

GEC/Quest Submissions

Non-Quest Requests

ANT2301 Human Sexuality and Culture: [R][CA]

Current: S, D, WR4

Requesting: S/B, D, WR6 (request for B has been withdrawn)

Submitter: S. Bogart

<https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/13536>

- The review subcommittee would like to invite the instructor to attend the upcoming meeting in order to discuss the rationale of offering both B and S, in light of the submitter comment(s) “This class is about half and half in its content regarding these two distinctions.”

[Email response, 4/25/19]

- This course is integrative using multiple disciplines to understand human sexuality as a whole in an anthropological context. As such all subfields of anthropology are highlighted: most heavily in examining human societies and cultures and in human biology and evolution. You can see that this is why I submitted for a course description change (see below the description that was approved and the rationale). This prompted my suggestion for the class be and either-or option for Biological GenEd credit (B) OR Social and Behavioral Sciences GenEd credit (S), and I frankly did not know that this had not been done for other classes. The material each week delves into diversity, social, cultural, biological, and evolutionary influences about a particular topic. This might best be displayed by using an example week/topic and go over what the class usually covers for that topic. I will use week 9 “intimate relationships” as an example:
- Lectures start out discussing what intimacy is. I cover the various relationship types from monogamy to polyamory and then go into the various hypothesis that people use as criteria for finding potential partners, such as the matching hypothesis. To bring in some cultural relativism I also discuss David Buss’s research on mate choice and the universal characteristics found in all cultures that define what men and women seek from a mate. Going into a bit of linguistics we discuss how communication is used to attract partners (flirting) and relationship communication patterns and difficulties. I discuss how do we define love, the different styles/types, and cultural variation related to this aspect. I also use archaeological example to show that relationships and love have a long historical context in human societies. I discuss the science of love, specifically the cognitive and physiological factors that have been associate with love. I discuss hook-up culture in relation to college students and the history behind the culture. Using some evolutionary hypotheses I discuss the selective advantage to mate poaching and jealousy. I will go into infidelity and the various social and diversity factors that can influence this behavior. I wrap up the lectures talking about relationship violence and abuse, relating to society, diversity, and our politics.
- Discussions are centered around some article readings dealing with sex education and relationship violence, online dating, and polyamory and they watch a TedTalk on how technology is influencing love in today’s society

- As you can see elements such as culture, diversity, and sociality are throughout, I also draw on linguistics, archaeology and history, and biology (both evolutionary hypotheses and biological/physiological aspects). Some weeks have a heavier focus on biology than this example (such as anatomy and physiology, arousal, conception/pregnancy, and STI weeks)]
- Please consider incorporating the same rationale from the UCC course description change request within this general education request.
[Submitter Response:
- The new course description that was approved and pending at the Office of the Registrar for the final change in the catalog is as follows:
- Examines cultural, biological, and archaeological aspects of human sexuality through time and space, while evaluating sexuality ideas to societal discourse. Investigates personal and cross-cultural views on sexuality, presenting gender identity, sexual orientation, relationships, and sexual ethics. Appropriate for those seeking an integrative approach to human sexuality (S and D)(WR)
- The rationale for the change is: “The current description is out of date and limited. The old description only discusses examining human sexuality from a “cross-cultural viewpoint”, while the course still does this, the current course takes a broader integrative examination of human sexuality. The current course explores sexuality using all four subfields of anthropology including cultural, archaeological (historical),biological (development, anatomy, evolution), and even linguistical with the examination of media discourse and influential platforms of celebrities. The old description while correct in stating the course looks at individual sexual identity is again limited because the course examines personal identity in the context of society with an emphasis on how identity is widely variable within and between societies. I added the final line to this newer revision based on the committee recommendations to look at the guidelines and examples of course descriptions. The reason for this line is to help students decide whether the course is appropriate for them and emphasize the integrative viewpoint of the course. While the course is an anthropology course, you cannot discuss human sexuality without an interdisciplinary approach, and the course uses concepts from psychology, sociology, biology, gender studies, and political science. My hope is that the description will help clarify the course for students and administrators to better assess student enrollment.”]
- The course has options for a final which include survey research of fellow students, this would require clearance from university IRB. The process for obtaining this approval may be extremely involved for students. Is this currently an optional final research paper in the course?
 - [I think there is some confusion here. There is a final exam, not an option for something else. I think this is confused with the research project. Students choose a topic related to culture of sex and relationships in campus life. Students have the option to incorporate surveys with the research to get a sense of how their peer’s on campus view certain issues. While this would require an IRB in any research study, it would be too involved for freshman to go through this process for a paper that is not published. Since this is an option and not all students do it and because every student’s topic is slightly different I do not have a largely freshman class fill

