



## Council on Undergraduate Education 2023-2024

January 19, 2023  
Meeting hosted via Zoom  
1:30pm-3:00pm

### Members Present:

- |   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erin McKenney (Chair)       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steven Miller    | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Garrie Pickworth |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marta Klesath (Chair-Elect) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nancy Moore      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gary Blank       |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Darby Orcutt (Past Chair)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tamah Morant     | <input type="checkbox"/> Wendy Krause                |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Qiuyun Jenny Xiang          | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lara Pacifici    |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeffrey Reaser              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logan Opperman   |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anna Maria Behler           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Beth Wright Fath |  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marc Russe                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joanna Stegall   |  |

### Members Absent:

**Guests:** Autumn Mist Belk, Fernanda Santos

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Li Marcus, Lexi Hergeth, Lydia Christoph, Sahil Bendale, Erin Dixon, Kaitlyn Mittan, Helen Chen, Latasha Wade

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Remarks from Chair Erin McKenney** – Welcome and introduction of guests. Consent agenda item does not need to be voted on.
- Remarks and Updates from OUCCAS/DASA** – Marcus mentioned surveys at the end of the CUE term, and creating a wish list for the CIM update. Hergeth gave a Fall 2023 CUE report. Ongoing points of discussion are double-barrelled outcomes and the Admin Save Memo.
- Approval of the CUE Minutes from December 8, 2023** – The minutes were seconded and approved.  
Discussion: None.

### OLD BUSINESS

### NEW BUSINESS

#### Consent Agenda – Approved

Discussion: The consent agenda was not voted on, as Biology was moving to drop a course.

#### Courses New to GEP

- DAN 305 : Dance Repertory and Performance (VPA) – Approved**  
Discussion: This new course was presented by Wright Fath. Reaser said the objectives were broad, but the measures were appropriate. Miller said standards, expectations, and outcomes were well-aligned, and the class was offered at a high level.
- DAN 315 : Site-Specific Dance Performance (VPA) – Approved with Suggestion**  
Discussion: This new course was presented by Wright Fath. The motion was made and seconded. Moore suggested that for the measure on Objective 2 that the “on Moodle” phrase be removed, because NC State might not always use that platform. The motion carried.
- FS 222 : Discover: Conventional, Organic and Genetically Engineered Foods (NS) – Approved Pending**  
Discussion: This new course was presented by Pickworth. Pacifici had questions about the measure for Objective 2. The measure asks students to answer a question, but does not seem to be drawing on the concept of genetic engineering, merely on the labeling of genetically engineered products. Santos explained that this was one prompt of several, and that the goal for the students was to have them research an answer and defend it, not necessarily give a correct answer. McKenney suggested that there could be a prompt to invoke the scientific concepts that support the student position. Orcutt asked for the statement to be explicit in the proposal, such as the following: “Describe what a genetically engineered food is, and provide scientific evidence for your response.” Morant said she needed more clarity

on Objective 1, and asked what methods were being used in the evaluation. She wanted the outcome to match better with the objective. Santos explained that the students would compose a literature review and draw conclusions about genetic engineering based on the evidence. Pacifici and Morant agreed that the learning outcomes for the course itself needed more detail. Santos asked about the different focuses between general course and specific learning outcomes. McKenney suggested the following wording: "Evaluate scientific literature to determine how organic animal husbandry and the integration of crops and animals utilized by organic farming, influencing the final food product." Hergeth clarified which information needed to be in the measure vs. in the syllabus. Santos said this change would change the outcomes of the course. There was a brief discussion of precedents. McKenney then suggested "Evaluate how organic animal husbandry and the integration of crops and animals utilized by organic farming influence the final food product." Pacifici said that it was harder to determine the scientific concepts examined in the current proposal than it had been for FS 221, Coffee and Chocolate, a similar course. Pacifici moved to change the motion to approved pending. The motion to change carried.

