



## NSCouncil on Undergraduate Education 2023-2024

March 8, 2024  
Meeting hosted via Zoom  
1:30pm-3:00pm

### Members Present:

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

### Members Absent:

**Guests:** Carol Ann Lewald, Levent Atici, Rebecca Stojancic, Melissa Ramirez, Christa Oliver, Claire Gordy, Robert Hayes.

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Li Marcus, Lexi Hergeth, Lydia Christoph, Sahil Bendale, Erin Dixon, Renee Harrington, Julia Law, Kaitlyn Mittan, Latasha Wade

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- Remarks from Chair Erin McKenney** – Welcome to guests.
- Remarks and Updates from OUCCAS/DASA** – April 26th meeting will be in-person with food. Please join our website usability focus groups. Please send Lexi the names of new faculty members who are using CIM this semester.
- Approval of the CUE [Minutes from February 16, 2024](#)** – *Approved*  
Discussion: None.

### NEW BUSINESS

#### Courses New to GEP

- DAN 232 : Dance on Screen (IP, VPA) – *Approved with Suggestions***  
Discussion: This [new] course was presented by Domingue. Xiang said that the course looked interesting. Reaser asked about content from film studies being incorporated into the course. Mist Belk explained that the course would involve films, research, and speakers. Reaser pointed out that an interdisciplinary studies focus was not very clearly reflected in the course learning outcomes. Orcutt agreed that these objectives were a marginal case of IP connection. Reaser suggested that an interdisciplinary focus be more clearly reflected in the objectives. Mist Belk confirmed that two fields were combined in the course. McKenney clarified Reaser's suggestion as bolstering what was coming from film versus from dance in the measures for Objective 1. The motion was seconded and carried.
- DAN 310 : Panoramic Dance Project (VPA) – *Approved***  
Discussion: This [new] course was presented by Domingue. Blank said it looked good. The motion was seconded and carried.
- HESF 114 : Functional Training and Proprioceptive Awareness (HES) – *Approved***  
Discussion: This [new] course was presented by Domingue. Reaser, Russo, and Moore all agreed that they had no problems with the course. The motion was seconded and carried.
- HESF 115 : Wellness and Resilience (HES) – *Approved***  
Discussion: This [new] course was presented by Domingue. Behler said that it looked good. Morant asked about Objective 4 because she thought it was immeasurably broad. She said that if someone could explain and demonstrate something, then they would probably have gained a working knowledge of that thing, but she wasn't sure how to measure appreciation. Harrington explained that the HES 200-level courses were fitness skills-based, while the

100-level courses were fitness-based. Orcutt affirmed that “appreciate” was vague and seemed to require a judgment from the students. Mittan concurred with Morant that the objective wording might need adjusting. Reaser said that the course perfectly met the guidelines for the 100-level HES classes, but that the guidelines were perhaps too broad. The motion was seconded and carried.

□ **MIE 309 : Entrepreneurship Skills for Non-Majors (SS, IP) – Tabled**

Discussion: This course was presented by Morant. The motion was seconded. Moore asked about the measures for the outcomes. She wondered if the other reviewers were looking for more information. Russo said he had exactly the same question. Reaser queried the extent to which this was a social science course, as there wasn't a social science methodology or any social science readings. Morant had discussed this course with the instructor, who had said there was more information in the syllabus. McKenney reiterated that it was not within CUE's purview to review syllabi, and that course proposals needed to include enough information. The motion was changed from approved to tabled. Blank asked to what extent other economics courses dealt with the social science category. Marcus looked for economics courses that had previously gone through CUE. Blank suggested looking at the NR 219 course. Lewald discussed the business terms in the objectives and language for NR 219, but stated that there wasn't much social science knowledge that appeared to be gained via the course. She felt the objectives and outcomes were equally as superficial in terms of social science knowledge as they were for MIE 309. Reaser mentioned that a consultation with a social scientist might be very important to this course. The motion was tabled.

□ **NE 291 : Introduction to Health Physics Laboratory (NS, IP) – Approved Pending for Natural Sciences. Tabled for Interdisciplinary Studies**

Discussion: This [new] course was presented by Moore. Orcutt greeted the instructor and said that with regard to the natural sciences, the measure for the first objective was a format rather than a means of assessment, and that an example of the prompt was needed. Attached rubrics seemed to address format rather than content. McKenney said that Wright Fath had submitted feedback on the measure for Objective 2, inquiring how problem-solving was a part of the measure based on the information given, and that for natural sciences, the description of the project in Measure 2, both in the objective and the measure, did not include problem-solving. But McKenney acknowledged that the instructor had recently changed some things on the proposal, including a clarification of the attendance policy. McKenney relayed Wright Fath's further concerns about the rubric language “attractive,” “pleasing colors,” etc., and praised the instructor for engaging in discussion with his students about this potentially biased language. Orcutt asked for an example prompt for the assessment for Objective 1. Hayes stated that students would be required to create a good introduction, study measurement results, evaluate dose rates, and analyze data to prepare to write a paper. McKenney summarized suggested language for natural science Objective 1. “Students evaluate dose rates from common household items and surfaces, and present their results...” The motion was changed to approved pending.

