The meeting began at 8:00 a.m.

The Chair welcomed the Committee.

Before moving on passing of the Consent Agenda, a couple comments were made. It was pointed out that the flowchart for the Civil Engineering program included a “History Elective,” and it was thought that it would be more appropriate to name it a “Humanities Core Elective.” There was no objection, however it was noted that in the University Catalog, the elective was properly labeled “Humanities Core Elective.”

Civil Engineering noted that when it submitted its package of changes for consideration, it included a “Design Elective.” At the time, it was not realized that the Catalog included a definition for a Design Elective, and the Chair had suggested changing this to a “Restricted Elective (Design).” Later, it was discovered that the Catalog did include a definition for a Design Elective, and Civil Engineering requested this be changed back in their program before approval. There was no objection.

A request was also made that a brief cover memo accompany any submission packages to the Committee to help the Committee understand the nature of the changes. The Chair agreed to be more proactive in requesting such memos from academic units.

Consent Agenda:

All items remained on the Consent Agenda and passed unanimously.

College of Engineering

1. Department of Biomedical Engineering
   a. ANC - BME 4252 - Biomedical Measurement and Instrumentation
   b. ANC - BME 4253 - Biomedical Imaging and Instrumentation Lab
   c. CGR - B.S. in Biomedical Engineering

2. Department of Civil Engineering
   a. CGR(1) - B.S. in Civil Engineering
   b. CGR(2) - B.S. in Civil Engineering

3. Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering
   a. CRC - ECE 3240 - Junior Design
   b. CRC - ECE 4112 - Digital Electronics
   c. CGR - B.S. in Computer Engineering

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts

4. School of Psychology
Discussion:

1. AP/Cambridge Capstone Program (Dr. Archambault)

Dr. Archambault reminded the Committee of the AP/Cambridge Capstone Program and the formation of a subcommittee to recommend what credit (if any) Florida Tech should award to students who complete this program. The subcommittee met on November 25, and Dr. Archambault, who chaired the subcommittee, reported its recommendations (see Attachment). In summary, the recommendation was that students who complete this program and score at least a 4 on each AP exam will receive, in addition to AP exam credit, 3 credit hours for COM 1101 (Composition and Rhetoric) and 3 credits of IDS 1000 (a course yet to be created) that could be substituted at the academic unit level within its discretion for an introductory course. At a minimum, IDS 1000 could be used as free elective.

There was some concern that, with the AP exam credit, this would lead to 15 credit hours being awarded and that seemed excessive. However, it was explained that this is a very rigorous program, involving not only the courses for the AP exams, but additional work on a major project spanning two years and a lengthy report. Based on the materials before it, the subcommittee believed much more was being done in addition to the AP courses.

There was also some concern about creating a new course (IDS 1000) for the exclusive purpose of carrying credit for this program. It was suggested that 1XXX credit could serve the same purpose. It was explained that the subcommittee considered just awarding three credits of 1XXX free elective credit, but that this might not be attractive to students holding the program certificate. Ultimately the Committee decided that it would be best to award IDS 1XXX credit, rather than create a new course, which would serve the same purpose as well as serve to flag each academic unit that this credit could be used as a substitute for an academic program’s course requirement. Also to ensure that students understand that they can request a review of their project for departmental consideration of credit substitution, the credit award letter needed to make it clear that students do have this opportunity to discuss the matter with their academic unit head or program chair.

A question was asked what would happen if a student received AP exam credit for COM 1101, would they also receive the full additional 6 credit hours. The response was “no.” Three of the six additional credits are for COM 1101 exclusively; if a student also receives AP exam credit for COM 1101, the student would only receive an additional 3 credits for IDS 1XXX.

A motion was made to recommend that students who earn the AP/Cambridge Capstone Program certificate and receive a 4 on each AP exam within the program would receive, in addition to the AP exam credit, 3 credit hours for COM 1101 and 3 credits for IDS 1XXX which could be substituted for another course at the discretion of the student’s academic unit. The motion was approved on a vote of 16-2.

The Chair indicated he would write a memo to the Registrar’s Office and the Office of Undergraduate Admissions describing the Committee’s recommendation.
2. AP - French Baccalauréat International Option (Dr. Archambault)

Dr. Archambault introduced the French OIB program to the Committee. He indicated that the Registrar’s Office and Gary Hamme (Assoc. VP for Enrollment Management) had requested the Committee make recommendations for a credit award for students who successfully complete this program. Dr. Archambault referred to a summary of the program that he posted online for the Committee’s review, examples of credit awarded by other institutions, and web links to the full documentation. It was explained, however, that the material before the Committee did not specifically list what subject matter was covered in the program, but instead only discussed broad subject categories (e.g. History, Geography, Mathematics, Science, etc.).

