

Reviewer Comments 1:

- Request seems fair for a course in medical geography to seek the 'B', however, the syllabus provided needs some re-tooling and editing. The course content on the whole is fascinating, but parts could be elaborated to clarify how the different Gen Ed Biological objectives will be achieved through the delivery of six formalized modules.
 - In other words, the syllabus's 'Tentative Course Schedule' should be slightly expanded to make the biology-content in terms of disease ecology, etc. clear in different weeks/lectures.
- Re. Textbook. At least one of the two 'recommended' textbooks should be 'required'. Also, new edition of Medical Geography textbook was published in 2017, with new authorship and organization. The first author of the 3rd edition (Melinda Meade) has died and the current authors of the 4th edition are Michael Emch, Elisabeth Dowling Root, and Margaret Carrel and the book has been re-titled Health and Medical Geography. The Epidemiology 5th edition book by Leon Gordis was published in 2014 in Philadelphia by Elsevier/Saunders – that may be the book to 'recommend' or find a way to assign the five chapters in a way that makes sense.
 - Both Textbooks should be required given the required readings every week. If they are required then please detail the various options students have to access to the texts.
- Should/Can STA2023 be required? The requests says preferred, how vital is statistics to achievement in this course?
 - Course is upper-division course should build on basics of statistics that many students take (or should take) early undergraduate career.
- Tentative Course Schedule. Looks okay, but could be spelled out better in terms of how course lecture/objectives and student participation will allow students to meet Gen Ed 'Biological' SLOs. In other words, each week or at least each module should have clearly state objectives and outcomes. One way to achieve this may be to elaborate the five lab GIS exercises.
- Assessments. Looks okay, but no 'final exam' seems odd. Design of course tests students on course content for Modules 1-3, but for Modules 4-6 only two in-class quizzes (worth 10% of grade) assess student's mastery of the subject. It is understandable that students might be focused on term paper and presentation, which provides a great opportunity for students, but course should test student's knowledge of content for the last three modules (5 weeks!) and should equate to the midterm (20% of grade).

Reviewer 2:

- Believe this to be a quality submission with no issues. The language in the second section on p. 1 explains quite clearly and succinctly how issues and methods relating to the subject area are engaged, and similar language can be found, also succinctly, in the section on grading policy.

Reviewer 3:

- Based on my reading of the Gen Ed areas and of these documents, both classes seem to comply with their respective areas, they state the criteria clearly on the syllabi and there seems to be good evidence that the coursework will help students achieve the objectives.

Reviewer 4:

- Medical Geography course seems to conform to the Biological Sciences area objectives, though I would like to defer to a biologist or at least someone in the physical sciences.
- The term paper could be mentioned specifically in the “communication” section of the SLO area of the syllabus.
- The cell phone policy should be updated to include a caveat, i.e. “Students may obtain instructor permission for emergencies or mitigating circumstances”.

General Comments:

- Some fine-tuning of required UF policy wording is recommended.
- Given that so many students enter UF with enough credits to be a sophomore while being 1st year students is the 3000 lvl appropriate for this course?

SPC2300 Introduction to Interpersonal Communication

Social Sciences (S)

<https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/11904>

Reviewer 1:

- The syllabus provides little clarity as to how the weekly assignments will engage issues, methods, etc. relevant to the “S” subject area. Also unclear are details about, and/or methods for assessing, projects, intercultural paper, participation, and “homework and other assignments.”

Reviewer 2:

- Based on my reading of the Gen Ed areas and of these documents, both classes seem to comply with their respective areas, they state the criteria clearly on the syllabi and there seems to be good evidence that the coursework will help students achieve the objectives.

Reviewer 3:

- The Interpersonal Communication course is a Social Science course but needs a little work to conform to the area objectives.
 - In particular, it isn’t clear how “underlying theory or methodologies used in the social and behavioral sciences” are incorporated. Perhaps a clearer expression of that in the section that describes accomplishing the objectives would help.
 - Tying the general education objectives (beginning of syllabus) to the specific requirements in area objectives would clarify them more.

Reviewer 4:

- Course looks agreeable to current General Education requirements.