

CUE Meeting Discussions

- [CUE Committee Composition](#)
- [GEP Co-Requisite-Dual Listing](#)
- [GEP Implementation and Course Review](#)
- [Health and Exercise Studies-\(Formerly PE\)](#)
- [Course Review Consultations](#)
- [GEP Co-Requisites and Credit Only](#)
- [Comprehensive Articulation Agreement](#)
- [GEP Shell Course Offerings](#)
- [Honors 290-Series](#)

CUE MEETING DISCUSSIONS TIMELINE & OUTCOME SUMMARY RELATING TO CUE COMMITTEE COMPOSITION

CUE MEETING DATE	DISCUSSION POINT	OUTCOME
05.03.13	<p>Dr. Kirby announced that the Committee on Committees approved the revised recommendations which will reduce the overall size of the committee and the number of voting members from 34 members (31 voting) to 26 members (20 voting). The council considered as justification for the reduction:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The change in general education requirements in 2009 that no longer includes university level responsibility for Advanced Communication (Writing, Speaking and Info Literacy) and Computer Literacy (Technology Fluency). 2. The completed implementation of the new GEP. 3. The current size of the committee with 34 members. 4. The representation needed to carry out the charge of the Council. 5. The appropriateness of the voting status for each seat. <p>The recommendation specifically requests the below changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain all College Faculty Seats with no change to voting status. • Remove the following seats: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ PE (-1) – will be represented under DASA seat ○ MUSIC (-1) – will be represented under DASA seat ○ UG students (-2) – will be represented by Student Senate seat ○ Faculty At-Large (-4) – will be represented by Faculty Senate seat • Change voting status and/or seat type: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ex-Officio seat – Office of Assessment change to non-voting ○ Ex-Officio seat – UCCC Chair change to non-voting ○ DELTA seat – change to Ex-officio seat non-voting • Retain the seats for the Chair, Past Chair, Faculty Senate Rep, Student Senate Rep, DASA, Library, and OIA with voting status remaining unchanged. <p><u>Criteria for Appointment:</u> The Council recommends the following criteria be considered in selection of members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appointment to serve in a College Faculty seat should, when possible, go to a person who also will serve on his/her respective College Course and Curriculum Committee. To carry out the charge of CUE effectively, the role and responsibility of the College representative on CUE is to communicate with and provide input from his/her College. To this end, it is important for the faculty selected to be in a position within their College to be able to effectively inform both CUE and their college. The committee also recommends consultation with the Associate Dean for the College seat at the time of selecting a representative to identify a representative that can serve in both capacities. • The person appointed should have experience at the undergraduate level working with undergraduate students, programs, or issues. <p><u>Implementation of the change to Committee Composition:</u> The Council recommends this change be made effective beginning with the Fall 2013 term but for members who serve in a seat that is being removed, the committee recommends the member serve in their current capacity until the end of their appointed term.</p>	Office of the Provost and the Committee on Committees approves recommendation
10.26.12	CUE Composition Subcommittee update - CUE is looking at its own charge and composition in a subcommittee in tandem with the	

	FGC. In years past there was some consultation with the CUE coordinator and Dean in reviewing the list of volunteers for appointment. The subcommittee is discussing the criteria/experience for membership such as some departmental/college level experience with courses and curricula; communication responsibilities; voting vs. non-voting membership status; at-large membership. There are good discussions happening in CUE and the goal is to have the most effective and meaningful committee for the benefit of the student and faculty. The subcommittee will continue discussion and bring forward recommendation to full council.	
10.12.12	<p>CUE Composition Subcommittee update - discussed CUE membership history and the need to have a large committee to efficiently handle the course actions & and the then new General Education Plan. The subcommittee also discussed desirable qualities for committee members such as experience with the Course and Curricula Committee of the member's college which would facilitate communication between CUE and College Course and Curricula Committees. Another consideration discussed during the initial meeting of the subcommittee was the appropriate number and composition of CUE seats to ensure balance and representation.</p> <p>CUE Composition Subcommittee discussion - Members were asked to submit feedback related to the approved problem statement by October 1. A Student Senate Resolution supports the continuation of the policy requiring the GK & USD Gen Ed co-reqs to be satisfied with a letter grade.</p>	The committee withheld a formal vote until the October 26
09.07.12	CUE Composition - The CUE structure was last reviewed in 2007. A subcommittee (C. Vick, D. Burton, J. Knopp, D. Reider, C. Freeman, and B. Kirby) will review CUE organization, university representation, and voting membership.	CUE Composition Subcommittee formed.

CUE MEETING DISCUSSIONS TIMELINE & OUTCOME SUMMARY RELATING TO GEP CO-REQUISITE - DUAL LISTING

CUE MEETING DATE	DISCUSSION POINT	OUTCOME
05-3-13	The committee took this opportunity to review the intent of the existing GEP co-requisite dual listing practice and determine if there is a need to revisit the issue or formalize a recommendation based on recent blended course offerings and courses with outcomes which successfully map to the objectives of the two co-req categories. After sharing their concerns, the committee concluded that further discussion is needed prior to making a recommendation on this issue.	For now, while a course may populate both lists, it cannot count for more than one co-req. C. Freeman and M. Johnson will work out the logistics of how the course will appear in SIS. Discussion will continue Fall 2013.
04-19-13	The developing issue of courses with learning outcomes that satisfy both GK and USD co-requisite objectives and whether such courses should satisfy one or both was discussed. In looking at minutes from 2008 meetings, Dr. Kirby reported that CUE voted not to allow a single course to satisfy both USD and GK co-requisite lists. Dr. Kirby asked the committee to consider whether there is a need to re-examine the issue. The committee discussed the issue, including setting precedence, the philosophical issue of how one course can satisfy two co-requisites, system capabilities, consistency, and whether to eliminate GK & USD categories, for instance, and have one Cultural co-requisite.	Dr. Kirby asked members to discuss this issue with their respective colleges and provide feedback to CUE at the next meeting.

