, then students should not have a choice. Another member asked if one objective was missing a measurement. Catherine Freeman explained that the category only requires two out of four objectives be filled out. Without any further discussion, the action was **APPROVED**, 13 approve, 1 abstention.

NEW BUSINESS

Courses for GEP Category-Review to Remain on GEP lists(s)

- ENG/COM 364 History of Film to 1940-GK, VPA-APPROVED unanimously.
Discussion: Karen Young moved; David Parish seconded. The presenter explained that he course looks at early films as a medium, throughout the world. It also studies analyses of film techniques and individual film styles related to countries. Without any additional discussion, the action was **APPROVED** unanimously.

Courses for GEP Category-New Courses

- HON 300 Race, Membership and Eugenics-USD- APPROVED unanimously pending revisions.
Discussion: Aaron Stoller moved; David Parish seconded. One member asked if Honors had made the changes her college recommended. One change involved the third learning outcome. Another suggestion was to change assignment to better honor a faculty members' time. Dr. Kirby asked for clarification on honoring the faculty member's time. She asked if a letter was sent to the Dean thanking the faculty member's commitment. The member suggested that one idea is to bring a faculty member to the group where questions could be asked. Dr. Kirby suggested to the council that when special guest lecturers participate in courses, a thank you to the faculty member, with a copy to the Associate Dean would be appreciated. The presenter noted that the instructor made the change to the title as the consult suggested. The presenter noted that he would talk to the instructor about addressing this. Without any further discussion, the action was **APPROVED unanimously pending revisions.**
- HON 347 Freedom and the Self-HUM, IP- APPROVED, 12 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions.
Discussion: Aaron Stoller moved; Jim Knopp seconded. Chair Elect Ashwell announced that this was the first course to be reviewed by CUE in CIM. One member asked what the disciplines were. The presenter explained that they were Literature and Philosophy. A different member felt that essentially any course can be interdisciplinary. He noted that he could not see the connection between Literature and Philosophy. He felt that the discussion of Literature is always a discussion of Philosophy. He felt that it did not look like there two separate academic disciplines present in the car. A member disagreed noting that the analysis of Literature would look at potentially the form, style, technique of writing, and the content would be fodder to tackle a topic. This may not look at an

argument as formally as Philosophy might. A different member felt that this course is a weak use of the IP category. The presenter disagreed, as he felt there was a clear distinction between Literature and Philosophy, and the methodology is radically different. He noted that the idea is to integrate methodologies that make works come alive and show interconnection. He did not understand why there would be confusion about methodologies collapsing into one another. He noted that the course is taught by a professor of Philosophy. Chair Elect Ashwell noted that the debate over the IP category is a different battle. He noted that there are outcomes to meet, and the course must be reviewed to see if these are met. A member disagreed asking how the council should evaluate a course from the perspective of a philosopher. Chair Elect Ashwell explained that CUE must trust the instructor's background in their field. Dr. Blanton felt that it was a very good example of an Interdisciplinary Perspectives course as it operates: a philosophy course and a literature course with two halves. One is the philosophical theme of freedom and the self, which switches to a literary consideration of works that were produced that relate to the information that students learned from the Philosophy outlook. Without any additional discussion, the action was **APPROVED**, 12 in favor, 1 opposed, 2 abstentions.

- **PB 213 Plant and Microbial Biology-add IP, drop NS-APPROVED unanimously.**
Discussion: Cynthia Hemenway moved; Timothy Buie seconded. The presenter noted that the department did a consult with CHASS, as the syllabus compares ethnobotany, different cultures, different plants, and how the developments affect what is seen today. She did have a question about Objective 3 in the IP paperwork. She noted that the two disciplines illustrate plant use and how this is used in modern times; economics were alluded to in the syllabus. Without any further discussion, the action was **APPROVED unanimously**.

Courses for GEP Category-Drop Course

- **ANT 371 Human Variation-drop SS-APPROVED unanimously.**
Discussion: Karen Young moved; David Parish seconded. The presenter explained that ANT 371 has a pre-requisite that satisfies the SS list, and is never waived by the department. Without any further discussion, the action was **APPROVED unanimously**.

Courses for GEP Category-Honors Special Topics Shell Request

- A motion was made and seconded to approve the following actions as a package. The package was **APPROVED**, 14 in favor, 1 abstention.

