The meeting began at 8:00 a.m.

The Chair welcomed the members of the Committee.

Consent Agenda:

All items remained on the Consent Agenda and passed unanimously.

1. College of Aeronautics – Adding a New Major or Minor to the Curriculum – Air Traffic Control Specialization
2. Department of Physics and Space Sciences – Adding a New Major or Minor to the Curriculum – Premedical Physics
3. School of Psychology
   a. Changing Graduation Requirements – AA Liberal Arts
   b. Changing Restrictions or Credits in a Course
      i. PSY 3441 – Social Psychology
      ii. PSY 3541 – Psychology of Leadership

After passage of the Consent Agenda, a question was raised as to why the “Adding a New Major or Minor to the Curriculum” form contained selectable options for “Major,” “Minor,” or “Program/Option/Concentration/Specialization” considering that “Program” in encompassed by the “Major” and “Minor” selections. In response, it was noted that only majors, minors, and options require a major code, but other types of curricula (concentrations, specializations) might still be needed by the Registrar’s office for informational purposes. It was suggested that “Program” be removed from the form since it is incorporated in the terms “Major”, “Minor,” and “Option”.

Note from the Chair: After the meeting, it was noticed that there appears to be a newer version of the aforementioned form that specifically notes that only majors, minors, and options receive major codes, and the checkboxes for concentrations and specializations are physically separated from the checkboxes for majors, minors, and options. (See for comparison the forms used for Items 1 and 2 on the Consent Agenda.) The form used for Item 2 on the Consent Agenda is the one that is currently available electronically on the University website.

Discussion:

1. Proposal to modify the University core: Subcommittee Report. (Dr. Rosiene)
   Dr. Rosiene (Humanities and Communications) stated that the subcommittee met on Oct. 21 and discussed several items associated with modifying the University Core (hereinafter “core”). The first was the appropriate timeline for formally introducing the changes. The 2012/2013 University Catalog would be the next print edition of the
Catalog where the changes could be reflected, but it was thought that the changes could be put into effect as early as Fall 2011. It was noted that the Fall semester traditionally offers fewer sections of HUM 2052 (Civilization 2: Renaissance Through Modern), and that introduction of any changes would likely mean even fewer sections of HUM 2052 would be offered. Second, the subcommittee discussed whether a core change would require every program on campus to submit paperwork for program changes, and it was thought this would not be the case. The subcommittee felt that the program changes could be handled within the Registrar’s office, and that the Registrar’s office could make the appropriate changes to CAPP. Dr. Rosiene also mentioned that the changes could be thought of as replacing HUM 2052 with a restricted elective rather than refer to it as “Civ 2 plus options,” but that technically it would not be an elective course. Dr. Rosiene also stated that the subcommittee briefly discussed the problem of upperclassmen registering for and filling up lower-division courses meant for lowerclassmen, but did not come up with any solutions. He noted that he will have to discuss with Liz Fox (Dir. of Catalog and Graduate Information) the precise wording of the changes for the Catalog. The subcommittee also discussed the possibility of giving credit for named courses for students receiving a 4 or a 5 on AP exams, rather than the current practice of awarding Humanities elective credit. For transfer students, there will be a need to go through the Florida university course numbering system, and this will take some time. The proposal to change the core will include more flexibility for transfer credit, especially for those students coming from a public Florida university. Next, Dr. Rosiene suggested that there may be a need to re-examine the restriction on giving equivalency exams for humanities courses, moving to a policy similar to what is done for COM 1101 (Composition and Rhetoric) and COM 1102 (Writing About Literature). Next, the subcommittee considered the prohibition on using core courses to satisfy minor degree requirements. Again, this policy may need to be re-examined with regards to HUM 2052. It was noted that the renumbering of some courses still must be done, as well as the prerequisites for other Humanities courses. The subcommittee also discussed how this would affect online programs, and further discussion is needed. Finally, Dr. Rosiene addressed why the proposed changes are only affecting HUM 2052 and not HUM 2051 (Civilization 1: Ancient Through Medieval). He said the University faculty wanted to see more emphasis on contemporary issues. Also, most of the Humanities faculty have specializations on “modern topics”, and there are fewer course offerings and faculty specializations on topics related to the “ancient world,” and thus this must continue to be covered through HUM 2051. However, as a second step, similar changes could be proposed for HUM 2051 in the future. Dr. Rosiene noted that the next meeting of the subcommittee will hopefully be in November, and that he hopes to have a formal proposal submitted to the Committee in January.

2. Credit hours for laboratory courses: Subcommittee Final Report (Dr. Hajilogiou)

Dr. Hajilogiou (Dept. of Electrical and Computer Engineering) thanked both Dr. Baum (Dept. of Chemistry) and Dr. Bahr (School of Psychology) for their contributions to this issue. He described how the subcommittee came to a consensus for their report (see attached for a summary of Dr. Hajilogiou’s comments regarding the subcommittee’s findings), and welcomed comments. He noted this was not the final report, but after
addressing any comments or questions, the subcommittee would present its final report at the next meeting.

Our next meeting is Friday, December 3 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences conference room. Agenda items are due Tuesday November 23.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Archambault – Chair
Credit for Laboratory Courses

Summary of Three Common Models for Awarding Credit Hours Earned by Undergraduate Laboratory Work

Prepared for the Florida Tech Undergraduate Curriculum Committee by committee members:
  John Hadjilogiou, Electrical and Computer Engineering
  J. Clayton Baum, Chemistry
  G. Susanne Bahr, Psychology

Models:

The following institutions were researched regarding their practices and policies governing the assignment of credit for laboratory work: Auburn U., Clemson U., Duke U., Georgia Tech, MIT, Polytechnic Institute of New York, University of Florida, and University of Miami.

The research identified that basically three established policy models exist with subtle variations in practice.

The first model is a standalone lab course where 1 (one) unit or credit corresponds to 3 (three) contact hours in the lab.

The second model combines lecture with lab credits. For example, a 4-unit or credit course will have 3 hours of lecture and 3 hours of lab. This results in a better coordination between the lecture and lab experience. The times for lecture and lab are well defined and conducted in different locations.

The third model is to award credits based on departmental evaluation of anticipated workload. For example, one assumption is that a full time load is 15 credits that will require 60 hours of work per week. Thus, one credit allocation should correspond to approximately 4 hours of work. The times for lectures and labs are not well established and in some cases, lectures take place during the lab session.

There are other variations, but the committee felt they belong to these three models with minor modifications.

Conclusion:

Through consensus, the committee reached the following:

- Florida Tech, with a history of structured programs, will find the first two models more appropriate and currently implemented by most of our programs/departments.
- The third model may present challenges to evaluate credits for Florida Tech courses both internally and for purposes of awarding transfer credits.
- The simplest and most rigid option would be to codify the current practice at Florida Tech and state that a minimum of two lab hours per credit hour is required.
- The option at the opposite extreme would be to embrace academic freedom, intellectual openness and creativity and allow colleges/departments to decide which or to develop a model that is best for their respective curricula. Florida Tech courses that fit the third model require proper justification and documentation to be submitted to the UGCC.