CUE MEETING DISCUSSIONS TIMELINE & OUTCOME SUMMARY RELATING TO GEP IMPLEMENTATION AND COURSE REVIEW

CUE MEETING DATE	DISCUSSION POINT	OUTCOME
01.18.13	<p>Proposal to designate courses to fulfill the GEP Additional Breadth category - ENE curriculum - APPROVED by Majority Vote [11 in favor, 1 opposed, 5 abstained] Discussion: D. Parish addressed the committee with a proposal from COE for a special exception to allow specified course offerings for the Additional Breadth GEP category for ENE students. ENE is the only program in the University that could not complete the GEP without making substantial curriculum changes. In the past this issue was handled by an advisory memo. D. Parish and C. Freeman have worked very hard but have been unable to find an alternative solution. Dr. Kirby confirmed that the courses to be specified under the exception do meet the GEP objectives and that accreditation requirements are in large part the reason for the proposal. The member casting the opposing vote believes the issue should be decided at higher levels within the university.</p>	Proposal to designate courses to fulfill the GEP Additional Breadth category - ENE curriculum - APPROVED by Majority Vote [11 in favor, 1 opposed, 5 abstained]
01.18.13	<p>The use of restrictive statements in GEP offerings - ID 444 was originally placed on the CUE agenda for approval to add it to the GEP IP course list pending new course approval by UCCC. UCCC tabled the action pending consultation with the instructor regarding suitability of coursework for open enrollment and with CUE relating to the use of restrictive statements in GEP offerings. Based on UCCC's tabling of the new course action, Chair-elect moved for and the committee approved making this item a point of discussion. After reviewing the action and the reasons for UCCC tabling it, CUE made the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If this is to be part of the graduate curriculum, it should be brought back to UCCC as a dual level course. • Because it is a 400 level course, students will assume they need to take during junior or senior years. • Provide specific example of Outcome(s) measure(s). • Establish UCCC guidelines regarding course numbering conventions. 	
11.09.12	<p>Courses for GEP Category Removal - A motion was made to remove PHI (STS) 325 from the GEP-USD category list. Some discussion took place relating to the reasoning provided for the action: the course is more appropriately aligned with Humanities and Interdisciplinary Perspectives (the course will remain on those lists) and removal will relieve excessive enrollment pressure. Statistics from the Dept. and from R&R indicate that 2/3+ of the students currently enrolled use the course to satisfy the GEP-USD co-requisite requirement. One member noted the course is popular and a requirement in many programs and questioned whether enrollment in the course would be affected if it were dropped from the USD list. Chair Jameson asked what aspect of the course was originally mapped to the USD category. D. Austin indicated it was the consideration of abuse in patient populations in the United States; adding that component of the course represents a small percentage of the overall course structure and some instructors may not focus on the issue at all. B. Kirby expressed concern about removing a course from a GEP category list for any reason other than it not matching the GEP outcomes; adding that this is especially true for a category such as USD which has a limited number of courses. Kirby suggested that if resources are an issue that should be addressed with the Provost's Office. D. Austin indicated reference to the potential impact on enrollments was included to address a question that would likely have been raised as a result of the request to remove the course from the GEP-USD category.</p>	
09-07-12	<p>FLC 401 was submitted for inclusion on the GEP HUM and GK lists. Committee members discussed the appropriateness of 300+ level courses for GEP classification. SACS standards indicate the broadness of the course must be taken into consideration. Cue has expressed concerns in the past: availability of courses that meet GEP standards but are restricted to students because of the number of prerequisites; 300+ level courses may be so narrowly focused that they do not match the objectives of the GEP. In the past, some Associate Deans felt a restricted course that meets the GEP requirements should be open. The committee discussed forming a subcommittee to revisit this issue. A report on the number of restricted GEP courses never used because of prerequisite limitations or the availability of less limiting alternatives would reveal if the issue warrants further review. Michelle</p>	

	Johnson suggested data from an annual report of GEP courses, the number of seats offered, and enrollments would be helpful. The committee voted unanimously to table the action for justification and agreed to consider the larger issue at a later date.	
05.04.12	Dual level course issues: HI 484 was pulled from a group of courses submitted concurrently for GEP review. The course raises an issue because it is a dual-level course and graduate courses do not count for General Ed. The difference with graduate-level courses is that the students do extra assignments and greater depth of work. A motion was made that a 500-level course (if it's dual listed) will be accepted in lieu of a 400-level course to fulfill a General Education requirement. A. Kirkman indicated this would be acceptable to the associate deans.	A vote was taken to allow dual-level courses (including 500-level courses) on the GEP list. Motion passed with 2 abstentions.
03.02.12	CHASS Global Knowledge Review Recommendation follow up: Chair Hergeth requested feedback from the Council on whether to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Continue with the trial run for another batch using catalog description and requesting syllabi or short form as needed to make a determination; or Require the short form for all courses moving forward; or End the trial run and specify the documentation for review that is needed (catalog description, syllabus, and short form?). After considerable discussion, Chair Hergeth said that of the three options it seems that the committee has narrowed it to either the catalog description or the short form. He asked if anyone wanted to continue the trial. Discussion continued and a motion was made that since USD and GK are co-requisites and not stand-alone GEP courses, that CUE use the new review process to expedite the process. Chair Hergeth reiterated that if a course description is provided, then the course goes on the consent agenda and any committee member can withdraw it and have it go through the same process if need be. This process is only applicable to existing co-requisite courses already on the lists and not new entrants to the list. The motion was seconded. A committee member amended the motion to include that CUE be provided with an electronic version of the syllabus at the same time.	Chair Hergeth restated the Motion as amended: <i>The motion is to allow the revised review process for the existing GEP GK and USD co-requisites in order to expedite the process. This process requires submission of the course catalog description and to make available the electronic version of the syllabus. The courses will be treated as consent agenda items and if a Council member has a concern or question, the course may be pulled from the consent agenda for further discussion and if necessary, a short form will be requested to be completed. This revised process is only applicable to the co-requisite categories.</i> Motion approved unanimously.
12.02.11	CHASS Global Knowledge Review Recommendation follow up: At a previous meeting, CUE voted to approve CHASS's proposal to change the method for reviewing GK courses. Dean Ambrose subsequently expressed reservations about this method. A trial run of the proposal which would allow for CUE review was approved. Based on this trial run, CUE would review, discuss, and decide if this process is appropriate for reviewing a course to determine if it meets the GK objectives. Motion was made to approve the FLS and PS courses for the GK list, seconded. Some committee members expressed concern, among other things, that there was not enough information to decide whether the courses meet the GK objectives. Lengthy discussion followed on the revised process.	
11.11.11	CHASS Global Knowledge Review Recommendation follow up: Dr. Ambrose provided detail regarding the process for review of GK courses using the method proposed by CHASS and supported by CUE. As mentioned previously, this review process will undergo a trial run wherein CHASS will bring forward a small sample group of courses to CUE with course descriptions. The courses could be a random selection of GK courses from across the college or selections from one particular department. The descriptions and any other supporting documentation CHASS deems appropriate will be sent to CUE prior to the meeting with the regular agenda.	Based on trial run, CUE will review, discuss, and decide if this process is appropriate for reviewing a course to determine if it meets the GK objectives.
10.28.11	CHASS Global Knowledge Review Recommendation follow up: Dean Ambrose expressed reservations about this review method and has talked with CHASS administrators about the issue and requested CUE do a test run/test pilot of this process. CHASS will bring forward in November a random selection of GK courses across the college or pick one particular department and provide CUE with the catalog description for these courses; in addition, for those courses where CHASS felt the catalog description is not enough, they will also provide a completed short form for that course. CHASS will also indicate whether any of the courses selected will be removed from the list since they felt it doesn't meet the category objectives. CUE will then review to see if there is agreement with CHASS's recommendations for the courses selected and whether what is provided is enough to make a determination.	
10.14.11	CHASS Global Knowledge Review Recommendation: CHASS CCC proposes that CUE follow the same rationale with GK co-requisite review as taken with study abroad; these courses bypass CUE review. A motion was made to approve recommendation and seconded CHASS presented the justification to expedite this process is because their college has about 130-150 courses on the list and it is not a good use of resources to have faculty/CCC prepare the short form when it is obvious that the course meets the Global Knowledge co-requisite. Considerable discussion on the merits followed.	A motion was made to approve and seconded. Motion passed by majority vote. <i>Hand Vote results:</i> 0 abstention, 12 yes, 5 no.
09.16.11	Update on GEP Course Review and committee functions: Coordinator Freeman gave an overview and summary of the GEP implementation. CUE has been working over the past few years at reviewing the IP and USD courses. As of September 2011,	



