The meeting began at 8:00 a.m.
The Chair welcomed the Committee.

Before reaching the Consent Agenda, the Chair informed the Committee that, in light of email discussions leading up to the meeting, the CGR in Item 2a below was amended to correct the last sentence in the comments box. The last sentence was amended to “Move Humanities Elective from Fall Junior year to Spring Sophomore year…”. Also, the effective date for this item and Item 1a below was amended to be effective for the 2017-2018 catalog year. The 2016-2017 catalog is no longer being modified.

The following items remained on the Consent Agenda and were unanimously approved.

Consent Agenda:

1. College of Business
   a. CGR – B.A. Human Resources Management

College of Engineering
2. Department of Civil Engineering
   a. CGR – B.S. Construction Management

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
3. School of Arts and Communication
   a. ANC – HUM 2053 – Introduction to Asian Civilization
   b. ANC – HUM 3531 – Philosophy of Science
   c. ANC – HUM 3541 – Philosophy of Law

Consent Agenda Discussion Items:

The following item was discussed and unanimously tabled.

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
4. School of Psychology
   a. ANC – PSY 2600 – Psychology of Gender

It was noted that the syllabus provided for review was incomplete. One of the required elements for the syllabus is a list of topics to be covered with associated time per topic, and this was missing. In response, it was explained that an instructor had not yet been identified for the course, and the specifics of the course had not yet been fleshed out. Because the earliest the course could be offered would be Fall 2017, a motion was made to table approval of this item until the next meeting to give the School of Psychology an opportunity to provide a more detailed syllabus to the Committee.
Informational Items:

1. Same Course Number On-Campus and Online:
   HUM 2332 – American History: From Reconstruction to the Present
   The Chair noted this item for the Committee.

2. CRC – FYE 1000 – University Experience – Approved by VPAA
   The Chair explained that he had received an emergency request immediately before the beginning of student registration for Fall 2016 to add a restriction of “Freshman only” to this course. Instructors of the course had introduced “themes” that had begun to attract interest from students who had either already taken the course, or from upper-division transfer students who did not need to take the course. Not only is it inappropriate for such students to enroll in University Experience, but there was also a concern that some sections of the course may have filled up with such students, preventing freshmen from registering for those sections. Because there was no time to bring a CRC request to the full Committee, Dr. Koksal (VP for Academic Affairs) agreed with and unilaterally approved the request, given the unique circumstances that brought it to her attention.

3. B.S. Logistics Management to be offered through Florida Tech Online
   The Chair noted that Dr. McCay (Executive Vice President/Chief Operating Officer) had promulgated a memo expressing his approval to offer this program as a four-year online program. Previously, it had only been offered as a degree-completion program through Extended Studies. The current University Catalog lists the program in the same format as other four-year programs, but notes that students must have an A.A. degree to be admitted into it.

   Prior to the meeting, it was noted that the Committee has never voiced its approval to offer the program as a four-year program, but showing faculty involvement in and discussion of such approval was important for SACS accreditation. For this reason, the Chair moved to approve that the program, as described in the catalog, be offered as a full four-year program, without modification.

   There was some concern that the Committee was being asked to make such an approval without forewarning, however it was explained that the Committee had approved the program as outlined in the catalog in October 2014 (minutes available at www.fit.edu/ugcc/documents/2014/10/Minutes-10-24-14.pdf). At the time, the Committee was requested to only approve changes to the first two years of the program to facilitate transfer into the program, but not to approve the program as a full four-year degree program. That request is now being made without modification to what the Committee had already approved.

   It was asked if the program met the University core requirements, and whether a Scholarly Inquiry (SI) assessment plan was already in place, to which the answer was “yes.”

   The motion was unanimously approved.