out IRBs, however I require students to attend an extra session (iv under research project called “info meeting” done on week 6) covering the methods of using questioners in research and the ethical standards that must be met – covering APA and AMA standards. Students must get approval from their TAs by submitting detailed methods and their survey questions for review and approval from TAs. I added some further clarification of this under the “Info meeting” section on the syllabus.]

- ~~Request as asking that students be allowed the option of using either S or B, but not both.~~
- ~~Please remove “Gordon Rule” terminology from syllabus.~~
- Please clarify assessment for “discussion session” participation and provide more detail regarding what a student must do to receive credit. [Updated, 4/26/19]
- As currently worded, “Critical thinking exercise” (pp. 4-5) is vague and has more of a feel of an exercise in effective advocacy than one in “critical thinking.” Explaining in plain English what the instructor means by “sexual discourse” might help, and casting a broad-as-possible net as far as what constitutes “helping sexual discourse” (e.g. Is there room in the course for a person who comes in thinking public discussion of sexuality is best not directed/aided/encouraged by universities in the first place?).
 - [I have tried to make the assignment and its elements clearer on the syllabus. It is not an advocacy project, though I can see where one might view it as such. It is more of a thought exercise to get students to critically think about where they and their peers receive information (in this case on sexuality) and how that is then used to make judgements, perceptions, and ultimately conduct behaviors. And ask themselves if the knowledge is accurate or if they are shrouded in myths and stigmas. Students will not actually be doing any activity that is directly educating anyone, they are just supposed to come up with methods and suggestions on how they might do that. The concept is meant to be broad so that students can pursue their own interests, for example maybe it is a method on how to make students aware of what STI testing is and where they can go to do it and why it is important to get tested. Or another example may be someone comes up with an activity that could be implemented in a middle school sex education class on contraception. I intended to leave it a bit vague, so students are free to come up with their own ideas, but can see where the reviewer points out that it need more clarification. I hope I have done this on the syllabus.
 - In regards to the last comment – students can do whatever they want, it can be as small as having a flyer in the health center.]
- ~~The bibliography may only be used once to satisfy writing requirement and only if it is an extended annotated bibliography, if it is an assignment and then also incorporated in the final paper it may not “double count” for total words:~~
 - ~~<http://undergrad.aa.ufl.edu/general-education/gen-ed-courses/structure-of-wr-courses/writing-requirement-syllabus-policy/>~~
~~Bibliographies: Extended annotated bibliographies may contribute to the word count if they evidence critical thinking and in-depth analysis. However, they may not be counted if they are simply bibliographies written for a paper or as an exercise to teach a specific disciplinary style, e.g., APA, MLA.~~
~~[The bibliography is a separate assignment and text will not (or should not) be duplicated in their final synthesis of the critical thinking exercise. Since the final~~

synthesis is more about the methods they are suggesting and what that entails, there should not be overlap with the bibliography. So it is not a double count assignment. This assignment is about gathering information and critically thinking about it, not just a format exercise.]