	<p>there are 16 courses on the IP and USD lists to be reviewed. The next category for review will be the Global Knowledge list that has a total of 174 courses.</p> <p>Assessment: Director of Office of Assessment presented a review of items to look for when reviewing GEP courses. Members were encouraged to review specific statements and outcomes/means of evaluations when looking at GEP courses. Carrie will be working with colleges and CUE members on GEP core competencies. She is looking to set up a committee this year to address this as accreditation approaches.</p>	
09.16.11	<p>Update regarding implementation of courses taken Study Abroad for GEP GK credit: R&R requested guidance from CUE on how this should be implemented. Committee members seemed to agree that if the student fails the class, they couldn't receive credit for the GK; students need to pass the study abroad course. There was some lengthy discussion on how a NC State student can take a course here as part of the study abroad program, make a D-, still pass and receive the zero credit to count for their GK co-req. However, if a student transfers in to NC State and has participated in a study abroad program course, the course taken at another institution has to pass with a C- or better to be transferred in. Would that student receive credit then for the GK co-req.? Some members argued that the study abroad component is what is being looked at to meet the GK co-req, not where you took the class, what it was, or where it's transferred in from. R&R needs a definition as to what satisfies and what does not to appropriately decide which students receive credit. Committee member Ingrid Schmidt, representing the Study Abroad Office reminded members that the NC State courses in the study abroad program already go through a rigorous process to be approved for the program. Final approval of study abroad program courses is to be made by the depts. R&R proposed that a 0 credit hour pseudo course will be placed behind the scenes in the degree audit for a student who took a course study abroad that is being used to fulfill the GK category. This way the "course" will fulfill the GK requirement and will also follow the student if the student changes majors/etc. If student takes a course study abroad and decides to not have this course count in the GPA by using the "Grade Exclusion" policy, then this course will no longer satisfy the GK co-requisite.</p>	
09.16.11	<p>Proposed Recommendation for GK credit from Study Abroad: While reviewing a new course for the GK list, discussion returned to CUE's recent decision relating to the Proposed Recommendation for GK credit from Study Abroad and some expressed that the decision still bothers several colleagues and there is still ongoing concern. The chair stated there is obviously still broader discussion to be had on this topic.</p>	
05.06.11	<p>Global Knowledge/Study Abroad credit implementation: Members discussed implementation issues with regards to the Global Knowledge/Study Abroad credit. Currently if a student changes majors the audit loses any waivers that are approved by one college to another. Perhaps for Study Abroad meeting GK credit a way to implement this and keep it in the system as being met is to provide a "course" that will carry no credit but can be met and carried forward if moved.</p>	<p>ACTION(S): Include a piece in the proposal that addresses implementation for this recommendation.</p>
05.06.11	<p>Associate Deans' recommendation relating to Study Abroad context for the Global Knowledge requirement – follow up: Associate deans endorsed with minor revision to add UG coord instead of advisers or other designee. This is not a rejection of the CHASS proposal and hopefully continues that discussion in the future. Some discussion on how soon this could be put into to provide guidelines and a way that students could start using this in the fall to receive GK credit.</p>	<p>Motion to adopt the wording of the proposed Recommendation for GK credit from Study Abroad with the edits endorsed by the Associate Deans; Seconded. Vote – 3 abstaining, 10 yes, 0 no.</p>
04.08.11	<p>Associate Deans' recommendation relating to Study Abroad context for the Global Knowledge requirement – follow up: The CUE subcommittee met to discuss the Global Knowledge co-requisite and the Associate Deans recommendation. The outcome of the subcommittee meeting is a proposal listing 3 different types of study abroad courses and recommendations regarding GK credit for each. The full committee discussed using courses taken study abroad as a framework for GK credit. Some felt the course itself need not meet the GK objectives but the course serve as a framework for evaluating and assessing courses that are offered via study abroad. After further review of the proposal brought forth by the CUE subcommittee, the recommendation was made to endorse the proposal with revision to bullets 2 and 3.</p>	<p>A motion was made that "CUE endorses the language in the addendum to the summary presented reflecting the subcommittee discussion on Study Abroad and the overall Global Knowledge discussion." The endorsement was approved by majority, one abstention. This endorsement will move forward for review by other campus entities such as the Faculty Senate.</p>
03.25.11	<p>Proposed revision to GEP objectives for Global Knowledge co-requisite: BACKGROUND: On 01.18.11 CHASS CCC submitted to CUE a proposed revision to GEP objectives for Global Knowledge co-requisite. DISCUSSION: In a memo to CUE, CALS responded to the request made by CHASS CCC to change the GEP Global Knowledge category objectives. CALS CCC felt the proposed changes should be broadened by adding "or scientific" and "or culture" to the type of courses that might be approved for the GK list. The committee talked more about the philosophy of the objectives. One member asked about the term "images" in the revised objective 1. The committee felt that the inclusion</p>	<p>Motion was made to adopt the changes to the GEP GK objectives per CHASS with the revisions requested by CALS. Seconded. Revision approved unanimously.</p>