Some of the documentation was sufficiently detailed that the School of Arts and Communication felt that, depending on score levels (to be decided by the Committee) that it might recommend offering 3 credits for COM 1101 (Writing about Literature) for a minimal score, and an additional 3 credits of humanities elective for a superior score on exams in the Literature area. In the History area, the School might recommend 3 credits for HUM 2052 (Civilization 2) for a minimal score, and an additional 3 credits of social sciences elective for a superior score.

Beyond this, there was agreement that there was not enough information presented to make a determination on credit in other areas. Dr. Archambault noted that earlier in the week he did relay a request for more information to Mr. Hamme who responded he is working on this request, but was not able to fulfill it before today’s Committee meeting. The Committee agreed to table the discussion until more information could be presented.

It was suggested that perhaps a subcommittee be formed to focus on this issue, but an alternative suggestion was presented to instead let each academic unit review any additional information pertinent to its program(s) and offer a recommendation as to what credit might be appropriate. The Committee agreed that the latter suggestion was perhaps best, and the Chair agreed to forward any additional information he received to the appropriate academic unit representative.

3. University Definition for a Credit Hour (Dr. Archambault)

Dr. Archambault noted that Dr. Monica Baloga (VP for Institutional Effectiveness) has requested that the Committee offer its recommendations for a credit hour definition for purposes of creating the SACS report. He noted that a similar request had been made of the Graduate Council and the Deans of the several colleges. Before the meeting, Dr. Baloga had provided the Committee with a draft definition of a credit hour, covering multiple delivery modes of instruction available from Florida Tech. Dr. Archambault asked the Committee for its comments.

There was a great deal of concern about how the amount of time defined particularly for the Hybrid/Online courses could be verified. Given the nature of this delivery mode, there is no way to prove that students are, in fact, paying attention to any online presentation rather than just having it on in the background while doing some other activity, nor is there a way to gauge how much time students spend on assignments. One suggestion was that some textbooks/solution manuals provide a suggested amount of time to complete a given assignment, and that perhaps this could be used as some evidence of the amount of time students spend learning. It was also asked if the software used to deliver course content could log the amount of time a student spent on the course, to which the response was that this had been considered in the past, but since there is no way to determine if a student is actually focused on the course while logged in, this would not be an accurate assessment. It was felt that knowing how these programs would be assessed and what material would be required was necessary before a verifiable definition for a credit hour for online courses could be developed.

Another concern, again relating to online courses, was the amount of time defined for the credit hour, and that 2250 minutes for a single credit in an 8-week period was too much. In response, it was suggested that this should not matter because an equivalent amount of quality instruction must be given. It was also
pointed out that most online students are only taking perhaps 2 courses per term, while traditional students are taking 5-6 courses. However, the concern remained about the practicality of the time burden on both the students and the instructor.

It was suggested that perhaps the only way to define a credit hour while encompassing all the possible delivery modes was to turn to some kind of outcomes-based definition. This would alleviate the need to count the number of minutes a student spends both inside and outside the classroom. A concern was raised about how this type of definition could be viable when one considers the possibility of student cheating, and how it is much harder to police cheating for an online course as compared to a more traditional course. Some discussion ensued about mechanisms in place to help catch any cheating that occurs in online programs.

The Chair asked if perhaps there were other delivery modes that were not included in Dr. Baloga’s draft definition. A question arose about the “Practicum” definition, and whether that included not only the actual field work, but also academic instruction in the course. It was felt that this definition should and did include academic instruction. Chemical Engineering indicated they had some delivery modes in their program that did not seem to fit into the categories in the draft definition, including computer laboratories and independent study.

The Chair indicated he would speak with Dr. Baloga about the Committee’s discussion, and requested that the Committee think about the issue of the definition for a credit hour, and that the discussion would continue at the next meeting.

4. Changes to the Mathematics Sciences course offerings

The Department of Mathematical Sciences gave the Committee a brief preview of changes they are making to some of their low-level courses. The Department explained that, for multiple reasons, it will be seeking approval for changes to the MTH 0111 (Intermediate Algebra)/MTH 1000 (Precalculus) sequence. The plan is to introduce two new courses to replace the above sequence: Precalculus-A and Precalculus-B. Those students who perform poorly on the math placement exam will be placed into Precalculus-A, followed by Precalculus-B, after which they will be ready to enter MTH 1001 (Calculus 1). Students who score sufficiently well on the placement exam will continue to be placed into MTH 1000 followed by MTH 1001, as is current practice. At least one section of MTH 0111 will continue to be offered for those students who are not required to take calculus, but instead move on to take MTH 1701 (College Algebra). The new sequence is only intended for those students in “technical” majors. Because this change will affect numerous programs, the Department requested, and the Chair agreed, to have the materials placed on the UGCC website early so that everyone can have plenty of time to review the changes. It was requested that he Department also provide copies of old and new syllabi so that it is clear what improvements are being made. The Department agreed to do so.

