UF UNIVERSITY of FLORIDA
Office of the Associate Provost

Suite 235 Tigert Hall
PO Box 113175
Gainesville, FL 32611-3175
352-846-1761

General Education Committee Meeting
January 9, 2015
Meeting was called to order at 8:30am

Present: Elif Akcali, Timothy Brophy, Shannon Cochrane, Elayne Colon, Eva Czarnecka-Verner, Creed Greer, Christopher Hass, David Julian, Tanya Koropeckyj-Cox, Bernard Mair, Andrew Ogram, Lynn O'Sickey, Mario Poceski, Heidi Radunovich, Jennifer Rea, Alison Reynolds, Vicki Sarajedini, Brenda Smith, and Lisa Spiryda
Absent: John Krigbaum and Hrishikesh Kumbhojkar
Guests: Rajeeb Das and Arlene Tabag

1. **Minutes from the December 5th meeting were approved following discussion and recommended editorial changes:**
   - Regarding the MUL 2010 review, the minutes should clarify that the School of Music should be working on the H, N, and E2 designations.
   - Editorial changes on page 2, item 3 provided by Czarnecka-Verner.

2. **Course Updates – Bernard Mair**
   - **MUL 2010:** Mair met with the course instructor and Associate Dean Ed Schaefer. They are very interested in completing the revisions as early as possible and will not wait until 2016.
   - **AMH 2020:** The course was recycled to change the designation from humanities to social science. Mair also emailed the professor who agreed to work on including the requirements for the diversity designation.

3. **Proctored Coursework Policy – Bernard Mair**
   The committee recently discussed creating a policy to govern the amount of un-proctored online quizzes and tests that could account for the final grade of a course. Mair feels it is important to have some kind of policy as education is shifting more toward the online environment. Additionally, the Provost has developed an academic integrity policy (probably available on the Provost website), which does require online courses to have sufficient security to guarantee the academic integrity of the grade for the course. Many members of the committee expressed concern about the prevalence of cheating and students' openness in exposing practices that are commonly accepted as cheating.

   The committee felt that the idea of proctored work will mean different things to different people; therefore, the definition of the term proctored will be a weakness in the policy.

   Two items that were proposed:

1. No more than 25% of the grade for the course can be obtained from un-proctored work. Some members felt this would limit the ability to include projects involving teamwork which is being used to a greater extent now.
2. No more than X% of the course can be obtained from work that cannot be evaluated by Turnitin, some other anti-plagiarism software, or proctored. That is, at least X% must be obtained from work that is proctored or subject to analysis by anti-plagiarism software. It was suggested that 50% may be an appropriate level.

Mair will use the committee's feedback to draft a policy, send it to the committee, and discuss at another time.

4. Institutional Assessment Processes and Procedures – Tim Brophy

Cheryl Gater and Brophy drafted a document that clearly explicates the responsibilities for institutional assessment processes and procedures. Brophy brought it to the committee because the top of the second page states the responsibilities of the General Education Program.

Revisions:

- "And" is missing on the third line "many aspects of their lives, and to understand and…"
- In the second paragraph, fourth line, change "development of assessment procedures, and implementation of an indirect program assessment" to "development and implementation of assessment procedures."

The committee approved the language in the first two paragraphs on page two as amended.

5. General Education Assessment Subcommittee Update – David Julian

The subcommittee suggested:

- Changing the Statewide General Education Core and the Grand Challenges Core in the document to State Core and UF Core, respectively.
- A modification to the assessment schedule using the UF Core courses as a reasonable sample size for assessment of the General Education Program because most of the students, except transfer students, will be required to take the UF Core. The schedule should change to indicate the direct course embedded assessment will be UF Core instead of State Core in Fall 2015, Spring 2017 and Spring 2019.

Julian explained that the last time direct, course-embedded assessment was used there was pushback from instructors because the subcommittee had to make sure there was an assignment within the course that was appropriate for embedded assessment. With the UF Core, the courses will be structured with the assessment as part of the course and, therefore, there will be assessment data every semester.

Some committee members felt that it was too early to be using UF Core courses for assessment. It was suggested that, for Fall 2015, there would not even be enough students in the UF Core courses for assessment, as the courses will not yet be required. Whereas, with the State Core, there are many courses that have been successfully running for several semesters. There was also concern over whether the UF Core courses cover all of the general

education categories, as the committee needs data in every category in order to successfully assess the program and make appropriate modifications based on the data. Specifically the UF Core courses will not be able to assess the mathematics and composition categories.

The committee provided feedback and opinions to the General Education Assessment Subcommittee. The subcommittee will take the comments into consideration and report back.

6. Courses for Review

Course #	Title	Current	Request	Status
LIT 2000	Introduction to Literature	---	H	Approved
MGF 1106	Mathematics for Liberal Arts	---	Recertification	Tabled
GLY 3882	Hydrology and Human Affairs	---	P	Tabled

LIT2000: *Introduction to Literature*, Approved.
This course was reviewed by the committee in September and recycled for various reasons. The syllabus now meets the requirements. After discussion, the course was approved for the humanities designation.

MGF 1106: *Mathematics for Liberal Arts*, Tabled.
This is a course that went through the recertification process. The main concern was if the course was meeting the communication requirement. Mair stated that two reasonable ways to show communication in mathematics are: in-class participation where students demonstrate how to solve problems, and test questions that require a student to write out the answer, involving communicating mathematical concepts in a clear logical manner. There was much discussion on this matter as a variety of views regarding what qualified as communication in Mathematics and even if those courses should be required to meet the communication outcome. It was pointed out that the communication SLO was limited to "in the discipline" and only required oral or written, so written would suffice. The committee eventually agreed that showing work in solving a problem would be acceptable, if the solution included enough steps to demonstrate communication. No decision was made.

Due to time constraints GLY3882 was tabled.

Adjourned 10:05am