	proposed by CALS was appropriate.	
03.25.11	Associate Deans' recommendation relating to Study Abroad context for the Global Knowledge requirement: <u>BACKGROUND:</u> A unanimous recommendation came from the Associate Deans relating to Study Abroad & GK (March 2011): "Any academic course taken in a study abroad context satisfies the GEP global knowledge requirement." <u>DISCUSSION:</u> A motion was made & seconded to consider the recommendation. A lengthy discussion addressing the different perspectives related to the recommendation followed.	A motion was made to table the discussion and form a subcommittee to look into this issue in more depth. – Volunteers for subcommittee are: Allen Dupont, Jim Knopp, Andy Hale, Andy Nowel, Ingrid Schmidt, Randy Foy, John Ambrose, Catherine Freeman. Seconded. Approved.
01.28.11	Proposed revision to GEP objectives for Global Knowledge co-requisite: <u>BACKGROUND:</u> Members in the CHASS CCC had discussed previously the objectives for the Global Knowledge category and agreed the current objectives were not as clear as they could be so a revision was submitted. [09.25.09 CUE Meeting] <u>DISCUSSION:</u> CHASS CCC submitted a proposed revision to GEP objectives for Global Knowledge co-requisite. A motion was made to approve the proposed revision. Motion was seconded. One asked if there would be negative impact to students who have already taken GK courses under the current objectives or would it negatively affect any courses that have already been approved under the current objectives? There was some discussion as to whether GK should include non-human global knowledge.	A motion was made to amend the motion & recommend the proposal as written to be presented to the campus and seek consultation from the colleges before further action. Approved unanimously.
12.10.10	GEP evaluation rubric: Should the GEP evaluation Rubric seat count question clearly indicate when a course does not meet the 25% non-restricted seats?	In review of the form, it does allow for comments so no revision to the form is necessary.
10.01.10	Concern re: GEP Course Review Process: Some programs/departments expressed concern with the process of review for GEP courses and asked if there might be a way to simplify the review process/work load involved , especially for a list as large as GK one.	CUE members were asked to think about how to handle this when it comes up in the future.
09.03.10	GEP Course Review Update: Last term, the committee began review of the IP list of courses. There are 24 courses remaining on the IP List to review. The US Diversity list review will also begin this fall and this list has 32 courses. Global Knowledge will follow. Dr. Dupont gave an overview of what CUE should look for as they review courses for GEP and reminded the committee SACS likes to know if there is a process in place and is the institution following it.	
04.30.10	Update from IP Subcommittee – review of IP criteria: The Subcommittee tasked with revising the methods of delivery criteria for the IP Category presented a revision to Method of Delivery bullet #3 based on CUE comments from 04.16.10. CUE members briefly discussed expertise versus showing how disciplines in the content of course overlap and bring together informed and rigorous exploration of different perspectives.	Subcommittee recommends this revision for acceptance by the committee. Approved unanimously.
04.16.10	In discussion of an IP course drawing on disciplines within a College, some members voiced concern that a program requiring a course that is on the IP list that draws on the different disciplines within the college limits students gaining exposure outside of their college.	
04.16.10	Update from IP Subcommittee – review of IP criteria: The Subcommittee tasked with revising the methods of delivery criteria for the IP Category [02.19.10 CUE Meeting] presented their proposed revision to Method of Delivery bullet #3. The clarification to the bullet was meant to be a helpful guideline to instructors who are looking to see what is involved for the IP category. CUE members provided feedback on the proposed revision.	Motion and second to approve the revision. After further discussion, the revision was Tabled and will be brought back to CUE for vote.
02.19.10	A course review led the committee into a lengthy discussion about the interdisciplinary perspectives category, interdisciplinary approaches, and how CUE reviews courses for the IP. Members also discussed issues of the quality of instruction for IP courses, having enough courses for students to take & the goal to work towards more ideal courses in the future. CUE reviewed IP Category rationale & objectives and recommended a subcommittee form to look over the bullets under "methods of delivery" for possible improvement. This led to discussion on what to do with courses that have already been approved or reviewed under these guidelines. One member pointed out there is a precedent of the University having taught similar courses before in the IDS, MDS, and STS areas emphasizing there are faculty who can teach with a pedagogy that approaches topics/disciplines from multiple views and teaches students to think critically.	A motion, seconded and approved to form a subcommittee to re-examine the IP course design guidelines concerning methods of delivery; specifically "Individual scholars providing interdisciplinary instruction" to discuss expanding the description for more definition and clarity. (Volunteers: A. Dupont, A. Khater, B. Matthews, J. Odom, D. Auerbach)
01.08.10	Notable Course Review(s): IDS 260 (Changing Paradigms of Leadership, Learning, and Service) – drop from IP list – Jameson- A motion was made. Seconded. Some discussion on how to handle when a course is dropped and the system drops it off the list, how can advisers/faculty make sure those students who have taken or are taking the course still receive credit for it? Catherine agreed to follow up with Registration and Records to find out how or what would happen with this. Approved	

	<p>unanimously.</p> <p>Notable Course Review(s): FLN 401 (Hindi Literature & South Asian Cultural Contexts) – new – HUM & GK lists – Jameson – A motion was made to approve. Seconded. Some discussion on whether the pre-requisites for this course are already on the HUM and GK lists, and if so is putting the 400 level course on these lists redundant? Further discussion that there is no harm in putting it on the lists either. Members agreed this was a good point and would recommend going ahead and putting it on the list. Approved unanimously.</p> <p>Revisit IP Course Review Process [09.11.09, 09.25.09 CUE Meetings]: Some members felt providing a longer form with more information would not necessarily help short of showing two different instructors on the course when examining how a course approaches subject matter from two different disciplines. Some members felt including a course description or short summary would help clarify the course and how it's approached. Other suggestions included: a) have the instructor include details on scheduled guest lecturer(s) & provide information about how this meets the interdisciplinary approach, and b) provide a specific question for faculty to answer such as "What are the two disciplines or more that make this course meet the interdisciplinary perspectives category objectives and explain how you address/synthesize/integrate it in the course?"</p>	
11.06.09	ARE/EC 436 Environmental Economics is on the IP list but course is not currently offered. The department requests removing the course from the IP list, but not from the course catalog. Members requested a memo from the dept. requesting dropping from the list with departmental signatures and processing through college CCCs.	Members requested a memo from the dept. requesting dropping from the list with departmental signatures and processing through college CCCs.
09.25.09	The CHASS curricula committee reviewed the GEP IP course review schedule & 60% of the courses are CHASS courses. There is concern the IP course review schedule will be hard to meet if the review requires a complete course action form. The CHASS representative requested approval to use a "short form" for the review process for GEP courses. CUE Members discussed the value of seeing the full syllabus as it is helpful in determining the appropriateness of the course for a GEP category. Full course action review versus a shorter form for quick review was evaluated. CUE members favored the inclusion of GEP objectives and outcomes as well as the weekly outline and schedule of readings/assignments.	Motion made to require courses coming forward for review complete the Short Form providing the student learning outcomes & means of assessment, along with attachments to include the GEP Rubric, weekly course schedule (including assignments, quizzes, tests, topics, field trips or other activities including lab or studio topics and any required readings) & the signature page. Seconded, and approved unanimously. No abstentions. NOTE: Via email response, CUE also requires that the title and author of any required text or publication be included in the attachment to the short form.
09.11.09	First year of GEP implementations. CUE can now begin reviewing GEP Course Lists, beginning with IP and course transfer credit. GEP course review is the main focus of the committee this year. CUE will review courses currently listed on the IP course list and work with faculty and college members in the revisions of these courses to meet the IP Category objectives. CUE is tasked with this course review over the next three years as charged in the GERTF report. Faculty is encouraged to use the syllabus tool to assist in revising courses. A full course action to drop a course with justification is required if an instructor wants to remove a course from a list and/or the university course catalog. The action will come to CUE for approval to drop after it's been reviewed by its college course and curricula committee and then move to UCCC for final approval. It should be clear if the request is to remove the course from the GEP list, drop it from the catalog, or both.	

