The meeting began at 8:00 a.m.

The Chair welcomed the Committee. Because it had been postponed from the last meeting, the Chair invited members to introduce themselves to new representatives and attendees, which was done.

Consent Agenda*:
The following items remained on the Consent Agenda and passed unanimously.

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
3. Department of Humanities and Communication
   ANC – SOC 1000 – Intro to Global and Multicultural Awareness

4. School of Psychology
   CRC – PSY 3423 – Physiological Psychology

College of Science
7. Department of Physics and Space Sciences (BIO)
   a. CRC – PHY 1001 – Physics 1
   b. CRC – PHY 2001 – Physics 2
   c. CRC – SPS 2010 – Observational Astronomy
   d. CRC – SPS 4035 – Comparative Planetology
   e. CRC – SPS 4025 – Introduction to Space Plasma Physics
   f. ANC – SPS 4045 – Physics and Chemistry of Planet Formation
   g. ANM – B.S. Planetary Science

Agenda Discussion Items

College of Engineering

The following item was discussed and unanimously tabled.
1. Department of Biomedical Engineering
   ANC – BME 4320 – Engr. and Clinical Applications in Medicine

The ANC form lists “advisor approval” as a restriction. There was a concern that this is not a usual restriction and it was asked why it was necessary. In response, it was stated that the course may not be appropriate for some students, that some students require a certain level of maturity to take the course, and that some courses might be needed beforehand. There was a comment that advisor approval was automatic since a student requires advisor approval for any course during the registration period, however it was quickly pointed out that once a student’s registration flag is lifted in PAWS, a student could go ahead and register for any course irrespective of what the advisor might have approved. The Registrar’s office pointed out that while it could program BANNER to restrict registration on student standing and instructor approval, there

* CRC: Change Restrictions or Credits in a Course; CGR: Changing Graduation Requirements in a Major/Minor; ANC: Adding a New Course to the Curriculum; ANM: Adding a New Major/Minor to the Curriculum
was no mechanism to restrict on advisor approval. The Registrar’s office also asked, based upon the course description, if it was intended to restrict this course to Biomedical Engineering majors and the few premedical programs the University offers, to which the response was “generally, yes” though exceptions could be made. In light of the uncertainty over the restrictions, and that it was indicated that some courses might be needed, it was suggested that the agenda item be tabled so that the department could review the restrictions, perhaps adding courses they feel would serve as appropriate prerequisites.

The following item was discussed and unanimously approved, as amended.

2. Department of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering
   CRC – MAE 3161 – Fluid Mechanics

Two errors were noted on the CRC form. First the “Add co-requisite” box was not checked. Second, in the comments section, a typo was discovered: “MAE 2201” should read “MTH 2201”. The items were corrected.

The following items were discussed and unanimously approved.

5. Department of Biological Sciences
   a. ANC – BIO 4209 – Molecular Biology of Plants
   b. ANC – BIO 4413 – Applied GIS for Biological Research

With regard to BIO 4209, it was noted that the syllabus indicated that a project would be completed by the students, but it was unclear how that project factored into the grading scheme. In response, it was pointed out that the course was bi-level, and the project would be factored into the grade for graduate students, but not for undergraduate students. This was one of the ways the course would be structured differently for undergraduates versus graduate students.

With regard to BIO 4413, the restriction in the syllabus for a grade of a C or better on the final exam was questioned. It was asked that if a student get such a grade, would the student fail the course. In response, it was explained that this restriction was only on the syllabus, not the ANC form, and that a new faculty member had crafted the course without realizing that such a restriction is not appropriate. The Committee was assured that this restriction is not a formal part of the course and would not be enforced.

The following items were discussed and unanimously approved, as amended.

6. Department of Education and Interdisciplinary Science
   a. ANC – PED 1200 – Basic Swimming
   b. ANC – PED 3200 – Advanced Swimming

The question arose as to why these courses would award two credit hours each when all similar PED courses are only 1 credit hour. In response, the department indicated that the course instructor thought two credit hours were appropriate, but indicated that if the Committee ultimately felt that one credit hour was more appropriate, that was fine with them. The Committee agreed to a single credit hour, but it was then asked if the course would still meet twice per week, to which the answer was “yes.” It was also asked how many hours per week other PED courses met for a one-credit course, to which the response was one hour. However, because the course instructor felt two hours per week would be more appropriate, and because if one considers PED courses analogous to experiential courses for which more than one class hour per week is appropriate, the weekly meeting time was not amended. Finally, again because the course is more
experiential in nature rather than a lecture course, the course mode was amended to “Laboratory” instead of “Lecture.”