Mittan stated that she appreciated the changes made to the course proposal by the instructor as a result of the conversation about presentation in UCCC earlier that week. McKenney read Wright Fath's comments about the interdisciplinary perspectives, and Orcutt remarked that it was difficult to evaluate the changes the instructor had made recently on the spot. He was uncertain that this was an IP course, and asked how Interdisciplinary Perspectives were being integrated into the course. The earlier draft had seemed to say only that the course would use statistics to do science, which wasn't a strong IP connection. Hayes said that this lab would put into practice what the students learned in the course, and referred to the rubric. He reiterated that the lab would emphasize public health, radiation measurements, and statistics use and theory. McKenney mentioned that several disciplines were listed in IP Question 1 on the course proposal, and that if Hayes were to add a phrase at the end of the statement under IP Question 2 that the students were making measurements, applying hypotheses, and testing and identifying statistically significant differences. She pointed out the measure for IP Objective 1 that referred to the rubric and asked what the students would be doing to accomplish the measure, and how that was interdisciplinary. Orcutt asked about using IP ways of thinking for this course. Reaser said that using charts to interpret results wasn't the same as thinking through how the standards from other disciplines were created in the first place. A concept from public health, not just using a tool from public health, was required. Hayes said the students would not have access to things that presented safety issues, and that the students would need to contextualize what a dose rate would do in a practical setting and how that related to regulatory limits. He stated that you could not do one without the other, and that this involved mating the health concerns with the physics. Orcutt said this was fantastic, but it needed to be spelled out in the measure, especially if someone else were to teach the course. Orcutt recommended taking language from the companion course proposal and using that, if appropriate, to clarify the IP measures for the lab. The 290 class was a co-requisite with the lab, Hayes said, and the 290 lecture was an IP course. Orcutt asked if the lab was required. Hayes stated it was not. He said that his department had been asked to offer natural sciences courses with labs, and this was their first attempt. Orcutt stated that the clarifying language needed to be on the proposal. McKenney suggested the following language: “Students will evaluate dose rates from common household items, compare them using statistical tests, and compare their results with health and safety limits to infer whether the items are a radiation risk.” Additionally, “Students

contextualize their results by drawing from discussions of regulatory limits and health physics in lecture.” Orcutt and Reaser said that this language minimally addressed their concerns, and that the work done in the lab wasn’t being done in an interdisciplinary manner, but Reaser wasn’t sure that mattered, because this was only a one-hour course, and if the lecture was interdisciplinary, then maybe the lab didn’t need to be. It was proposed that the natural sciences portion of the course proposal would be approved pending, but the Interdisciplinary Perspectives section would be tabled. Lexi Hergeth clarified options, such as a split amendment. Klesath detailed the order of procedure, and the motion to split the vote carried. A motion was made to change the interdisciplinary piece of the proposal to tabled, and the motion carried. Hergeth clarified that the action would be rolled back in CIM for the natural sciences piece, since the course record could not be split in CIM. The motion to approve the natural sciences portion pending changes and to table the interdisciplinary section carried.

☐ **PS 325 / PSY 325 : Introduction to Political Psychology (SS) – Approved**

Discussion: This [new] course was presented by Reaser. Moore mentioned Social Sciences Objective 1. Russo said that the proposal looked good. The motion was seconded and carried.

Special Topics/HON Course Offerings

☐ **Genes, Race and Society USDEI 295 (USDEI) – Approved**

Discussion: This course was presented by Klesath. The motion was seconded. Blank said that he was not as familiar with special topics courses, and although he didn’t see anything he thought was problematic, he deferred to his colleagues. Marcus explained how to review a special topics course. McKenney and Klesath thought that the measures looked great, and that they were not too broad or too narrow, which was difficult. Blank asked about structuring a special topics course within these guidelines. Marcus clarified. The motion carried.

Discussion: Hergeth raised the issue of the Department of Foreign Languages wishing to change its name to “World Languages and Cultures.” Marcus put the official memo to the CUE committee from the department on the screen. Orcutt clarified that the change as far as CUE was concerned applied to changing “Foreign Language Proficiency” to “World Language Proficiency” for the GEP category. Blank asked who changed all the degree audits, and Hergeth explained. The motion to approve the memo was made and seconded. Blank asked about prefix and number changes. Marcus mentioned an email from Scott regarding this issue. The motion to approve carried.

Marcus mentioned a change to course delivery language in the Enrollment Wizard, and Dixon stressed the importance of this. Klesath echoed Dixon and stated that she was working with her department to clarify this for students, and that calling “online hybrid” courses “IH” classes was confusing, and suggested calling these classes “OH” classes instead. Dixon said that this change could be made eventually. She mentioned many students dropping courses due to confusion about the course format. Orcutt remarked that people thought of “hybrid” in different ways. Blank asked where the codes appeared. Marcus hypothesized that they might be in the Enrollment Wizard. Reaser said that they were enrollment codes, and suggested that specifics of class delivery be worked into the descriptions, especially since for most classes, the “work” was done outside of class. Dixon said that she would make the suggestion to change the language.

Meeting adjourned at 3:02 PM

*Respectfully submitted by Lydia Christoph*