CUE MEETING DISCUSSIONS TIMELINE & OUTCOME SUMMARY RELATING TO HEALTH AND EXERCISE STUDIES (formerly PE)

CUE MEETING DATE	DISCUSSION POINT	OUTCOME
01.08.10	NC State accepts an AA or AS degree as satisfying the GEP requirements when students transfer with two exceptions: Foreign Language and PE. There is some concern that some community colleges do not require PE. Considering CUE's recent endorsement for PE in the GEP the issue will likely return to a future agenda.	
09.25.09	Due to budget cuts there has been discussion about reducing the PE requirement in the GEP from 2 credits to 1 credit, or dropping the requirement completely. In the past, CUE has supported PE in General Education and may want to consider expressing continued support. It was noted that the GER task force looked at this issue at NCSU & peer institutions and felt the PE requirement very important to retain. Additionally, many groups on campus who offered feedback while the GEP was developed demonstrated support of PE.	Motion to endorse retention of 2 semester PE requirement as part of the GEP. Seconded, and approved by majority: 18 members voting yes and 2 abstentions. Two student members not present at the meeting responded via email that they endorse the PE requirement in the GEP making the total members endorsement at 20 yes and 2 abstentions.
09.11.09	Input from CUE regarding the possibility of dropping PE credit from the GEP was welcomed. CUE has supported including PE for students in their general education in the past and members discussed the appropriateness of CUE developing an official statement in support of keeping PE.	Motion was made to bring back the discussion of PE and transfer PE credits on a future CUE Agenda and approved unanimously.

CUE MEETING DISCUSSIONS TIMELINE & OUTCOME SUMMARY RELATING TO GEP COURSE REVIEW CONSULTATIONS

CUE MEETING DATE	DISCUSSION POINT	OUTCOME
11.12.10	CUE discussed the issue of consultation and CUE's response for consultation in regards to IP courses. [BIO 227 Biological Illustration, New for NS & IP lists, 10-29-12 CUE Meeting] As part of course review and responsibility of the committee, UCCC examines consultation issues when actions come forward.	CUE members were asked to think about consultation as reviewed by UCCC as satisfactory when an action comes to CUE. On 12.10.10 A motion to accept UCCC consultation review for new courses or course changes as sufficient for CUE approved unanimously.
10.29.10	A course review [BIO 227] led to discussion on whether a consultation would help the committee with this course.	A motion was made to table the course action for the GEP Interdisciplinary Perspectives list for consultation. Seconded. Approved by majority.
02.19.10	A course review led the committee into a lengthy discussion about the interdisciplinary perspectives category, interdisciplinary approaches, and how CUE reviews courses for the IP list. One member cited a recent issue with a new course that wants to be on the IP list but is experiencing difficulty in moving forward due to requests for consultations and questioned if this a "one" time issue or something that may come up again in the future?	
11.06.09	Notable Course Review(s): <u>WGS 330 (Women and Health)</u> – New IP list – A motion was made to approve WGS 330 for the IP list. Seconded. Discussion followed from members with concerns on the interdisciplinary aspects of this course. There was a request to see more consultation to see how this course is approached from different disciplines.	A motion was made to table the course pending a chance for the committee to review it with consultations. Seconded. Item was tabled and will return at a future agenda with requested consultations.

CUE MEETING DISCUSSIONS TIMELINE & OUTCOME SUMMARY RELATING TO GEP CO-REQS AND CREDIT ONLY

CUE MEETING DATE	DISCUSSION POINT	OUTCOME
10.26.12	S/U grading for co-requisites Discussion & Vote - Chair Jameson clarified that the current credit-only grading policy and interpretation of the policy is that all courses taken to satisfy a GEP requirement must be taken for a letter-grade. S/U grading is allowed only if the course grading method is credit-only and for PE courses. This vote is a vote in favor of maintaining this current policy or changing the policy to allow the option for student's to be able to select S/U grading to satisfy the co-requisite when taken as a free elective or non-degree course. Upon this clarification, a formal motion was proposed as follows: "For those courses which are graded, the course must be taken as a letter grade to satisfy the co-requisites in the General Education Program." Following the discussion the committee allowed the motion to come to a vote. The vote was taken by hand count with 15 in favor and 4 against the motion, no abstentions. Motion passed by majority vote. The current policy will remain as is.	The current policy will remain unchanged. .Vote by show of hands: 15 in favor/ 4 against the motion) abstentions.
09.07.12	Review of Problem Statement re: S/U grades for GEP Co-requisites - the statement presented referred to courses that would be used to fulfill a free elective/non-degree. If a student uses the course to satisfy a major requirement, it has to be taken as a letter grade. The credit-only grading regulation policy addresses what courses can be taken to credit-only. The statement was unanimously approved pending revision to the first sentence: "... advising in favor of allowing selected S/U grades".	Committee coordinator sent problem statement to CUE and Assoc. Deans. Members were asked to share with their colleges & provide feedback by October 1, 2012. Student members were encouraged to share it with students. Student Senate Representative would seek resolution at upcoming Student Senate Meeting.
05.04.12	GEP Co-requisites - S/U grading option: a continuation of the discussion after members sought feedback on the issue from their respective colleges. Dean Ambrose asked if CUE wants to permit students to take a co-requisite as S/U when it is a letter graded course. After continued discussion it was the consensus of the committee to have the Chair draft a statement regarding the proposal to allow students the option to change to credit-only grading for a GEP co-requisite course if the course is being used to satisfy a free elective.	
04.20.12	Comprehensive Articulation Agreement & the Foreign Language Proficiency requirement in the GEP and credit-only option follow up: Dr. Ambrose informed the committee that he'd met with the associate deans and updated them about CUE's recent discussion on "S/U" grading and the Foreign Language Proficiency requirement. The issue was discussed at length.	A vote was taken to require a letter grade for foreign language proficiency. Approved unanimously.
04.20.12	S/U Grading for Co-Requisites: There has been some interest in whether the GEP co-requisites could be taken S/U. Co-requisites don't have a credit hours requirement. When the GEP task force put together the GEP plan, there was a compromise to keep the number of credits for the GEP to a minimum. Dean Ambrose encouraged everyone to go back to their colleges and discuss this, adding that if we don't do anything, we'll just follow the current regulations regarding courses in a major and GEP courses have to be letter graded. Discussion will continue at the next CUE meeting	
11.06.09	Members discussed the pros and cons of having a student take a course for the U.S. Diversity or Global Knowledge co-reqs for credit only versus a grade. <u>University Regulation</u> on Credit-Only courses regulation covers the question - students cannot elect to take GEP courses as credit only and have them count toward fulfilling the GEP/graduation requirements.	No revision to the University Regulation was suggested.

