



## Council on Undergraduate Education 2024-2025

October 11, 2024  
Meeting hosted via Zoom  
1:30pm-3:00pm

### Members Present:

- |                                                                  |                                                      |                                                    |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marta Klesath (Chair)        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marc Russo       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joanna Stegall |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erin McKenney (Past Chair)   | <input type="checkbox"/> Steven Miller               | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alison Edwards |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logan Opperman (Chair Elect) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nancy Moore      | <input type="checkbox"/> Mary Schweitzer           |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jeffrey Dorfman              | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trung Ly         | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Khodr Zaarour  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lynda Nyota                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lara Pacifici    | <input type="checkbox"/> STUSEN                    |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Anna Maria Behler            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wendy Krause     |                                                    |
|                                                                  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tom Koch (Proxy) |                                                    |

**Members Absent:** Autumn Mist Belk, Kaitlyn Mittan

**Guests:** Lynn Worley-Davis, Dustin Heinen, Kristen Sullivan, Kelsey Dufresne, David Stokes, Ray Levy

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Li Marcus, Lexi Hergeth, Annabel Breen, Erin Dixon, Tamah Morant, Julia Law, Latasha Wade, Levent Atici

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- **Remarks from Chair Marta Klesath** – Chair welcomed everyone and reminded the committee that they can edit and adjust their responses to the CUE Stakeholder Feedback Form.
- **Remarks and Updates from OUCCAS/DASA** –
- **Approval of [CUE Minutes - September 27, 2024](#)** – *Approved*  
Discussion: The minutes were moved to approve. No additional discussion was shared.

### OLD Business

#### Courses New to GEP

- **WLCL 225 : Roman Topography (IP)** – *Approved*  
Discussion: This returning course was presented by Behler. Having spoken with the instructor and other reviewers in a separate meeting, Erin McKenney welcomed discussion with the inclusion of the course instructor, Dustin Heinen. The instructor shared that he tried to include and improve upon language and specifics, for example confusion about named individuals, explaining that in true interdisciplinary nature, Rome could not have been created without design and technology. McKenney noted that the three elements (geography, technology, and design) are now represented clearly and are well explained by the nature of this being a study abroad course.

### NEW BUSINESS

#### Consent Agenda – *Approved*

Discussion: The consent agenda was moved and seconded to approved. No additional discussion was shared.

#### Courses New to GEP

- **PO 325 : Aspects of Animal Welfare (IP)** – *Tabled*  
Discussion: This new course was presented by McKenney. Lynn Worley-Davis represented the instructor. She explained that she and Erin have discussed assessment concerns with Kaitlyn Mittan. Erin McKenney shared a document of suggestions: [PO 325 – IP GEP](#). Reviewer asked about the measures - is some variation needed? Tom Koch (Proxy for Autumn) shared reviewer Autumn Mist Belk's concerns, which are as follows:
  - Outcomes under Obj 1 are repeated under objective 2 and 3, yet the same outcome cannot meet these different IP objectives.
  - I recommend using only one or two outcomes under objective 1 and be clear how students will distinguish between two disciplines. Are biology and ethology the disciplines? For example, how

would biology approach animal welfare in a particular case versus how would ethology approach animal welfare in the same case? Maybe rewriting the 2nd outcome to be: "Distinguish between biological and behavioral indicators of animal welfare" ? Or do the two disciplines come into play in the "animal welfare and its framework" outcome?

- All three outcomes use the same assignment as a measure. It is not clear that this assignment is both distinguishing between approaches, applying connections, and synthesizing approaches between approaches. (While covering objective 2 and 3 in the same assignment seems very achievable, I'm not sure 1 and 3 are covered at the same time.
- Outcome 3 is not clear to me how approaches are being synthesized. Will the scientific literature being used cover more than one discipline? (If so, add that into the outcome to be clear here.)

Members voted to table the action in order to review the course again at a later time based on re-review of information shared in the chat by Tom Koch (proxy for Autumn Mist Belk). This course will return as Old Business in a future meeting. Other suggestions and feedback shared at a later time should be sent to OUCAS and will be shared with Erin McKenney and Lynn Worley-Davis.

