



## Council on Undergraduate Education 2024-2025

September 27, 2024  
 Meeting hosted via Zoom  
 1:30pm-3:00pm

### Members Present:

- |  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marta Klesath (Chair)        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mare Russo                        | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Joanna Stegall  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Erin McKenney (Past Chair)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Steven Miller                     | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alison Edwards  |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Logan Opperman (Chair Elect) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sharon Thorne (Proxy)             | <input checked="" 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"/> Autumn Mist Belk (Fall '24 proxy) |   |

**Members Absent:** Nancy Moore, Helen Chen, Erin Dixon, Jonathan Duggins, Latasha Wade

**Ex-Officio Members Present:** Li Marcus, Lexi Hergeth, Annabel Breen, Kaitlyn Mittan, Tamah Morant, Julia Law,, Levent Atici

### WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS

- **Remarks from Chair Marta Klesath** – Marta greeted the committee and shared that new 400.1.5 policy updates are being shared with the CUE group. Marta requested that members gather information from colleges/groups and summarize the feedback. Every meeting moving forward will involve discussions of the new UNC policy.

Li shared in the chat: *The new UNC SO policy ([UNC Policy Manual 400.1.5 II.9](#)) states that beginning in fall 2025, all students are to take at least one course covering the foundations of American democracy, detailing the specified learning outcomes. To this end, a work group composed of faculty from the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, the College of Education, and the Chairs of the University Committee on Courses and Curriculums (UCCC), Council on Undergraduate Education (CUE), and the Faculty Senate has been actively working to exam curriculum requirements and administrative strategies for this implementation. The group has diligently gathered curriculum information, facilitated discussions, and consolidated feedback from UCCC, CUE, and Associate Deans. The next step involves submitting the work group's recommendation to integrate this requirement as a co-requisite within the General Education Program (GEP) to the Council on Undergraduate Education, which oversees the general education curriculum. We look forward to your discussions.*

- **Remarks and Updates from OUCCAS/DASA** – Li shared that OUCCAS had the onsite CIM Refresh discussion this past week. In October, OUCCAS plans to give members a chance to look over the changes/updates.
- **Approval of CUE Minutes - September 13, 2024 – Approved**  
 Discussion: Members moved to approve the minutes from September 13, 2024. No discussion was shared.

### NEW BUSINESS

#### Courses New to GEP

- **HI 378 : Global Games: Sport History around the World (HUM, GK) – Approved Pending**  
 Discussion: This new course was presented by Nyota.

Regarding HUM Objective 1, for the purpose of clarifying assessment and reflecting the instructor's intention accurately, reviewer suggested to use the term "introduced" as a parenthetical so that it would be more obvious that students are comparing, researching, and writing, thereby extending discussion of historical context of sport and its change over time and more clearly aligning the objective, measure, and assessment. Reviewer shared an alternative wording option for HUM Objective 1: *"Each student will choose a theme or concept as a framework to compare national cultures of sport (introduced and emphasized during class discussion in the unit on "Sport in the International Context"), research additional primary and secondary sources, and write an essay using an historical argument to extend the discussion of the historical context of sport and its change over time."* Reviewer also noted HUM Objective 3 a concern about specification of what sport or how sport reflects the human experience within the objective. Reviewer commented that the research project essay sounds great, but is not sure if it immediately aligns with the objective clearly; the learning outcome and the measure seem to align separately, but not necessarily together.

One reviewer shared the following message in the chat: *"This research essay project sounds terrific, but I can't immediately tell that it's aligned with the Learning outcome for Objective 3...From what I can tell, the essay assignment requires students to critically evaluate the argument in a monograph by incorporating perspectives from at least two other scholarly sources — but the prompt does not necessarily require students to evaluate changes over time (as stated in the Learning Outcome). The Learning Outcome and Measure each separately align with Objective 3; I just don't see that the Measure completely aligns with the Learning Outcome."*

Second reviewer commented that there appears to be a need for an increased level of clarity regarding measures and objectives. Both reviewers expressed that it would be useful to hear from the instructor of the course in order to verify, but it would be acceptable to move to approve the course forward with suggestions.

Reviewer also shared the following suggestion in the chat, pertaining to the GK section: "This Measure aligns well with Objective 4, but I would suggest minor revisions for clarity: Each student will choose a theme or concept as a framework to compare national cultures of sport (introduced and emphasized during class discussion in the unit on "Sport in the International Context"), research additional primary and secondary sources, and write an essay using an historical argument to extend the discussion of the historical context of sport and its change over time." **Members** stated that it would be best to avoid digging too deeply into word choice and semantics if the objectives and measures remain sufficiently and clearly aligned.

Li revisited the different options for moving the course through the committee (approved, pending, suggestions, tabled). Reviewer inquired about a tabled motion, requesting that the instructor be present to receive feedback. Members discussed this option and clarified that tabling will ensure that the instructor has time to review and make changes. The Chair clarified that tabling and attendance are not mutually exclusive. Reviewer withdrew the pending motion (which was not seconded) and members expressed interest that approved pending would be sufficient for the GK. Members moved to approve pending changes to SLO GK Objective 1 to state something along the lines of "in a variety of national contexts across the world" to emphasize that you'll be exploring different nations".

- **WLCL 225 : Roman Topography (HUM, GK, IP) – Tabled**

Discussion: This new course was presented by Behler. Reviewer asked if "daily lecture" counted as an assessment. Chair noted that this is a study abroad course and that the lectures are in the context of being in the field during study abroad. Reviewer noted that Objective 3 in HUM may not align with the measure clearly. Members debated on whether or not the sample assignment provides sufficient evidence that the measure does not align clearly with the objective; it appears to address the secondary part of the objective. Member stated that if there is alignment with "describe" and "analyze" and that this is being sufficiently addressed, then the objective and measure would be properly aligned.