CUE MEETING DISCUSSIONS TIMELINE & OUTCOME SUMMARY RELATING TO **COMPREHENSIVE ARTICULATION AGREEMENT**

CUE MEETING DATE	DISCUSSION POINT	OUTCOME
04-5-13	Dr. Kirby informed CUE that A Gen Ed Advisory Council composed of chief executive officers from each university in the UNC system has been selected to evaluate our Comprehensive Articulation Agreement and efforts to provide quality access to the university system through the transfer process.	
01.18.13	Resolution from the General Faculty about consistent general education requirements across all 16 campuses Discussion: Dr. Kirby announced the Faculty Senate has previously approved a UNC system wide resolution relating to GEP requirements. Revisions to the CAA are being looked at. Kirby asked CUE members to review the common core competencies and how to achieve them, to consider efficiencies within the system, and to be attentive to messages related to the resolution and pathways of prescribed coursework as they are likely to appear on CUE agendas in the future. Suggestions and comments for Dr. Kirby are welcome.	
10.26.12	Foreign Language Proficiency & CAA update R&R identified 161 students who have had the FL proficiency waived due to the CAA from the community colleges. The FL proficiency discussion will continue in regards to admission criteria, general education transfer and there are discussions with the community colleges regarding the CAA and also at the Board of Governors level that is reviewing the CAA regarding requirements and expectations.	
10.12.12	Foreign Language Proficiency & CAA update - B. Kirby reported that advisors have questions about the foreign language proficiency requirement and Gen Ed requirements for eligible transfer students under the CAA. The agreement is that eligible students will have satisfied the GEP including Foreign Language Proficiency, even if they didn't take foreign language classes to earn their AA or AS at the community college. This is inconsistent with the foreign language proficiency graduation requirement and some feel is unfair to students not eligible under CAA. For these reasons and because the CAA speaks to Gen Ed credit and not graduation requirements, B. Kirby asked the committee if they would like to revisit the issue. Although the CAA articulates that transfer students with an AA or AS will have completed the Gen Ed requirements, the university's PE and Foreign Language requirement can be enforced. S. Dunstan suggested consulting with FLL who is assembling an inter-institutional consortium to coordinate system-wide community college transfer requirements. B. Kirby asked committee members to share discussions occurring at the College Course and Curricula Committee level with the CUE body. A. Parker noted that the Student Senate supports the Foreign Language requirement. The discussion raised concerns about SACS review and treating CAA eligible students differently. Suggestions from the floor included: make the issue part of QEP conversations, survey a subset of students who will not or cannot meet the foreign language proficiency requirement to determine why.	Members will talk with their colleagues and consider if NCSU needs a different approach.
03.23.12	Comprehensive Articulation Agreement & the Foreign Language Proficiency requirement in the GEP and credit-only option: There won't be a vote today on the issue of credit-only grading and FL proficiency. Discussion starts with CUE, which is charged with developing guidelines and rules related to the GEP and it is a work in progress. If we have a recommendation it will be shared with campus. The entire issue of S/U is much bigger than CUE. One question is: Do we allow S/U for co-requisites? And the bigger issue is: How does campus deal with S/U when "S" is equivalent to a C-? Historically, S/U was put in place as a means to protect a student's GPA; now, when a student earns an "S," it really means something. Chair Hergeth said that this issue goes back to CUE's previous discussion, in a different form, in November 2009 regarding co-requisites and allowing S/U grading. The consensus of the Council was that we do not accept S/U grading for GEP classes except for PE as reflected in the credit-only regulation. Lengthy discussion on the issue took place. The Chair told the members that they could continue the discussion by extending the meeting, or they could continue it in two weeks. Dean Ambrose mentioned a subcommittee has been charged to review this very issue and to let him know if anyone else wanted to participate in it.	
03.02.12	GEP Task Force and the Comprehensive Articulation: BACKGROUND: Dean Ambrose opened the meeting with comments about the GEP Task Force and the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement in that if a student earns an Associate's degree in science or the arts and then transfers in, the Associate's degree will satisfy all of our GEP	Chair asked for volunteers and the following CUE members agreed to sit on the committee: Candace Vick, Megan Albidrez,