Quest Requests

Before Columbus: H, N, WR2 [R][CA]

Submitter: T. Murtha

Mentor: E. Butler

<https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/13731>

- The review subcommittee would like to invite the submitter to attend the upcoming meeting to discuss the current title. The review subcommittee feels that the course content is exemplary and worthwhile, but that there are better options for a title which highlight the course's efforts at contrasting between the past and the present in regards to urban development.
 - ~~[Previous Review subcommittee comment]~~ The title may be misleading to students and should evidence modern connections. Please consider updating the title to include context regarding the subject matter in a contemporary context as well as the pre-Columbian era.
- ~~Recommend document be spell checked.~~ [Done, 3/22/19]
- ~~The third bullet under Quest SLOs (pg 2) is "Connection," not "Critical Thinking."~~ Please update. [Done, 3/22/19]
- ~~To meet writing requirement, syllabus must include a required or recommended writing or style manual.~~ [A recommended style guide and link to the library citation management guide has been added.]
- ~~To meet International designation, it is unclear how international course content is connected to the "contemporary world", per the General Education definition for International.~~
 - ~~The current required readings do not show explicit connections to the contemporary world.~~
- ~~Please provide more detail regarding the International designation request for this course in regard to the contemporary world and how/where this will occur in the course (i.e. assignments, readings, etc).~~
 - [Submitter has provide more details]

Identity of the Self from Classical Antiquity to the Digital Era: H & WR4 [A]

Submitter: E. Bozia

Mentor: A. Bascik

- <https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/13821>
- The submitter may develop/use any Writing Rubric they feel is applicable, the samples provided are not necessarily the "UF writing" rubric. Please adjust accordingly if you feel the need to.

Justice and Power: Law and Violence: H & WR2 [R] (or A, only for Humanities designation) [A]

Submitter: E. Dale

Mentor: S. Steinberg

<https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/13653>

- The request may be approved for H without WR2 if the submitter wishes. However, it will be recommended for Recycle in its current format if the Writing Requirement components are not updated to be in line with General Education Writing guidelines. [Submitter has clarified WR issues and provided updates in syllabus. 4/25/19]
- ~~Needs syllabus to be considered. (No response yet regarding syllabus) [Syllabus uploaded 3/21/19, after review committee meeting.]~~
- ~~Considering, lack of details from missing syllabus, the course description lacks any description of the assessment. It does specify what students are expected to learn where the assessment explanation is requested.~~
 - ~~Please provide more detail regarding the response papers, midterm paper, and final paper.~~

Writing requirement:

- ~~The writing assignments do not add to 2000 words:~~
 - ~~Bi-weekly response papers: 25% of grade [1500 words total, 6 papers. Clarified, 4/25/19]]~~
 - ~~Midterm paper **500 word** essay: 25% of your grade [500 words]~~
 - ~~Final exam **1000 word** essay: 30% of your grade~~
 - [Submitter Response:
There are 6 distinct 250 word papers (adding up to 1500 words) plus a midterm of 500 words, and that these are the papers that count toward the 2000 WR requirement. To call attention to these papers, I have bolded the word counts throughout the syllabus when they appear. Email, 4/25/19]
- ~~Format: The nine modules of the course need to be presented in syllabus format.~~
 - ~~The weekly plan should include the readings and grading policy. [Updated, 3/21]~~
- ~~WR: Of the 2000 words, 1000 appear to be part of the final examination and possibly 500 from in-class writing responses. This does not meet with General Education Writing word count requirements. Are the remaining 500 words to come from the bi-weekly response papers? <http://undergrad.aa.ufl.edu/general-education/gen-ed-courses/structure-of-wr-courses/wr-course-guidelines/>~~
 - ~~Submitter response: to correct the misapprehension that the papers are done in class, I have indicated throughout the syllabus that they are turned in at the start of class. To correct the misapprehension that they are free writing papers, I have made it clear that all the 250 word papers (and the final exam) will be graded according to the writing rubric that appears in the syllabus. That rubric indicates specifically that papers are graded for content, structure, grammar and other issues relating to writing. The papers are not free writing in any sense of that term, they are analytical papers that will be held to scholarly writing standards. 4/25/19]~~
 - ~~“**In-class writing assignments, quizzes, class notes, in-class essay examinations:** may not be counted.”~~
 - ~~The final exam in its current format, may not count for total words.~~