Discussion Items:

1. TCE Policy/Guidelines Promulgated by Dr. McCay – Dr. Archambault
   The Chair noted the guidelines that Dr. McCay had forwarded to the Colleges. Mr. Dave Micus (University Registrar) was in attendance to clarify some points. He explained that the University was losing some potential students because credit from courses these students were bringing to the University were being
rejected for non-equivalency, and those students were going elsewhere. He did not believe major substantive changes were being made, however to streamline transfer credit evaluation for some students, the Registrar’s office would make an initial evaluation of equivalency for some introductory courses. For example, he explained that if a student came to Florida Tech with a course entitled “Introduction to Psychology,” it was probably safe to assume that the course would largely mirror FIT’s own identically-named course and would include introductory topics on psychology, and thus would be appropriate to transfer as PSY 1411 (Introduction to Psychology). He indicated this would be mostly limited to the freshman and sophomore level introductory courses. Mr. Micus also indicated that courses more technical in nature would still be sent to the relevant academic units so that they can provide their input.

There were several comments. First, an example was described regarding freshman biology courses. The Department of Biological Sciences had received several courses for evaluation relating to biology, and for various reasons their direct equivalency with BIO 1010 (Biological Discovery 1) and BIO 1020 (Biological Discovery 2) was rejected in some cases, and it was felt that a SCI 1xxx transfer designation was more appropriate since such courses would not be usable by biology majors. In response, it was suggested that the department should use a BIO 1xxx designation instead, because other students in other majors may want to use the course as a science elective, but may also need to know the science discipline. For example, ABET requires students in Civil Engineering to take an additional science course beyond the named courses in chemistry and physics they are already required to take. The SCI prefix makes it unclear whether such a course is usable for that Civil Engineering student, whereas the BIO prefix removes that ambiguity. Mr. Micus noted that courses can be designated for use by the academic units as usable for major students versus non-major students. He also reiterated that more technical courses coming into the University for the first time can still be reviewed by the relevant academic unit.

Another example was provided from the Department of Mathematical Sciences. In this case, two courses from a Chinese university were to be evaluated, and it was requested that equivalency be given for MTH 1001 (Calculus 1), MTH 1002 (Calculus 2), MTH 2001 (Calculus 3), and MTH 2201 (Differential Equations). The Department noted that the provided syllabus for one of the courses stated that only six lecture hours were devoted to “[a] brief introduction to differential and difference equations.” In the Department’s view, it was not possible to provide equivalent credit to MTH 2201 in this case, and that such determination should be left to the Department for math courses. In the end, credit was only provided for MTH 1001 and MTH 1002.

It was noted that having the Registrar’s office determine class equivalencies is a good idea, but there will be challenges in implementation. Some courses may seem to have straightforward equivalencies, but instead may raise issues with the academic units.

A suggestion was made that each department forward to the TCE office their written guidelines (if any) that are used within the department for determining course equivalency. This would at least provide the Registrar’s office with some input and guidance on how to initially determine equivalency when the relevant department is not requested to make a determination or is otherwise unavailable to do so. The general consensus was that this would be a good idea.

It was asked whether the digits of a course number could something other than “xxx” to denote possible course use. For example, could a course receive a BIO 1xnm designation to denote that the evaluated course has biology content at the 1000-level, but cannot be used for biology majors? At a prior meeting, the
suggestion had been raised that designations such as HUM 1xss be used to denote a particular humanities course could also be used as a social science elective. The Registrar’s office was unclear whether this could be implemented in BANNER.

Relating to another aspect of the promulgated TCE guidelines, it was asked whether it is appropriate for the University to accept transfer credit from all types of testing programs (CLEP, DANTES, etc.). It was pointed out that not all institutions accept all these exams. In response, it was noted that the most recent program Florida Tech chose to accept credit for was the AP/Cambridge Capstone Program. In that case, the Committee formed a subcommittee which thoroughly investigated the program, and then made recommendations to the full Committee as to what the university could accept for credit, which the Committee then voted upon. It was expected that any program the University does not currently accept but might contemplate accepting would go through a similar vetting process. It was also pointed out that each academic unit routinely reviews current CLEP and DANTES exams/offerings to determine their continuous applicability to specific programs and/or courses.