Our next meeting is Friday, February 28 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences conference room. Agenda items are due Friday, February 21.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Archambault – Chair
Florida Institute of Technology
AP/Cambridge Credit Award Subcommittee for
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee
November 25, 2013
3:00 p.m.
Link Bldg. Room 112

Subcommittee Membership: Mark Archambault - Dept. of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering (Chair), Marshall Jones – School of Psychology, Alan Rosiene – School of Arts and Communication, John Windsor – Dept. of Marine and Environmental Systems

MINUTES

Due to unforeseen circumstances, Mr. Jones could not attend the meeting, however he forwarded his comments to the Subcommittee, which are attached to these minutes.

The meeting began at 3:00 p.m.

Dr. Windsor began by explaining that the Associate Dean of the College of Engineering had forwarded him material approximately a year ago asking that it be evaluated for possible credit. At the time, Dr. Windsor suggested that credit might be given for ENS 1001 (The Whole Earth Course), but given the scope of the program and various possible topics of the projects, he speculated that it might be appropriate to give some kind of interdisciplinary studies credit. Dr. Archambault suggested, and the Subcommittee agreed, that three credits seemed too little given that this was a two-year, rigorous program, and that six credits would be more appropriate. Mr. Jones (via email) also suggested this might be appropriate. The Subcommittee also agreed that since Florida Tech only accepts AP credit from exam scores of 4 or greater, credit for the AP/Cambridge program would not be accepted unless a student scores 4 or greater on each of the three exams required to earn the certificate. (In order to earn the certificate, the AP/Cambridge program requires students, among other requirements, to take a minimum of three AP exams and score a minimum of 3 on each.)

The discussion turned to where to assign this credit. The Subcommittee felt that free credit was not sufficient to offer an incentive, and Florida Tech would want to be competitive with other participating universities. It was agreed that it would be more attractive to students if they received credit for a named course rather than a 1XXX course. Dr. Rosiene pointed out the difficulty in assigning credit to any particular course without knowing the nature of the student’s project. Dr. Archambault suggested creating a new prefix (APC) and new course (APC 1000, for instance) for which six credits could be given, and then each department could decide, at its discretion, to use that credit simply as free elective, or substitute it for another course, depending on the nature of the student’s project. It would then be incumbent upon the student to supply a copy of the project to the department for evaluation to determine if the credit could be used for anything other than free elective. Dr. Windsor indicated that this was along the same lines as his suggestion for use as interdisciplinary studies credit. He noted that there is one course, IDS 1010 (Community Service) with the IDS prefix, and that this might be an appropriate prefix for a new course. Dr. Rosiene suggested that given the rigor and length of the final report (20 pages), and given the information about the program the Subcommittee had before it, he would be willing to award three credits towards COM 1101 (Composition and Rhetoric). Dr. Archambault asked what would happen if the student also had been awarded COM 1101 credit directly from an AP exam; could the student receive credit for COM 1102 (Writing About Literature) or COM 2223 (Scientific and Technical Communication) instead? Dr. Rosiene did not think that would be workable, but he felt this would not affect many students, and noted Mr. Jones email comment suggesting that there probably would not be that many students seeking Florida Tech credit through this program.
After some additional discussion, it was decided that the Subcommittee would recommend that if a student applies to Florida Tech with the AP/Cambridge Capstone Certificate, that student should be awarded three credits towards COM 1101, and three credits for (an as-yet-to-be-created) IDS 1000. At a minimum, the three credits for IDS 1000 could be used for free elective, but it would be up to the discretion of the various academic units to decide whether to substitute that credit for another suitable course. Dr. Windsor wondered if it were possible to create a named course only for this specific purpose. Dr. Archambault offered to call Cookie Young (University Registrar) and ask for her thoughts on this matter. Dr. Archambault also asked which college would host this new course, or more specifically, which college already hosted IDS 1010. No one present knew, but no one thought there would be any significant issue on hosting such a course. Dr. Archambault said he would ask this of Ms. Young as well.

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Archambault – Chair

APPENDIX – Mr. Jones’ Email Comments

Hi Folks,

I will not be able to attend today’s meeting. I had an unexpected student issue come up that I must take care of this afternoon. I did review the AP/Cambridge materials and here are my thoughts.

1. This is a pilot program based on the Nov 2012 letter. The letter also outlines that in addition to the capstone courses they must have “3 or higher on at least three AP Exams.”
   a. Since Florida Tech requires a score of 4 on AP exams I suspect that a volume of potential students would be low. I assume we would require the three AP classes to all be 4s as opposed to 3s?

2. I do like what they are attempting to accomplish. I spoke with Vanessa and we agree that for School of Psychology programs we would only be able to offer free elective credits. Given it is multi-year program we would be open to discuss 3-6 credits.

I recommend we support admissions request to accept the credits as free elective as long as the expected potential candidate pool at the score of 4 rather than 3 justifies whatever work that must be expended to be part of the pilot.

Marshall