- Additionally, the final paper appears to incorporate previously submitted work from the response papers.
- “Journals, blogs, and reflection or reaction assignments:** May not be counted if they approximate free writing and lack organization, critical thinking focus, and integration of ideas into the disciplinary context.”
 - The bi-weekly response papers currently appear to be free writing.
- “Team writing assignments:** Team-written documents may not be counted for credit unless clear individual sections are identified for grading, such that individual students’ writing may be evaluated and graded.”
 - “Friday: discussion section, students turn in two-page (500-word) assessment of the primary source they identified **based on the assessment rubric their group developed.** Discussion of the assessment rubrics.”—pg. 7 of syllabus. [To clarify the confusion about the rubric developed by groups during the mid term, I have designated that the “evidence rubric” (as distinct from the “writing rubric”). While students will be expected to assess the documents they uncover for their midterm using the “evidence rubric” their mid-terms will be graded using the “writing rubric.”]
 - Is the midterm paper the result of group work?
- No designated time for the receipt of feedback. Please provide a description of how/when students will receive feedback. [As the syllabus clearly indicates, feedback on every paper that counts towards WR 2000 will be given within a week of the paper being turned in. Papers (or the midterm) will not only be returned with comments based on the “writing rubric,” the TA will lead a discussion of writing issues during the discussion section. Email response, 4/25/19]

Art of Identity: H, D, WR2 [CA][A]

Submitter: J. Pufahl

Mentor: C. Craig

<https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/13679>

- Questions regarding Required reading with textbook from 1956. (March meeting minutes).
 - Please provide more detail regarding this book as the only required reading for the course. Will the course be comparing current efforts in the field to this work? Is this book foundational in the field? Will more current theories be discussed and contrasted? [Submitter response: This is foundational in the field. I have reduced the reading assignments from this text and will provide these readings via Canvas and I have added a more current article for the students to read (the Buchanan article on Social Atoms). It is difficult to find general texts on the subject of role theory and this text offers a concise understanding of the theory as it is applied. By reducing the required readings to specific sections of the book and contrasting it with Dr. Buchanan's current work with Social Atoms, I believe students will gain a foundational knowledge of Role Theory. I will be able to synthesize more texts and authors into my lectures. Email, 4/28/19]

- ~~The total number of words in assignments do not add up to the correct total, they are currently less than the requested minimum of 2000 words.~~
 - ~~Please provide more detail on what the writing assignments are and how they will be assessed. There is not enough information to determine whether or not the assignments meet the requirements of a Writing course according to: http://undergrad.aa.ufl.edu/general_education/gen-ed_courses/structure-of-wr-courses/wr-course-guidelines/~~
- ~~Please provide clarification regarding what General Education designations are being requested. Currently listed as having D, H, N, and Writing 2000 words. A course cannot have a D and an N designation.~~
 - ~~There is also confusion regarding current v. requested designations. This will be a new course so it should not have any current designations. Please clarify.~~

Current GE Classification(s) D - Diversity, H - Humanities, N - International
 Current Writing Requirement Classification E2 - 2000 words
 Requesting Temporary or Permanent Approval 3 semesters
 Requested GE Classification D - Diversity, H - Humanities
 Requested Writing Requirement Classification E2 - 2000 words
 - ~~Syllabus SLOs refer to "N," though this designation does not seem to be requested. Please clarify.~~
- ~~Missing minimum Grade statement [Updated, 3/27]~~
- ~~Missing link to writing support website. [Updated, 3/27]~~
- ~~Syllabus missing required mention of recommended/required style/writing manual [Updated, 3/27]~~

Music & Spirituality: H & N [CA][A]

Submitter: C. Pickeral

Mentor: B. Smith

<https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/13667>

- ~~The course does cover information related to other countries and societies; however, it is less clear whether the emphasis is on CONTEMPORARY culture. There are multiple references to historical contexts in the weekly lessons, for example, middle ages, ancient Peru, ancient Japan, and Indian classical music.~~
 - ~~Please provide more detail regarding how students will make connections between international components and the contemporary world.~~

[Email response, 3/24/19:

 - I don't think any substantive changes are in order, since there's a lot of emphasis on contemporary cultures already in the proposal. For example:
 - In Week 5, the module deals with elements of West African spiritual/musical practice that have influenced American popular music and culture, continuing to the present day. As noted in the syllabus, we'll cover "Spirituals through Hip-Hop." The goal in this case study is to bring awareness to the presence of spiritual music and dance techniques in seemingly secular constructs such as contemporary rap, rock, and pop music, and to understand the forces that have made this so. This module has both reading and listening materials that are quite contemporary.