2. Additional Transfer Credit Evaluation Topics – Dr. Heck

Dr. Heck (Civil Engineering) noted that it is common practice for academic units within the College of Science to use the SCI prefix when evaluating science courses. Indeed, there are many examples of courses transferred as SCI 1xxx – SCI 4xxx. Dr. Heck expressed a desire for a similar process using the EGN prefix for engineering courses. For example, if the Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering department received an industrial engineering course, that department could recommend it transfer with an EGN prefix at the appropriate level since it isn’t specifically an MAE course. It was noted that the EGN prefix already exists, and it was believed that courses have previously transferred as EGN Xxxx. However, unlike in the College of Science, in the College of Engineering, the academic unit heads must refer such a course to the College for approval to assign the EGN prefix. It was suggested that perhaps the College of Engineering might relax this requirement and permit the academic unit heads to directly assign the EGN prefix, when appropriate. Dr. Heck stressed that it is still very important that the EGN and SCI prefixes not be overused, and that courses that have primarily MAE or chemistry content (for example) still get the MAE or CHM prefixes, even if those courses cannot be used by students in those majors. Dr. Heck also recommended that the FREE prefix only be used by the TCE office, and only when such a course evaluated by the TCE office cannot reasonably be fit into any academic unit at Florida Tech.

There was no objection to using the EGN prefix in the manner suggested by Dr. Heck, nor with the proposed use of the FREE prefix. It was asked if Dr. Heck preferred a student to receive no credit for a course rather than use the FREE prefix, to which Dr. Heck responded “no.” He clarified that the FREE elective should be restricted only for those courses for which there is no appropriate “home” for it, and that all other courses should either receive a departmental prefix (MAE, CVE, CHM, BIO, etc.), or at a minimum, the EGN or SCI prefix.

A motion was made to recommend to the Registrar’s office that the EGN prefix be used in a similar manner as the SCI prefix is currently used, and that the FREE prefix be restricted as described above. The motion was unanimously approved.
3. Changes to the University Core Curriculum:
   Formation of a Subcommittee – Dr. Archambault

The Chair summarized the discussion had by the Committee in the March meeting, and again suggested that a subcommittee be formed with the task of examining the current University Core requirements, and recommending changes that modernize those requirements. He also explained that, prior to the meeting, he had spoken with Dr. Baloga (VP for Institutional Effectiveness and International Programs), and that she had suggested it would be advantageous to first identify those core competencies that the faculty and the University would like to see our undergraduates master as part of their university experience. Dr. Baloga was in attendance, and distributed a list of our current competencies, and suggested that knowledge of the current competencies was important to understanding what future competencies should be. She suggested that perhaps the Scholarly Inquiry and global initiatives embodied in the QEP2 programs might be important in shaping those competencies.

It was asked if the competencies should address the University’s mission statement. Dr. Baloga indicated that they could, just as elements of the SI and QEP2 programs currently point to the mission statement.

It was also asked if, with the imminent changes in the upper administration and likely additional changes resulting from that, if it might not be wise to wait until the Fall to address the core. Dr. Baloga indicated that she felt changes were coming, and suggested that waiting would not be inappropriate, though she stressed she did not wish to influence the Committee as to when it might begin to examine the core. In light of such potential changes, a motion was made to table the formation of a subcommittee until August. The motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Jones (Criminal Justice and Forensic Psychology) noted that the School of Psychology is working on a new B.A. in Intel Studies program, and that they may wish to take action on it during the summer, and asked what would be the appropriate process since the Committee would not meet again until August. The Chair indicated that, unless there was an objection from the Committee, that Mr. Jones could forward appropriate materials to the Committee for review via email during the summer, and that after a reasonable amount of time, the Committee could provide an electronic vote on approval. No objections were noted.

Finally, the Chair noted that Ms. Turner (Library), Dr. Turner (Biological Sciences), and Dr. Baum (Chemistry) were retiring from the Committee. The Chair thanked them for their many years of service and dedication to the UGCC, which was echoed by several of the members. Ms. Turner announced that Ms. Chelsea Stripling will be the Library’s representative in the Fall. It was also announced that Dr. Drew Palmer will represent Biological Sciences, and that Dr. Andy Knight will represent Chemistry.

The Chair wished everyone a good summer.

Our next regular meeting is Fri., Aug. 26 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences Bldg. conference room. Agenda items are due Fri., Aug. 19.

The meeting ended at 9:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Archambault – Chair