Course	GEP Category
HON 290 Sec. 001 <i>The Golden Ages of Athens</i>	HUM, GK
HON 290 Sec. 002 <i>The Intersection of Myth and History</i>	HUM, IP
HON 296 Sec. 001 <i>Fiction and the Sciences</i>	IP
HON 296 Sec. 002 <i>Politics and Literature</i>	IP
HON 299 Sec. 001 <i>Music of the Celtic World</i>	VPA, GK

- **HON 290 Sec. 002 The Intersection of Myth and History-HUM, GK- APPROVED unanimously without discussion.**
- **HON 296 Sec. 001 Fiction and the Sciences-IP- APPARENTLY-APPROVED**, 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 4 abstentions.
Discussion: Aaron Stoller moved; Jim Knopp seconded. One member asked what the disciplines for the course were. He felt that the disciplines were Science and Literature, but it does not mention if

history is in the pedagogy. The presenter explained that the course looks at three historical movements, with the literature coming out of the time that reflects the scientific achievements of the period. It would be difficult to talk about the works of fiction without talking about the scientific context in which the events occurred. A member asked where the discipline e that illustrates the way a historian would look at the question. A member felt that the course appears to be with a focus in science fiction. He considered it a stretch to consider its disciplines the History of Science and Literature. Dr. Blanton provided the example of “Frankenstein” that illustrates the discoveries of the time of electricity in animals. It illustrates an examination of scientific phenomena. Dr. Kirby noted that this is the second time the course has come to CUE for review. She was not sure why these questions were not raised at its first offering. She noted that there needs to be consistency for people bringing actions to CUE. Dr. Kirby explained that analyzing the players rather than the criteria of the category makes review more challenging. One member asked if it was possible that since the course is shell course, CUE gives a little more leeway. A different member suggested that for procedure in the future, a course wanting to be considered for the IP category could provide a letter from the other discipline agreeing to the process? She suggested that this might be beneficial even for shell courses. Dr. Kirby explained that particularly for permanent courses, issues may make it a deal breaker. However, it is hard to say that to an instructor if the shell course is approved without question the first time. A member asked if the course was approved and the course and its criteria have not changed, and it is offered a few items, what the point of reviewing it two more times is. A different member felt that the standards haven’t changed, but applying the standards has grown tougher. There are still expectations, and there has been an ease off for the first experimental time a shell course is offered. Dr. Kirby pointed out that the minutes indicate that there were no concerns raised in the previous review of the course. Without any additional discussion, the action was **APPROVED**, 10 in favor, 1 opposed, 4 abstentions.

➤ HON 296 Sec. 002 Politics and Literature-IP-**APPROVED unanimously.**

Discussion: Aaron Stoller moved; Kim Outing seconded. The presenter noted that this course is not un-similar to the one previously discussed. The course looks at Political Science themes in Literature. It also investigates how literature illuminates those themes. A member noted that a student emailed asking about the literature requirements. The member sent the information to the English Department; English supported the course, for this student, for Literature I and Literature II. The English Department was happy with the course. Another member complimented Objective 1 in the IP paperwork. Without any further discussion, the action was **APPROVED unanimously.**

➤ HON 296 Sec. 003 Creative Non Fiction as Civic Discourse: Reading, Writing About and Making Environmental Literature-IP,HUM- **APPROVED with the amendment that any subsequent offering will not be labeled under the IP category**, 11 in favor, 1 abstention.

Discussion: Aaron Stoller moved; David Parish seconded. The presenter explained that his course is a different way of Environmental Science writings. Students will evaluation and do creative writing themselves. A member asked how the instructor is teaching students the science. The presenter explained that the IP category is met through the Environmental Science/Natural Sciences and Literature disciplines. He explained that students will look at different science and literature works: they will examine public documents, Op Ed pieces, Rachel Carson’s “Silent Spring”. A member noted that it is one thing to read the works, and another to critique them. The presenter noted that it was his understanding that course is interested in the modes of writing by dissecting different issues. A member expressed concern with labeling the course under Natural Sciences. She understood the concept of evaluating forms of writing concerning Natural Sciences, but this is not the same as a natural scientist. Chair Elect Ashwell asked if the instructor would approach the course as an environmental scientist. He didn’t this she is looking at it from a scientist perspective, but rather as environmentalism as a history or a movement. Dr. Blanton suggested that perhaps the discipline is not that of environmental science but rather environmental studies. One member noted that the literature

uses science writers not scientists. Dr. Blanton suggested that for future offering, the course would only be put forward for the HUM category, unless content is significantly changed. A motion was made and seconded to add this amendment to the action. Without any additional discussion, the action was **APPROVED with the amendment that any subsequent offerings will not be labeled under the IP category**, 11 in favor, 1 abstention.

Courses for GEP Category-GEP Special Topics Shell Request

- **IPGK 295 Leadership in the Caribbean-IP, GK-APPROVED unanimously.**
Discussion: Karen Young moved; Jim Knopp seconded. The presenter explained that the course incorporates leadership in the context of the Caribbean, with Political Science and Africana Studies as the disciplines. She introduced the instructor for the course, Dr. Lloyd McCarthy. Dr. McCarthy provided the committee a context of what students would be learning concerning politics and goals in the Caribbean. He emphasized that it is important for students to have ideas, thoughts of the people, and a world view, which will put them in a good position to respond to projects and programs to be implemented in these regions. Without any further discussion, the action was **APPROVED** unanimously.

- **IPUS 295 Diversity and Environmental Justice-IP, GK- APPROVED unanimously without discussion.**

ANNOUNCEMENTS and DISCUSSION

Meeting adjourned at 2: 55 pm.

Respectfully submitted by Gina Neugebauer