With regards to the IP Objectives, members commented that the "design" aspect of the disciplinary measure (design and technology) is not clearly addressed. The interdisciplinarity of the course may require some clarification, specifically regarding the implications and invocations of "technology" and "design" in the IP Objectives. Multiple members expressed further concerns with IP Objective 1, particularly with the question of how the approaches of the two disciplines are distinguished in the outcome. More members came forward with concerns about the alignment of the second and third objectives under IP. Members moved to table the course, pending changes to IP Objectives 1, 2, and 3 pertaining to alignment. Lexi requested that members provide feedback to the initiator via follow-up emails.

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

Chair noted that CUE's role in FoAD is the discussion of the place of the requirement in the GEP. The recommendations from the working group include that the requirement should be a co-requisite, that courses of any credit amount be allowed to count towards the requirement, and that both outcomes be included in a single course. Li shared the feedback form to be used by members to share the responses from their represented groups - **CUE Stakeholder Feedback Form - Foundations of American Democracy**. Li walked through the form, pointing out the questions to seek input on and answers to, and welcoming additional feedback and questions via other methods as needed.

Members had no immediate no feedback/discussion regarding the form.

Members asked questions about the implementation timeline and logistics, including for transfer students, students matriculating through Articulation Agreements, and more. Li confirmed that there is a sub-group working on implementation questions led by Registration and Records. Members discussed that they wanted the requirement to be able to multi-count so as to avoid additional complications for students and advising (who already have the challenge of student expectations what does/should double-count in their audits), as well as how many courses may be eligible to fit within the requirement. Li and Tamah shared the needed information shared from CHASS and the additional possibilities of a MOOC class and/or a module to meet the additional

needs. Tamah Morant shared insights into the efforts being made towards smooth implementation, such as adjustments to existing courses, incorporation of modules/MOOC-style modules, and integration with existing GEPs.

Members asked if there are required reading and references. Li responded affirmatively, pointing out the required references on the form (Section 3 of 4). Tamah Morant pointed out that there is flexibility in the interpretation of the reference material, key milestones and progress points. Tamah reiterated that arguments and contexts are to be expanded upon flexibly, reflecting that the learning objectives were purposefully left undefined to allow for interpretive latitude.

Members inquired about the implementation plan, commenting on the fast turn-around time. Li responded that the implementation plan is being led by Charles Cliff and may also include John Harrington and Erin Dixon. When members expressed concern about the speed at which implementation will occur, Li replied with the assurance that there are already plans for CIM implementation effective for students entering NC State for baccalaureate degrees in Fall 2025. Li also noted that there are multiple working groups focused on implementation, such as one for a MOOC-type course as well as one working on a pre-existing course list. This elicited a follow-up question pertaining to how many courses are already anticipated to be capable of meeting the new mandate. Li recalled that CHASS has determined that the total student audience need is under 2,000 students so there may already be enough courses to meet that demand; other courses may still yet need to be created, adjusted, etc., in order to meet later demand. Li stated that the course list is coming soon, along with relevant needs data.

Tamah Morant stated that if NC State can enact this implementation well, particularly in the space of developing a MOOC or other relevant modules, then NC State may be able to assist other, more resource-constrained institutions within the UNC System with their respective implementations.

Members proposed that the GEP and GEP hours will be impacted regardless of implementation style (MOOC or co-requisite), and that students may not be able to take extra hours because their major programs may not have the flexibility to allow for extra hours. Tamah questioned how many slots one course can fill, suggesting that this course/requirement might have a broader allowance (such as triple-counting or quadruple-counting) due to the fact this was not an NC State imposed, internal change. Tamah mused that perhaps the requirement could count widely, applying to the major, the GEP, and the humanities requirements. Members responded, stating that, especially given the incoming changes, they'd appreciate seeing the GEP plan generally simplified to avoid needless complications and frustrations for students and academic advisors. Members brought up a previous swimming requirement, noting that it was a simple check-box feature that necessitated a HES/PE GEP (Beginning Swimming) if it could not be passed. Tamah suggested that a single-line item could be put into place for FAD, like a final graduation check, to see if any course the student took could fulfill the requirement and if so, to check off the requirement with no further action needed.

Members expressed concern about transfer students in this single-line requirement idea; it will be crucial to look closely into the articulation agreement, as the CAA fulfills all GEP requirements. Questions about whether FAD could be considered a GEP at all in the case of transfer students were raised, with comments about FAD being a graduation requirement rather than a GEP inclusion. Tamah also raised the notion of testing out of the requirement, wondering that it may not work in this case if FAD ends up not being a "true" GEP course and is a check-box corequisite. Li stated that it will need to be for-credit and will likely be tied to a class on a list, sharing conversations with John Harrington have led to further questions pertaining to understanding the extent of counting and what defines it. Tamah Morant suggested it could be an "unrestricted corequisite" that works, in essence, in combination with anything and stacked with other requisites as much as necessary. Members seemed to respond positively to this suggestion.

Members suggested that CHASS needs more representation than the other colleges. Li confirmed that CHASS has heavy involvement, with two key representatives; Tamah assured members that CHASS is also well-represented in the working groups.

Members were asked to share the questions, recommendations, and discussions thus far with their constituents with feedback in the form expected by October 14, 2024. Li confirmed that the Associate Deans are also aware of this effort, and if they or CUE or OUCCAS could offer assistance in connecting representatives to constituents to let them know. The Chair shared the charge and the form for members to fill out after the meeting via email.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 PM

*Respectfully submitted by Annabel Breen*