**Council on Undergraduate Education 2022-2023**  14 October 2022

 **Meeting hosted via Zoom**

 1:30pm-3:00pm

 **Members Present:**

* Chair Darby Orcutt (Chair)
* Qiuyun (Jenny) Xiang
* ~~Erin McKenney~~
* ~~Jeffrey Reaser~~
* ~~Anna Behler~~
* Marc Russo
* ~~Steven Miller~~
* ~~Nancy Moore~~
* ~~Tamah Morant~~
* ~~Lara Pacifici~~
* ~~Logan Opperman~~
* ~~Jane Lubischer~~
* ~~Ahmed El-Shafei~~
* ~~Nathan Leaf~~
* ~~Peggy Domingue~~
* ~~Dave Provost~~
* ~~Christopher DePerno~~
* ~~Riley Edmondson~~

**Guests**:

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Li Marcus, Lexi Hergeth, Mukund Vora, ​​Annabel Breen, Kaitlyn Mittan, Erin Dixon, Julia Law

**Absent:** Marc Russo, Qiuyun (Jenny) Xiang, Chair Darby Orcutt

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS**

* ***Remarks from Chair Temp Erin McKenney*** – Explained how they are serving as interim Chair while Darby Orcutt is not in attendance for the next two meetings. Welcomed everyone and introduced Riley Edmondson, new SSEN voting member.
* ***Remarks and Updates from OUCCAS/DASA –***Li updated the committee on repeat Special Topics GEP form implementations and that she would bring finalized process and form details to both CUE and Associate Deans once complete and before implementation.
* ***Approval of the CUE Minutes from 30 September 2022 -*** *Approved*Discussion: Move to approve the minutes by Dave Provost.

**OLD BUSINESS**

Courses New to GEP

* **AFS 444 African American and African Women Leaders (IP, USDEI)** – *Approved Pending*

Discussion: This new course was presented by Jeff Reaser. Member reminded the group that the action was tabled. Member requested an explanation of why the action was tabled. Li shared the details of the changes on the relevant catalog page with the group via screen share for visual context. Members discussed what the changes entailed. Member requested to know if there was anything from USDEI that was part of the conversation from the previous meetings; the Chair replied that it was a case of clarity, specific language, and greater detail in the IP Objectives of the course.

* Members entered a brief discussion of the concern of using the term “why” in objective statements and why this term is permitted if it required more in-depth analysis. In response, the Chair shared a resource of applicable Blooms Taxonomy verbs to demonstrate that the changes that are made using such resources are theoretically acceptable.
* Member drew attention to Objective 3 and requested amending Objective 3 Outcome to include some mention of multiple disciplines in the outcome as was carried out in the sample. Members moved to approve pending changes to IP Objective Outcome 3.
* Chair provided in the chat: [Blooms taxonomy verbs list from OFE: https://ofd.ncsu.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/ofd\_blooms.pdf](https://ofd.ncsu.edu/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/ofd_blooms.pdf)

**NEW BUSINESS**

*Consent Agenda* – *Approved*

Discussion: The consent agenda was moved to approve by Jane Lubischer.

Courses New to GEP

* **HI 383 Law in the American Story (HUM, IP, USDEI)** – *Approved Pending*

Discussion: This new course was presented by Jeff Reaser. Reviewer stated that the course was good and that the measures/examples met the objectives, albeit expressing that under USDEI Objective 2 asks students to “identify causes and consequences” and this does not seem to meet the appropriate level of analysis. The member subsequently suggested that the Objective be rewritten to highlight the requirement for thorough student analysis. Another reviewer seconded this, stating that under IP Objective 2 the wording may need to be revised for better clarity and specificity regarding the use of terms “apply” and “‘identify”.

* Member stated that USDEI Objective 2 could be better matched to the level of learning demonstrated by the example prompt, i.e. that it is an analysis and interpretation, not simply an identification. The third reviewer agreed with the other reviewers about the concern regarding IP Objective 2 as well as USDEI Objective 2. Reviewer moved to amend, approved pending, recommending a change in the specific language.
* Member shared in the chat, for clarification: IP Obj 2 (clarity on applying authentic connections between two disciplines in the outcome) and USDEI Obj 2 (outcome verb)
* Member suggested including adding disciplines to the Objective and members returned to the discussion previously (with Old Business) and thus Member subsequently suggested including some form of the term “history” with regards to including a connection to disciplinary context.

*Review Courses for GEP*

* **COM 417 : Communication & Race (USD, USDEI)** – *Approved Pending*

Discussion: This course was presented by Anna Behler. Reviewer stated that on USD Objective 2, three learning outcomes are listed but the second objective is not addressed to the measures and recommended that the second objective be removed, since it is not clearly addressed to the measures. Reviewer drew attention to USDEI Objective 2, the objective requests analysis of “causes and consequences” and the stated outcome only mentions “causes” whereas the measure request analysis of “the role of communication”; the reviewer requested more explicit reference for “consequences” and “implications” of the measure.

* **ENG 265 : American Literature I (HUM, USD, USDEI)** – *Approved*

Discussion: This course was presented by Anna Behler. Reviewer asked a question regarding the wording surrounding “critical essays” to measure SLO; the reviewer questioned how these essays are used in the evaluation process. Li provided some form information; the student evaluation methods are from a limited list and the critical essays are often termed within the “major papers” section and that SEM are often analyzed within UCCC and not necessarily under the CUE purview. Member stated that they were seeking clarification in the consistency of the document - the question of whether or not critical essays entail a measurement tool and where does that measurement fit in the student evaluation process, *not* if the measurement tool would be an effective one (as that was agreed to be outside of CUE’s purview).

* **HI 360 : U.S. Agricultural History (USDEI)** – *Approved*

Discussion: This course was presented by Anna Behler. Reviewer complimented the use of primary and secondary resources for USEDEI aspects and noted a minor wording consideration of Objective 1, commenting that replacing “explain” with “differentiate” or “categorize” would improve the wording effectiveness of Objective 1. Chair stated that “explain” is under “analyze” on the shared OFD document, and therefore the use of “explain” is appropriate. Chair and Li confirmed that they would reach out to OFE about available resources and how to connect and clarify what CUE is looking for.

* **MUS 360 / WGS 360 : Women In Music (VPA, USDEI)** – *Approved Pending*

Discussion: This course was presented by Nathan Leaf. Member noted that in USDEI Objective 1 there is the use of the word “describe” and if use of that word is sufficient. Kaitlyn Mittan responded by posing a question: does what comes after the term “describe” raise the level of the measure to the appropriate level? Member suggested using “describe and explain” or simply “analyze” in order to meet the requirements. Members voted to Approved Pending changes to the verbiage in the USEDEI category.

**Discussion:**

Chair reminded members that Chair elect nominations are still open.

Meeting adjourned at 2:37 PM

*Respectfully submitted by Annabel Breen*