Reaser suggested for the measure: "Describe the scientific means by which a food is considered to be a generically engineered food, then lay out a scientific argument for labeling or not labeling genetically engineered food." Discussion of this phrasing ensued, and McKenney detailed the contrast between explaining a scientific shift vs. a scientific process. Klesath and Pacifici discussed this further, and McKenney then suggested, "Explain whether genetically engineered (GE) foods should be labeled, drawing from basic scientific concepts related to genetic engineering and the creation of genetically engineered foods." Mittan summarized the measure and connected it to the broader course outcome. Orcutt suggested, "Using basic scientific concepts, explain how GE food labeling reflects (or does not reflect) how such foods are actually created." Morant suggested: "Explain the basic scientific concepts related to genetic engineering and how they apply to the creation and identification of genetically engineered foods." The motion to approve the approve pending action carried.

#### Review Courses for GEP

##### □ DAN 281 Pilates (HES) – Approved

Discussion: This course was presented by Stegall. The motion was seconded. Wright Fath asked if the objectives still matched the outcomes. Stegall thought they looked fine, and Blank concurred. The motion carried.

#### Discussion

GEP Discussion: Chen announced that the administration was doing a review of the GEP, and asked what the goals and objectives for the GenEd revision should be. The last major revision was 10 years ago, and the administration wanted to see what the revision should achieve, and which mechanism they should use to collect revision data. Wade asked if anyone on CUE had been a part of the task force for the previous major review. Fath and Wade discussed documents regarding the prior GEP review. Blank wanted the task force to look at how many students had 5 versus 6 hours of IP credit. Many transfer students did not have transfer courses that counted toward the correct category, so as a result were forced to unexpectedly take extra classes. Miller espoused being specific with the Bloom's Taxonomy verbs and how helpful it was to uniformly apply them. He hoped for a precise taxonomy for the revision and offered his assistance. McKenney and Mittan discovered that the Wicked Problems, Wolfpack Solutions course satisfied 2 hours of the IP requirement, was online, and hopefully could assist transfer students in meeting the IP requirements.

Chen asked if current framework and structure categories were appropriate, and received silence in response. Chen mentioned talking with other groups, and asked for input. What could be the anticipated challenges in the review and revision, and what could be good ways to address them? McKenney advocated backward design and occasional ambiguity in course proposals, and suggested instituting uniform clarity in proposals, and ensuring that proposals included giving specific examples. Wright Fath asked if the committee members should go back to their colleges and ask their colleagues' opinions on the revision.

Reaser wanted to know whether or not the students thought the GEP requirements were working or not. He said he saw the IP category as the most problematic because it contained an outdated approach. Miller said he thought the current GEP categories were still appropriate, but that the individual standards needed work. Reaser commented that the GEP didn't articulate priorities to the students in a clear way. Wade explained that students should know the purposes and outcomes of the GEP and that there should be a GEP thread running through all the curriculum.

Blank said that he liked a variety of students in his IP class, thought it might be better to create a category rather than something specific, and asked about how the GEP requirement influenced faculty positively or negatively. Pickworth stated that her advisees looked for classes by determining which ones had open seats above other considerations. McKenney agreed with Blank that liberal arts study was so useful to her in real life. She suggested having time and mechanisms for students to reflect

and discuss their selected coursework and identify a personal theme/mission for themselves. Orcutt remarked that the GEP questions were difficult to determine without having a conversation first about values, and said that issues of faculty ownership and budget would be sensitive contributing factors to that conversation. Marcus suggested that the revision include advisors, and McKenney that they include Career Services, and stated that instructors could also help emphasize the importance of the GEP by mentioning how different disciplines were relevant to course materials.

Reaser said that the university wasn't good at honoring faculty collaborations across departments. Wright Fath agreed. Orcutt said that NC State did collaboration better than many institutions, which meant that NC State didn't do it all that well. Reaser said that his department had attempted multiple collaborations within their college, but they had been stymied by the confusing distribution of credit and resources and budget models. Wright Fath said many thought it was too difficult for faculty to collaborate across colleges, but that it would be cool if it could happen. Chen offered to discuss with colleagues how the administration could advocate for and support faculty collaboration. Wade thanked the faculty for their candor, and McKenney thanked the faculty for their thoughts.

Meeting adjourned at 2:57 PM

*Respectfully submitted by Lydia Christoph*