The meeting began at 8:00am.

Welcome and Introductions:
The Chair welcomed the Committee.

Consent Agenda:

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

1. College of Aeronautics
   a. ANM – A.S. Flight Operations and Dispatch

2. Honors College
   f. ANC – HON 2990 – Honors Research Experience 1
   g. ANC – HON 2991 – Honors Research Experience 2
   h. ANC – HON 4991 – Honors Research Experience 3

College of Psychology and Liberal Arts
3. School of Arts and Communication
   a. ANC – HUM 3273 – Environmental Literature and Society
   b. ANC – HUM 3571 – Engineering Ethics
   c. CGR – B.A. Humanities – Prelaw
   d. CGR – Minor – Prelaw

Consent Agenda Discussion Items:

The following item was discussed and unanimously approved.

2. Honors College
   a. ANC – HON 2001 – Honors Seminar

It was noted that the course had been given an (SS) designation for use as a social sciences elective, and the request was to also give it an (LA) designation for use as a liberal arts elective for those programs that require such electives. Because the course generally fit the definition of a liberal arts elective, there was no objection.
The following items were discussed and unanimously approved.

2. Honors College
   b. ANC – HON 1020 – Honors Special Topics
   c. ANC – HON 2020 – Honors Special Topics
   d. ANC – HON 3020 – Honors Special Topics
   e. ANC – HON 4020 – Honors Special Topics

First, it was emphasized that although the sample syllabi that were provided for these courses described humanities courses, neither these nor any HON course should be considered to include the (HU) designation (or any other content designation) by default. Only if the courses these specific HON courses are being used to mirror contain a particular designation, should these courses be used to satisfy the related requirement. Thus, for example, if one of these HON courses is mirroring a humanities course that includes the (HU) designation, then that instance of the HON course can be used to satisfy a humanities elective. However, if the same HON course is mirroring an engineering course without the (HU) designation, then the HON course cannot satisfy a humanities elective.

This led into the second point which is how, at the end of a student’s program, will one know whether these HON courses can be used to satisfy particular electives, especially if the associated topic is not clear. It was suggested that when a topic is attached to a particular section of these courses in the schedule, that any appropriate designation (HU, SS, LA, etc.) be put into the topic string itself. That will make it clear as to how that course should be substituted in the CAPP report. This was agreed to.

After the remainder of the Consent Agenda was approved, it was noted that he research courses described by Consent Agenda items 2f through 2g had different credits, and that this might seem to be inconsistent with the university definition of supervised research credit hours. It was explained that research credit hours are defined such that one credit hour is a minimum of 180 minutes per week of scholarly activity, and that definition shall prevail irrespective of the number of credits a student actually enrolls in (which could hypothetically be any number). Thus, it is expected that a student enrolled in three credit hours of supervised research shall be engaged in at least 540 minutes of scholarly activity per week. The wording of the credit hour definition is being reviewed for change to make it clearer. There was some confusion as to whether this meant that a student had to have a minimum of 180 minutes per week per credit hour of contact time with a faculty member (similar to a traditional lecture course), to which the answer was “no.” The student need only be engaged in that amount of scholarly activity (such as being in the library or in a lab collecting data), with the expectation that the overall supervision for the research is being provided by a faculty member.

It was also noted that a new version of the “Add a New Course to the Curriculum” form was available that included a field to indicate how many research hours are expected by a student in a new proposed course (much like lecture and laboratory hours have always been included).

Discussion Items:

1. Advanced Standing Credit – Dr. Archambault
   a. Criminal Justice Advanced Standing – Dr. Jones

The Chair announced that the suggestions for increasing the amount of credit awarded for Advanced Placement exams was submitted to Dr. Oyman (Interim Provost) last week. He then explained that the Committee was still tasked with finding additional ways to award more transfer credit and/or advanced standing for students who come to Florida Tech having taken other college courses or who have prior learning assessment. He noted that this request was coming directly from Dr. Oyman, that it had also been
discussed in the Academic Affairs Committee, and that Dr. Oyman was open to providing assistance from his office in whatever way he could to advance this goal. The Chair provided several examples that the programs or academic units might consider in advancing this goal including making equivalency exams more available, streamlining prerequisite requirements, making more substitutions of non-equivalent transfer credit for required courses (particularly those that are not prerequisite to follow-on courses) than has traditionally been done, among others. He also explained that programs should identify ways to provide advanced standing to students who come to Florida Tech with externally-assessed certifications, licensing, or other prior-learning experience.