### Review Courses for GEP

- **GOH 201: Foundations of Global One Health (IP, GK) – Approved with Suggestion**  
Discussion: This course was presented by Opperman. Reviewer noted that another activity other than the reflection essays could be included in the measure for Objective 2. Other reviewers shared no further comments.
- **GOH 302 : Foundations of Global One Applications (IP, GK) – Approved with Suggestions**  
Discussion: This course was presented by Opperman. Reviewer expressed some confusion at Objective 1 where it states "distinguish between different approaches by integrating different approaches"; there was a friendly suggestion to change the wording of "by" to "and". One reviewer made a suggestion to change the wording to something like: "Students will integrate knowledge from fields including public health, veterinary science, microbiology, and environmental science to assess global One Health challenges like climate change impacts or antimicrobial resistance". Li noted this is a course that is a good example for IP measures. Friendly suggestion to change "non-U.S." to "countries outside of the US" in the GK measures. Overall, reviewers and commenters praised the course.
- **MUS 270 : Songwriting Using Digital Audio Workstations (VPA) – Approved with Suggestions**  
Discussion: This course was presented by Stegall. One of the reviewers commented that the Objective 1 Measure 1 brought some confusion with the activities connected to "taste" and "beauty". Another reviewer commented that the catalog description presented some confusion in the sense that this course is "specifically designed for songwriters, musicians..." and was concerned that it indicated a requirement to be such. One member suggested adding "aspiring" as a preface to those descriptions; another suggested rewriting it as "designed specifically for students interested in songwriting, etc...". Members expressed that there needs to be a more "open" phrasing, so that it doesn't feel restrictive to those who are in performing arts or music.

Another reviewer noted that there may need to be rewording on Objective 3 so that the measure and objective are distinct; there was a suggestion to match use of the word "create" to the objective and not the measure (perhaps "production"). The objective would be focused on the process and knowledge of how students create their own compositions, whereas the measure would be to create those things/demonstrate skills with the tools students have gained knowledge of. Li noted that "create" portion of this Objective has not been changed since it was previously approved.

Summary of suggestions: include more information about how the process factors into the creation of the audio to ensure distinction between learning outcome and measure (Objective 3), clarify how students might be discussing individually (Objective 1), and clarify that this class is truly open to anyone (catalog description).

### Special Topics/HON Course Offerings

- **DSA 495 / USDEI 295 Special Topics in Data Science: Critical Data Considerations (USDEI) – Approved Pending**  
Discussion: This special topics course was presented by Edwards. Reviewer noted that the outcomes and measures look fine. Reviewers expressed confusion about the alignment between Objective 1 and the SLO; are students implementing data feminist principles to course-related content? Suggestion to adjust the term "implement" to "apply". Reviewer noted that the measures for Objective 1 and Objective 2 seemed quite vague. The instructor (Kelsey Dufresene) explained some of the background pertaining to these concerns. Reviewer clarified that the outcome is

what concerns her; she could not see how the SLOs are connected to the USDEI Outcome 2, in particular. Critically evaluate the data, how does this apply to Outcome 2. Adding a clause such as “Evaluate the data to identify possible causes and consequences of...” or “Critically evaluate data sources as a potential of cultural bias, and evaluate the data to identify possible consequences...”. Another member suggested qualifying with “Including (but not limited to) biases that contribute to structural inequalities in the US”.

Data Science representatives moved to a brief subgroup discussion. Chair paused the action while the subgroup discussed changes to DSA 495. Following discussion, the DSA subgroup proposed the following wording: “Critically evaluate data sources for possible causes and consequences of bias, including structural inequalities in the US.” Members moved to approve pending changes to the SLO of Objective 2 to read “*Critically evaluate data sources for possible causes and consequences of bias, including structural inequalities in the US.*” to more clearly align with Objective 2.

#### **Discussion: Policy 400.1.5 update**

Reminding members to complete their initial responses, Li shared the [CUE Stakeholder Feedback Form](#) for members to use to share their stakeholder responses and walked through some of the initial responses. The group was assured that they can edit and change their responses after the form is submitted. Li requested that the group complete four quick straw polls.

- Implement the Requirement as a co-requisite of the GEP in order to provide maximum flexibility to students and to avoid increasing the total credit hours needed for graduation.
  - The group agreed unanimously
- Require that both outcomes be covered in the same course. This will ease student completion of the requirement and make tracking it clearer and simpler for students, advisors, and staff.
  - The group agreed unanimously
- Allow courses with any amount of credit hours to complete the requirement. No credit hours were stipulated by the System Office, and a one-credit course may focus on the two outcomes while another 3-credit course may have the two outcomes as a portion of the class content.
  - The group agreed unanimously
- Allow the co-requisite to double-, triple- etc count as much as systematically possible.
  - The group agreed unanimously

Following completion of the straw polls, Li encouraged members to complete the form and engage with their groups when they can. Full feedback is anticipated by October 14th, 2024.

Chair thanked the committee and wished everyone a good Fall Break.

Meeting adjourned at 2:57 PM

*Respectfully submitted by Annabel Breen*