Discussion:

1. QEP Transition Plan (Drs. Baloga and Marcinkowski)

Dr. Baloga (Assoc. VP for Institutional Effectiveness) and Dr. Marcinkowski (Dept. of Education and Interdisciplinary Studies, Quality Enhancement Plan Implementation Committee) were in attendance to continue to discuss the plan to transition the endorsement and approval processes for QEP courses from the QEPIC to the UGCC. Dr. Marcinkowski reminded the committee that this transition is planned so that the QEPIC can focus its attention on the next phase of the Quality Enhancement Plan (presently referred to as QEP2). He noted that the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) expects the current Quality Enhancement Plan procedures (presently referred to as QEP1) to be institutionalized by the University, and that Dr. Catanese (University President) has indicated that he wants the current procedures to continue. Dr. Marcinkowski continued, noting that there are three steps involved in the QEP1 procedures: 1) the introduction of one or more courses with projects within each program, 2) assessment, and 3) evaluation and improvement. He said that the UGCC would only be responsible for the first of these steps, and that the other two would be handled by other University organizations. It would be UGCC’s responsibility to review new or revised courses designated for the QEP under the QEP1 criteria which are “plan, conduct, and report.” In practice, this had resulted in requiring a scholarly work appropriate for the field of study of the program. In conclusion, Dr. Marcinkowski said that it would be up the UGCC to develop its own policies and procedures for handling this, suggesting for instance that the Committee could continue to use the “QEP Course Summary Form” that the QEPIC had been using, or develop its own. He also added that SACS does not require QEP2 to be applicable to all University programs, but that SACS wants a University-wide impact. Thus, the QEPIC expects that QEP2 will be narrower in administrative scope than QEP1.

It was asked if, for clarity, whether QEP1 and QEP2 could be explicitly separated so that there is no confusion within the University community between the two phases. Dr. Baloga indicated that while it is currently being referred to as “QEP2”, QEP2 will receive a distinct name in the future before its implementation.

Another concern that arose was whether the UGCC was sufficiently competent to conduct these reviews and make these endorsements, particularly in light of the members’ current heavy loads both within and outside the UGCC, suggesting that the UGCC might just become a “rubber-stamp” without really doing the quality of a job that the QEPIC had been doing. In response, it was pointed out that the University had already implemented QEP courses in most if not all of its programs already, and it was expected that the volume of courses that would come through the Committee for this purpose would be low. It was also suggested that the Committee could form a subcommittee to conduct this review and report its recommendation to the full Committee, which could then act upon this recommendation, thereby reducing the burden on all members. To help allay the concern about competency, Dr. Marcinkowski noted that at least some of the members of the Committee also served on the QEPIC, and thus already understood the task involved. It was also suggested that perhaps the QEPIC could provide to the UGCC a document that explained in detail what the criteria were, perhaps with some examples. This was generally thought to be a good idea.

Finally, it was suggested that perhaps the ANC form could be modified or a new form created that would be used specifically for QEP-designated courses. It was thought this was a good idea, but it was suggested that
the form name be changed to include something such as “Scholarly Inquiry” rather than “QEP” to ensure it isn’t confused with the other processes/procedures of the QEPIC, particularly QEP2.

In the interest of time, the Chair suggested that the Committee plan to discuss at its next meeting how best to implement this transition so as to be able to conduct the reviews it will soon be asked to do. This was agreed to.

2. AP/Cambridge Capstone Program (Ms. Young, Registrar)

Ms. Young could not be in attendance. Recalling his discussions with Ms. Young, the Chair briefly described that in a vein similar to AP exams or IB credit, the AP/Cambridge Capstone program was a program (involving a project related to their field of interest) that some high school students participated in for college credit, and that the UGCC was being asked to review the program to determine whether Florida Tech should accept this credit, and if so, in what capacity. He explained that the Registrar’s office had originally sent information on the program to the Colleges, at least one of which indicating it might be willing to give three credits towards certain introductory courses, but which also felt that this should be decided on a University level. The Academic Affairs Committee also reviewed this material, but that committee felt it would be more appropriate for the UGCC to handle. Ms. Almasi (Assoc. Registrar) also indicated that discussions had been held within the Registrar’s office suggesting that it might be a good idea that the UGCC also review credit received for other external exams. She reminded the Committee that it formed a subcommittee in 2004 to conduct such a review, and its recommendations were implemented, but that things had changed with these programs and exams. For example, she described how the State of Florida’s university system will accept scores of “3” on some Advanced Placement (AP) exams for credit, but Florida Tech will only accept scores of “4” or “5,” and that students and parents often ask why that is. In response, it was explained that some University departments will offer equivalency exams to students who receive a score of “3” on an AP exam, but in their experience, these students rarely pass them.

A motion was made to table this discussion until Ms. Young could attend and better explain what the Registrar’s office would like to request of the Committee. The motion was unanimously approved.

Our next meeting is Friday, October 25 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences conference room. Agenda items are due Friday, October 18.

The meeting adjourned at 8:52 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Archambault – Chair