To that end, Dr. Jones (CoPLA Online Programs) described a proposal for advanced placement for law enforcement or correctional officers admitted to Florida Tech who have been certified by the Florida Department of Law Enforcement (FDLE). Dr. Jones explained the history of this proposal and how state schools currently award credit for such experiential background. According to Dr. Jones, the FDLE curriculum is very prescriptive and standardized, that students must pass a rigorous 200-question exam (with a pass/fail cut-off at 80%), and that the exam has an approximately 70% pass rate. Given this level of rigor, credit would be awarded without any retest and when the student presents a copy of their state certificate. Students certified as law enforcement officials would receive 18 credit hours towards a criminal justice degree, while students certified as correctional officers would receive 12 credit hours. Nine credit hours are the same between the two awards.

A motion was made to approve the proposal for advanced standing, which passed unanimously.

2. Minor Requirements (raised during meeting) – Dr. Palotai

Dr. Palotai (Aerospace, Physics, and Space Sciences) explained that it was recently emphasized that students cannot enroll in a minor degree if that minor requires more than nine credit hours of named courses in the student’s major, and that this prevents most students in STEM majors (particularly engineering) from taking the Physics Minor because the minor requires 10 credit hours that are named in most of the STEM majors. He said that it is common at other institutions and in industry for engineering students (and others) to have a minor in physics. He requested that the policy be revisited and relaxed to permit such students to take the Physics Minor.

The Chair noted that at the most-recent Academic Affairs Committee meeting, a list was presented delineating what majors are restricted from taking which minors, and that several other minors were also affected, not just the Physics Minor. When minors were first introduced, the intent was to have students pick a minor far-removed from their major, and hence the limit of nine credit hours of overlap. But again, it was raised that it is common practice to do otherwise outside of Florida Tech. It was suggested that, rather than preventing a student from taking a desired minor, the policy be changed to permit up to nine credit hours of overlap between the minor and the named courses in the major, and that a student will need to make-up any additional overlap with additional courses such that the student meets the minimum required credits for the particular minor without counting the additional overlap. These decisions would be made between the student and the minor advisor. It was also noted that this would likely mean there will be a need for a minor program plan so that the Registrar’s Office can confirm that degree requirements have been met. This plan was agreeable to the Committee, and it is recommended that the policy be so changed.
3. Associate of Science Core Requirements (raised at meeting) – Dr. Rosiene

Dr. Rosiene (School of Arts and Communication) explained that there are differences in the state schools in the core requirements between A.A. degrees and A.S. degrees, with A.S. degrees having lower minimum requirements. For example, A.S. degrees only require three credits of communication and six credits of humanities. In comparison, Florida Tech uses the same higher-level requirements in its A.S. degrees as it does in its A.A. degrees. He suggested that the Committee review the core requirements for A.S. degrees with an eye towards reducing them to be more aligned with the state schools. He indicated he would draw up a proposal and present it for discussion at a future meeting.

Our next regular meeting is Fri., Jan. 31 at 8:00 a.m. in the Physical Sciences Bldg. conference room (OPS 202). Agenda items are due Thurs., Jan. 23. **Deadline for all 2020-21 catalog changes.**

The Chair noted the date and time of the next meeting. He reminded the Committee that the next meeting is the deadline for changes to the 2020-21 catalog.

*The Chair wished everyone a good holiday break.*

*The meeting ended at 8:45am.*

*Respectfully submitted,*

*Mark Archambault – Chair*