	<p>requirements including the Foreign Language proficiency. Before the articulation agreement was in place, the transfer credit was evaluated as equivalencies and was not automatically accepted.</p> <p>DISCUSSION: There has been some confusion surrounding the FL proficiency as it relates to the GEP and that some colleges may be advising the transfer student with an AA/AS that a FL course is required. Currently, there are approximately 73 students who have fulfilled the FL proficiency through the CAA but not reflected in their audit. In addition, the FL proficiency as a carryover from the old GER is currently set up to allow S/U (credit-only) grades to fulfill this requirement. To fulfill a GEP requirement (other than PE), a letter grade is required unless the course grading is S/U. Dean Ambrose recommended to the Chair that a subcommittee be created to take a look at the FL proficiency as a requirement of the GEP. 1) Should the FL requirement remain under the GEP? and 2) should S/U grading continue to be accepted? An S/U is equivalent to a C- or better. A course taken to fulfill a GEP requirement will count if the student passes with a D- or better. He also suggested that a representative from CHASS and FL department be part of the subcommittee.</p>	<p>Donna Burton, Jim Knopp, David Rieder, and Ingrid Schmidt.</p>
05.06.11	<p>NC Comprehensive Articulation Agreement update: R&R has implemented the solution suggested by CUE [03.25.11] to indicate on the degree audit that the student has met the NC Comprehensive Articulation Agreement. Due to this a number of students were identified that were registered for courses that their NCCAA has already been met so they are signed up for courses they do not need.</p>	<p>R&R notified them to let them look for other courses.</p>
03.25.11	<p>General Education Transfer credits under the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement – follow up: Michelle Johnson spoke to the 01.28.11 discussion about how R&R is currently processing students with regards to the CAA and students transferring to NC State having met the GEP requirements under the CAA. It was difficult to track which students have completed an AA or AS or core requirements so completion of the GEP via the CAA was not reflected in the degree audit.</p>	<p>R&R is working on an identifier for students who have completed their GE requirements through the Articulation Agreement as students are admitted so that this will be a more seamless process. The Degree audit will also have a note that the student has completed their GEP under the CAA.</p>
01.28.11	<p>Presentation on handling of General Education Transfer credits under the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement - Michelle Johnson, Registration & Records: Michelle Johnson explained there is no easy way to handle general education courses transferred in from community colleges to get Gen Ed credit but presented examples of ways R&R can handle this. Lengthy discussion on accreditation requirements, the articulation agreement requirements and how that is impacting students who transfer in followed.</p>	<p>Members agreed there needs to be a broader discussion about this in order to help these students who are waiting for answers currently as well as in the future. The committee chair encourages further discussion after the meeting and this issue should return for discussion on a future agenda.</p>
10.01.10	<p>NC State’s Response to UNC Tomorrow’s Recommendations on General Education: Dr. Dupont asked committee members to review and provide suggestions and feedback on his draft response. The committee started a brief discussion of the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement and the GEP categories of Global Knowledge & U.S. Diversity. Some discussion on making the CAA section a little stronger in the draft report and also add a section discussing the effects of a “two-tier” system with the university and the community college system.</p> <p>Course Equivalencies: Brief discussion also took place on course equivalencies, general education, and meeting the requirements when a student transfers in to the university.</p>	
09.17.10	<p>The committee briefly discussed the Articulation Agreement in that “the community college students who have completed the general education core will be considered to have fulfilled the institution’s lower-division general education requirements at the receiving institution.” By this statement also students who have an Associate degree are considered to have met the General Education Program laid out by NC State. Some members are still concerned about the U.S. Diversity, Global Knowledge co-reqs categories as well as the Interdisciplinary Perspectives category and how this applies to transfer students.</p>	
09.17.10	<p>NC State has a two year technical program called Agricultural Institute. This program has been around for years. The courses offered in the AAS programs do not transfer into the 4 year degree programs offered at NC State. SACS raised concern regarding the transferability of the AAS general education core. CALS updated their Agricultural Institute programs to be in compliance with the guidelines set forth by the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement. The students will now be taking undergraduate level General Education courses in Math, Social Sciences, Humanities,</p>	

	Healthy Living and Composition. The program has developed a WRT 111 & 114 course for their programs. If a student decides to transfer and apply for a four year degree the English department has agreed to allow these 3 credit hour courses to meet the ENG 101 GEP. The WRT 111 & 114 are restricted to Agricultural Institute students. These courses were recently reviewed and approved by the University Courses & Curricula Meeting.	
09.03.10	Members voiced that they hadn't received word from Associate Deans of their colleges and faculty to know what to do with transfer students & USD & GK co-reqs, especially with students who are coming in from community colleges. This is an issue of concern especially in regards to the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement. Another conversation needs to happen about this issue. Freeman volunteered to bring this up with Dean Ambrose for more discussion.	
09.25.09	Relating to the discussion on transfer course equivalencies processes within colleges, Carrie indicated she will meet with Dr. Ambrose, the Admissions Office, and Registration & Records to discuss the issue which will then be brought back to CUE at a future meeting.	
09.11.09	Transfer credit is evaluated for course equivalency but when a course does not match an NCSU course by number it is given a generic label such as HI ***. In the case of a student with an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree from a NCCC, transfer credits are accepted and the student has fulfilled the GEP requirements. For those without an AA or AS, the courses from the transcript are evaluated on a course-by-course basis within colleges. There is no standard for evaluating transfer course credit that does not map to an IP, GK, or USD course. Discussion continued on the appropriateness of CUE taking this extra responsibility. Members seemed to favor College approval of transfer credit for these categories and submission of the identified course to a GEP transfer course list.	Members agreed to discuss this issue with their colleges, think about it themselves, and bring it back for future discussion.



CUE MEETING DISCUSSIONS TIMELINE & OUTCOME SUMMARY RELATING TO GEP SHELL COURSE OFFERINGS

CUE MEETING DATE	DISCUSSION POINT	OUTCOME
02-22-13	Dr. Kirby updated the committee on UCCC's approval of GEP special topics course shells and descriptions. Information about the use of GEP special topics course shells will be distributed to associate deans and to advisor lists.	Committee members were asked to communicate with their college colleagues that GEP special topics course shells have been approved. A link on the CUE website will be made available for quick reference.
01.18.13	GEP Shell course endorsement - APPROVED with minor edits to the course prefix/number for certain categories. Discussion: this discussion is a second opportunity to provide feedback on draft Guidelines for use of a GEP Special Topic Shell for course offering. The committee discussed minor points related to cross listing vs. piggybacking, clarification related to the number of times a course could be offered. Concerns relating to prefix designations remained. Freeman will work on those and send an edited list of prefix/#'s to committee for approval by electronic vote. Freeman noted that the Associate Deans had no objection to the guidelines as presented. The committee was in agreement that issues were minor and not significant enough to delay presentation of the guidelines to college course and curricula committees for feedback by February 1st.	GEP Shell course endorsement - APPROVED
11.09.12	GEP category course shells proposal – Approved with 4 abstentions - Chair Jameson reminded the committee that at the 10.26.12 CUE meeting the committee agreed to consider creating special topic shells for other GEP categories to allow for special topic offerings to be approved for GEP credit based on the current guidelines for the IP 295 shell. C. Freeman presented a draft list of special topics shells for other categories and the guidelines adopted for IP 295 for committee review. Proposed guidelines for new category shells will provide for DASA scheduling to monitor the course offerings. C. Freeman explained the thought process in developing the list; noting that not every category is appropriate for shell course, For example, PE is probably never going to have a course which will map to GK outcomes. However, should the need arise, a shell could be added at a future date. The committee discussed the advantages and disadvantages of creating a special topics shell for other GEP categories to allow for special topic offerings to be approved for GEP credit. One member suggested that if the committee moves forward on this issue, the need for a sunset policy should be revisited. B. Kirby noted the opportunity for innovative course offerings via special topics shells while protecting students by maintaining academic integrity.	A motion was made and seconded to approve the creation of GEP category course shells. A friendly motion to amend to include CUE negotiations relating to departmental goals in the developmental process - Approved by majority with four abstentions. Feedback from members' college CCC related to the implementation timing, preferences, and strategies will be reviewed by CUE. C. Freeman will finalize the proposal to share with member colleagues
10.26.12	Proposal for Special Topics Shell for all GEP categories: Chair Jameson brought forward a proposal to establish a shell for the other GEP categories based on current guidelines for the IP 295 shell. Discussion: Although special topics courses should not be permitted to satisfy a GEP requirement, advisors are allowing this substitution so establishing the shells would allow for these offerings to automatically satisfy the category and will be under CUE review. The student senate indicated that the QEP for critical and creative thinking tends to support the expanding of special topics offerings for the other GEP categories to promote this. The shells might encourage FYI-type courses and other offerings that have a critical and creating thinking focus. Will need to advertise and notify advisors about policy for special topics and the new shell options. We allow HON special topics already and have a process in place. Shells could be useful for the study abroad special topics courses to count for GK credit. Some discussion about study abroad programs and how the GK credit for study abroad courses is being implemented. The coordinator informed the committee that SAO will provide the names of the students completing the study abroad program to DASA for forwarding to Registration and Records to give the student credit for the GK category. Currently study abroad does not require faculty to complete the GK short form but approves the offerings and reviews for academic content/connection with location and objectives. SAO also informs instructor upon request for 2 nd special topics offering of a course that the Dept. should bring course forward as permanent offering.	Coordinator will draft a special topics shell list for other categories and bring to CUE at the next meeting for a vote.
11.11.11	Shell course subcommittee: The subcommittee reviewing GEP IP experimental/Special topics offerings met to review	Revisions to the guidelines were approved