- In Week 6, the syllabus states that we will examine “the Spiritual Undercurrents of Western Art Music from the Middle Ages through the present day.” Once again, we chart a path from overtly religious works and practices through contemporary secular and sacred works that, while seemingly far-removed from their historical antecedents, still preserve many of their techniques and spiritual intentions, either overtly or subliminally. This module also relies on readings and media from the 21st century.
- In Week 8, the students will be exposed to esoteric techniques in the spiritual/musical practices of both ancient and modern cultures with the explicit goal of recognizing the ways that these forces are still active in the modern world. Readings include works from the 21st century and this module will feature an interview with a John Coltrane scholar who is currently engaged in research on such esoteric techniques in both Coltrane’s music and that of contemporary jazz musicians. In addition, we will examine the ways in which the cosmology of ancient Chinese Medicine informs the work of composer/choreographer Gabrielle Roth and her disciples in the contemporary Trance Dance scene.
- In Week 10, this module deals with Japanese aesthetics and spirituality. As noted in the syllabus, we will cover both “ancient & modern” manifestations of Japanese culture, but with a greater emphasis on contemporary culture, with examples from 21st-century science fiction literature, anime, manga, and gaming. Because of the pervasive presence of such Japanese constructs in contemporary American culture (particularly youth cultures) as well as in Japan, this unit presents a particularly direct example of ways in which spiritual traditions and ideals can infuse seemingly-secular works and the impact that such works can have even on cultures that are removed from the original tradition.
- In all of the case studies presented in Weeks 4-8, 9-11, there is an emphasis on timeless or universal practices, ideals, and techniques and on the ways in which they continue to inform and influence our contemporary experience, often in ways that aren’t overtly recognized or discussed. One overarching ideal of the course is to move these practices, ideals, and techniques to a place of conscious attention and discussion. The purpose of all of the case studies is to expose students to multiple manifestations of such practices and ideals, allowing them to recognize such forces at work in their own lives and surroundings.
- To that end, the students will propose, research, and present a Capstone Project dealing with spirituality and musical/artistic practices in “a specific culture or subculture, an artist, a genre, or in a specific construct” not already covered in one of the case studies modules. They will be encouraged to select a topic that has some personal relevance to their own lives, their heritage, social groups, etc. Many of these projects will doubtless engage contemporary cultures and, even if the student chooses an historical topic, their work will require an examination of the topic’s contemporary relevance.

- Finally, the students will submit a personal philosophical/aesthetic statement that will, among other things, ask them to “recognize and describe the role(s) that a spiritual experience of music plays in their family/peer groups, regional culture, and contemporary society as a whole, comparing and contrasting their personal experience with that of these groups and cultures.”]

Fairy Tales and Identity: H & WR4 [CA][A]

