

## **ANNUAL REPORT**

University Standing Committee: Council on Undergraduate Education

Academic Year Covered by Report: 2019-2020

Date Report Submitted: 1 June 2020

Report Submitted on behalf of: Kimberly Bush

Number of Times Committee Met: **A total of 15 meetings were conducted over the 2019-2020**

**academic year.** 10 out of 14 meetings that were originally scheduled met in-person, with one additional electronic meeting outside of the predetermined schedule. 4 total meetings were electronically hosted to comply with social-distancing measures.

Link to Minutes: [2019-2020 CUE Minutes](#)

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

The following tables reflect actions taken by the Council on Undergraduate Education (CUE) in the 2019-20 year. CUE met fifteen (15) times for 1-2 hours per session during the 2019-20 academic year.

Fourteen of the Fourteen were during the regularly scheduled times while one was scheduled after the conclusion of the originally scheduled meetings.

The committee had appropriate representation to carry out its charge with 17 voting members with the following roster:

- 1 voting member from each College and 2 from the largest colleges (CALs, CHASS, COS).
- 2 voting members (1 each) representing University Libraries, and Faculty Senate.
- 1 voting student member representing the Student Senate
- Ex-officio non-voting members from Registration and Records, DELTA, Office of International Affairs, and DASA

The membership and its quorum (minimum of 9 voting members established at 6 September 2019 meeting) worked diligently each meeting period. In the 2019-20 academic year, a total of 241 actions were considered and processed. 196 permanent offerings and 45 Honors and Special Topic offerings. There were a few returning actions from both the Honors and Special Topic offerings as well as the permanent offerings, which is not uncommon.

The GER>GEP review project, originally began in 2009 and ramped up in 2018, came to a close. Based on the schedule created collaboratively by OUCCAS, the Chair of the 2018/2019 CUE committee, and Associate Deans of Academic Affairs, courses came to the committee for review. If the course did not have GEP information or the information provided was insufficient to provide alignment with GEP objectives, the course began a "sunset" process. This means that the GEP designation of the course would be removed effective the next term if no further action was taken by the colleges. This both allowed for feedback time for the colleges and prevented negative impact on enrolling students. If a course wished to return for GEP consideration during the intervening time, they would come through the standard review process and if CUE recommended approval the course would maintain its GEP status.



<b>Division of Academic and Student Affairs</b> Office of Undergraduate Courses & Curricula Oucc.dasa.ncsu.edu courses-curricula@ncsu.edu	Campus Box 7105 211A Park Shops Raleigh, NC 27695 P: 919.515.5627
--	--

For clarity, crosslisted courses and offerings are considered one action. **Table 1.1** indicates a breakdown of these actions.

**Table 1.1**

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>CUE 2019- 2020</b>
Existing Course New to GEP	<b>16</b>
GER>GEP Categories Sunsetting	<b>16 Sunset &amp; 10 Tabled</b> (one tabled was split vote)
GER>GEP Courses Reviewed	<b>98 GER&gt;GEP courses reviewed</b>
New Course New to GEP	<b>20</b>
Courses Dropping GEP/ Dropped Courses	<b>4 dropped courses, 10 courses dropping GEP</b>
Honors/Special Topics Shell Offerings	<b>45</b>

*\*One action reviewed, dropped, and added various GEP Categories and counted as an Existing New course to GEP, Courses dropping GEP, and GER>GEP Review. A few added GEP categories while up for GER>GEP review.*

Other business included:

- Carrie Pickworth was elected as Chair for 2020-2021. (September 20, 2019)
- The committee discussed the possibility of including a non-voting seat for the Office of Institutional Equity and Diversity (OIED). The committee discussed this at the 18 October, 1 November, 15 November, 2019 and 10 January 2020 CUE meetings. While the committee was open to the discussion of a recommendation to add, they wanted to be sure to understand the XONV role that such a position would have and what they would add to the discussion of the committee. After further discussion with OIED, the Office elected to join the agenda listserv and have a standing invitation to join the meetings as guests if they have anything to discuss. Further discussion may arise about the possibility of this seat in the future.

- Robert's Rules of order were modified during quarantine Zoom meetings. (20 March, 3 April, 1 May, and 15 May 2020). Once quorum was established, actions came directly to the floor without a second once presented. Votes were also taken in opposite order - oppose and abstain, and if no voting members voiced either of these votes the matter was passed. Through discussion with the Chair and Chair-elect after further examining this process, further electronic votes will be taken by the poll function in zoom to ensure that all members are positively engaged in the voting process

#### **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- Vote Splitting was brought up at the first CUE meeting (6 September 2019) and was confirmed that members can split the votes for different GEP categories at the 20 September 2019 Meeting. If a vote is split (one GEP was recommended for approval and another was tabled), the OUCCAS would save the entered information and send it to the college, delete the unapproved GEP category, and move the action through. Further information and changes would proceed once the course was fully approved through the regular campus process in CIM.
- The committee should be able to assess a course's alignment to GEP objectives solely through entry in the CIM/Special Topic GEP form fields. At the beginning of the year the committee discussed that they should review the CIM record only, not relying on the syllabus to verify the GEP information. All actions initiated as of 1 October 2020 or after were assessed solely on the information in the CIM fields.
- Discussion of how much information is needed to be able to review a course for GEP alignment. Members discussed that while having more information can be useful, fields should have direct and clear answers that clearly illustrate how the outcomes and measures are aligned with the provided objective. The information should be easy to find, easy to read, and provide clear alignment between the provided objective, the outcome, and measure.

- Robert's Rules procedures for amending a motion continued to be applied, clarifying the approval process/discussion for all involved, and allowing for fair discussion and dissent when an amendment to an action is proposed.