	the proposed revision to CUE guidelines on the issue and recommended extending the deadline to December 31, 2013 to allow more time for history of these IP courses to build and have time to be developed into permanent course, and also removed the section on incentives in the guidelines.	unanimously. (See PDF for copy of revised guidelines)
12.10.10	CUE discussed how general education courses are viewed by SACS as a University requirement. The IP course shell would be an opportunity to develop and offer an IP course on a temporary basis to help meet the lack of IP offerings for students. Types of courses that could use the shell include courses that reflect current topics that are interdisciplinary but would not become a permanent offering. Michelle Johnson from R&R described how this course would be reflected in SIS. CALS submitted a memo sent to the committee to share concerns. CALS folks also had concerns about the stipend & faculty's commitment & resources. Members questioned the need for an IP prefix. A lengthy discussion on the merits followed. <i>Approved CUE Guidelines for a GEP Interdisciplinary Perspectives (IP) Experimental/Special Topics course offering</i> <i>CALS CCC Memorandum - RE: IP course shell</i>	A motion was made to accept the proposal as written with the inclusion of a 12.31.12 expiration date - at which time the process will be re-evaluated. Also extend the stipend to faculty who are currently developing a new course that will be on the IP category list, as a shell or permanent course, with the stipend to expire in spring 2011 semester. Voting results: 3 abstentions, 12 yes, 2 no. Motion carries with the revisions provided.
11.12.10	Shell course subcommittee: The subcommittee presented a draft proposal for how an IP Special Topics shell course might work. One member questioned the use of the IP shell number vs. using their own departmental special topics course number. Others suggested using this idea for faculty to develop other GEP courses & content in other GEP categories before developing it into a permanent course. Dr. Dupont noted that, since the course offering under the special topics shell provides the GEP outcomes for the category and CUE has a chance to review it prior to offering, there shouldn't be a problem for accreditation with SACS. Also, establishing an IP Special Topics course with its own prefix and number would help track the courses/content in SIS.	A motion was made to approve the draft proposal as provided by the subcommittee with minor revisions. Seconded and approved unanimously. Another motion was made to have DUAP develop the course action form for this IP shell course (establishment of prefix, IP 295 and 296). Seconded and approved unanimously. Proposed IP shell course documentation will come back to CUE for review and approval.
10.29.10	Experimental Offerings: A way of recruiting courses/faculty for IP courses might be to develop experimental offerings for the IP category to try out Interdisciplinary content before developing permanent courses.	CUE formed a subcommittee tasked to examine this topic. David Rieder, Allen Dupont, Jim Knopp, Roger Callanan, and Randy Foy volunteered. The subcommittee will also discuss other methods for bringing forward new content in the IP category. [11.12.10 CUE MEETING]

CUE MEETING DISCUSSIONS TIMELINE & OUTCOME SUMMARY RELATING TO **HONORS 290-SERIES**

CUE MEETING DATE	DISCUSSION POINT	OUTCOME
04-5-13	The committee reviewed seven Honors GEP Special Topics Course offerings for spring 2013. Committee member Knopp noted that the format in which the HON series was presented was different and asked members if they were comfortable with the new Short Form format. CUE expressed the preference to continue presenting HON Series in this format, the short form with the appropriate attachments, with the understanding that syllabi will be made available to CUE upon request.	
11.09.12	Committee members discussed presenting Honors Special Topics courses for review earlier in the semester, particularly those listed as second or third offerings. Dr. Blanton reviewed how the process works for Honors Special Topics, noting that it would be difficult to bring these courses to committee for review earlier because of the nature of the courses and the timing of the review process. The current policy, which allows additional sections to be offered in the semester they are presented, affords flexibility and the opportunity to present timely course offerings under the preexisting shells. A requirement to present these courses for review earlier in the semester could seriously impact the ability to offer HON courses, result in scheduled courses being withdrawn, and a loss of flexibility for faculty. Both Blanton and the committee noted the current policy could be revisited however no motion to do so was made.	
03.23.12	UHP course list: Dr. Blanton brought up a concern about the UHP course list, noting that its seminars appear in the university course list, yet sometimes a department will subcategorize it to be included on a co-requisite list. Looking at Special Topics by GEP categories, he said that HON 290, for instance, is a history course, but not all 290s are GK courses. This will mostly be a HUM course, not necessarily a GK course. Some manual moves may be required. A CUE member recommended putting the UHP course list in another location so that advisors can double-check to see the GEP specifics.	ACTION(S): Dr. Blanton wondered if, semester by semester, a list could be provided in the advisor's section. Catherine Freeman said that she would look at where we can place this list to be more apparent. We currently have a list on the CUE website of HON special topics courses that are approved by CUE. A notice can also go to the advisors listserv.
10.28.11	While reviewing the Fall 290 Honors series, CUE members had brief discussion on the possibility of seeing these earlier in the semester. Dr. Blanton reviewed how the process works for the honors special topics review and how he is dependent on the professors for bringing information/syllabi to him and working on improving this to help get the courses to the committee earlier.	
11.12.10	Honors 290-series experimental course offerings review: The timing of the review of these course offerings was questioned in that the review is not being done prior to the semester offered. The University Honors Council used to review the offerings. Will the Honors committee be reconstituted to allow for review by faculty? Dr. Ambrose reviewed how CUE reviews these Honors Special Topics shells each semester and that course content is only allowed to be offered three times before it has to be made into a permanent course. Some of the courses are coming forward for review for their 2nd and 3rd offering and had been approved by CUE for the previously offered terms. If member(s) would like to bring back up the issue of process for these items, this topic to a future agenda.	