Submitter: R. Bloom

Mentor: A. Reynolds

<https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/13660>

- ~~Please clarify what “feedback” will be given to students regarding their writing? Will this be a single summary comment, or will there be detailed feedback throughout the paper.~~
 - [Submitter Response:
 - Updated syllabus to include, “Each assignment will be returned to students with a grade and comments that address the students’ writing skills. Comments will be provided throughout in addition to a completed rubric. Feedback on Paper 2 will be provided electronically by the end of finals.” 4/26/19]
- ~~For the purposes of Writing Requirement courses, feedback must be provided to students by the end of the semester for them, at the latest the last day of class/final exam. Please adjust this in the request/syllabus.~~
 - [Submitter response:
 - Updated syllabus, “ Please note: There is NO FINAL EXAM/PAPER in this class. Paper 1 (due week 8) and Paper 2 (due week 15) are of equal weight. 4/26/19]
- Please include SLO’s for “Communication” of requested designation. [Updated, 3/29/19]
- Minor point: “participation” requirement seems more an “attendance” requirement as worded. There are distinct differences between participating and attending a course and the wording appears to be confused in the syllabus. Please provide clarification where appropriate. [Updated, 3/29/19]
- How will feedback be provided to students on the final paper? [I will grade according to my rubric and add a brief comment on final papers which students may pick up from my office on the Monday that grades are due or in the first week of the following semester.]
 - Does a “brief comment” suffice? - CG
- ~~Critical Response paper:~~
 - ~~“2 critical responses to a fairy tale to be submitted on a PowerPoint slide one hour before the class in which they are due. Due dates TBA. (2x100=200 words) 2x5%=10%”~~
 - ~~This assignment may not meet the requirements for word count. Please provide student directions for critical response papers. These papers appear to require the inclusion of passages from course content which will not satisfy the word count requirement in addition to the original student writing. The word count totals may be added to other assignments to meet the 4000 words.~~
 - ~~As this assignment will be submitted as a power point how will students receive feedback?~~

- [Regarding Critical response PowerPoint: You must write 100 words NOT including the quoted passage. Please e-mail me your slide so that I may provide feedback via email. Updated in syllabus, 3/29/19]
- Will feedback on these assignments be provided to students in line with Writing designation requirements? <http://undergrad.aa.ufl.edu/general-education/gen-ed-courses/structure-of-wr-courses/wr-course-guidelines/> [Feedback will be provided]

Nature, Spirituality & Popular Culture: H, N, WR2000 [R][A]

Submitter: B. Taylor

Mentor: H. Radunovich

<https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/13558>

- A case is made throughout the syllabus for the desired “N” Designation. The “N” need not appear after each element in the syllabus as it currently does, but you may leave it if you wish. [Removed, 3/26/19]
- Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs):
 - Please separate SLOs for Humanities and International. An example syllabus can be found at: <http://undergrad.aa.ufl.edu/general-education/gen-ed-courses/structure-of-gen-ed-courses/gen-ed-syllabus-policy/> [Updated, 3/26/19]
 - Please provide a document detailing/explaining how students in the course will achieve the student learning outcomes related to the International designation throughout the course (i.e., writings, assignments, projects):
 - Please include information regarding the bolded sections below:
 - International courses promote the development of students’ global and intercultural awareness. Students examine the cultural, economic, geographic, historical, political, and/or social experiences and processes **that characterize the contemporary world**, and thereby comprehend the trends, challenges, and opportunities that affect communities around the world. Students analyze and reflect on the ways in which cultural, economic, political, and/or social systems and beliefs **mediate their own and other people’s understanding** of an increasingly connected world.
 - [New language and descriptions have been added to the syllabus satisfying this request. 3/26/19]
- Please include “minimum grade for credit” statement such as;
 - “To receive General Education credit for this course students must obtain a C or better.” [Included]
- The syllabus does not include a rubric for the writing assignments. Please include a rubric per the General Education program requirements which can be found at <http://undergrad.aa.ufl.edu/general-education/gen-ed-courses/structure-of-wr-courses/writing-requirement-syllabus-policy/> [Now included]
- There is a statement under Week 14 about returning papers grades with comments by *a date to be determined*. A clear expectation regarding feedback should be included in the course schedule, as required by the General Education program (<http://undergrad.aa.ufl.edu/general-education/gen-ed-courses/structure-of-wr->

[courses/writing-requirement-syllabus-policy/](#)), please provide a time prior to the end of the course. [Updated]

- ~~Some material is redundant It appears that there are duplicate sections in the syllabus.~~
 - ~~There are two explanations of the writing requirement and the SLOs within the syllabus.~~
 - ~~The readings, movies and documentaries, other materials and course relevant cultural experiences are listed in two different ways within the syllabus.~~
 - ~~Please revise and remove redundant sections.~~

[Updated]