

GEC Review

January 2023

Approve	Conditionally Approve	Recycle
IDS2935: The Rhetoric of Artificial Intelligence Q1	IDS 2935: Personalized Nutrition Q2	IDS 2935: Documentary, Identity & Media Q1
IDS 2935: AI and Society Q1	IDS 2935: People and Places in a Changing Climate Q2	
IDS 2935: The Universe and Humanity's Place In It Q2		
IDS 2935: The Evolution of Eating		

1. **Course:** IDS2935: The Rhetoric of Artificial Intelligence (Quest 1 Temporary) [A]

Requesting: H, WR2000, Q1 temp

Department: Writing

Submitter: Zea Miller

Link: <https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/17682>

Comments:

- None

Quest Checklist:

- Course Description
 - Is the question (“essential” for Quest 1 and “pressing” for Quest 2) that is the focus of the course explicitly stated in the Course Description and sufficiently highlighted?
~~○ Yes. Please mention that this is a Quest 1 course in the course description.~~
 - Is the multidisciplinary content of the course explicitly mentioned?
~~○ Could you explain the multidisciplinary ‘humanities’ components of the course in a sentence or two.~~
- Required & Recommended Course Materials
 - If the course will count towards the Writing Requirement, is a recommended writing manual listed?
~~○ Need to add a recommended style book.~~
- Description of Graded Work
 - If the course will satisfy the Writing Requirement, does the Graded Work section indicate which assignments count toward the Writing Requirement and how many words students are required to write for those assignments?
~~○ Is the Position Statement team written? If so, how will that be graded? The 500-word self-reflection cannot count toward WR. Can you increase the words on another assignment to meet the 2,000?~~
- Methods of Assessment and/or Grading Rubrics
 - Will the course include group projects? If so, has a method of assessment or a rubric for group projects been provided?
~~○ Please explain how the students will self-grade the group project.~~

- Annotated Weekly Schedule
 - Do the Weekly Summaries indicate that the course regularly addresses the essential (Quest 1) / pressing (Quest 2) question mentioned in the Course Description?
 - ~~Yes. A few of the weeks seems to be more about the practicalities—could you explain how the essential questions are being addressed.~~
 - Do the Weekly Summaries indicate that the course focuses sufficiently on the multidisciplinary content mentioned in the Course Description?
 - ~~Yes. See note above.~~
 - Is the length of each video or film that students are required to watch outside of class provided in the Weekly Schedule?
 - ~~There are a couple of links to readings (please provide estimated length/time to read)~~

2. **Course:** IDS 2935: Documentary, Identity & Media (Quest 1 Temporary) [A without N] or [R]

Requesting: H, N, WR4000, Q1 temp

Department: Foreign Languages and Literatures

Submitter: Ying Xiao

Link: <https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/17698>

Comments:

- Recommend changing title to be more specific
- **Subject Area Objectives:**
 - Meets Humanities requirement. 5 of 15 weeks clearly are focused on international however the requirement is more than half the course. It would help to show how international fits in the general topics on film and not just the five weeks on films from other countries.
 - Recommend dropping request for “N,” or clarifying how International is interwoven throughout at least 50% of the course through content, weekly schedule.
 - **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. <https://undergrad.aa.ufl.edu/general-education/gen-ed-program/subject-area-objectives/> [The course explores documentary and media through a global lens. The international component is the proper designation that defines and underpins the course. If examining closely the weekly schedule with the films and course materials, almost every week touches upon a documentary work or form with an international dimension and influence. This is clearly demonstrated in week 1 (Netherlands), week 2 (France), week 3 (Canada), week 4 (Soviet Union), week 5 (U.K.), week 6

(Germany), week 8 (France), week 11 (China), week 12 (Japan), week 13 (China), week 14 (Iran), week 15 (China). There are three weeks focusing on the development of American documentary and its interplay with social movement and globalization. Update 1/9/23]

- **Assessments:**

- ~~Writing rubric included but unclear how content is being scored for H or N. Please provide more detail on how grading will be managed for these assignments. [Uploaded, 1/9/2023]~~

Quest Checklist:

- Description of Graded Work

- If the course will satisfy the Writing Requirement, does the Graded Work section indicate which assignments count toward the Writing Requirement and how many words students are required to write for those assignments?
- ~~Yes. The graded work clearly describes how the WR will be achieved. It is important to note that 500 words Final Research Project Proposal and Annotated Bibliography does not satisfy the WR expectation. Outlines and Annotated bibliographies are not accepted in the WR word count. To meet the 4000 WR word count, a different assignment requiring 500 words will need to be added.~~

- Methods of Assessment and/or Grading Rubrics

- Is participation graded? If so, is a participation rubric provided?
- ~~Participation is described as 7% of the grade. It would be useful to simplify the language that describes participation expectations. There will be a grading rubric (present in the syllabus but not yet completed) that provides up to 5 points for quality contributions to class discussions. There are also what appears to be “extra credit” ways to increase the participation score that are not a part of the grading rubric. Students will need to know how the extra points (2 each) will be determined and recorded.~~
- ~~The two different ways to gain points through participation may cause confusion or distress among first-year students. Earlier in the same paragraph, it is stated that failure to meet the expectations will have a negative impact on the final grade. Please strive to have all the expectations for participation be clear to each student~~
- Will the course include group projects? If so, has a method of assessment or a rubric for group projects been provided?
- ~~The course description mentions “individual/group projects” that appear to be entry/exit interviews to facilitate self-reflection. They would require no rubric. A template for the interviews will be distributed. If the short videos can be created by groups, a grading rubric for everyone within the group should be added.~~

- Annotated Weekly Schedule

- Is the length of each video or film that students are required to watch outside of class provided in the Weekly Schedule?
- ~~Nearly all media is identified with specific time lengths. Please check Weeks 11, 13, 14, 15 and 16. In those weeks, films are assigned but the playing time is not included~~

3. Course: IDS 2935: AI and Society (Quest 1 Temporary)

[CA][A]

Requesting: H, Q1 temp

Department: Philosophy

Submitter: David Grant

Link: <https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/17701>

Comments:

- Recommend making title more specific to the content.
- **Required General Education Components:**
 - ~~Please separate attendance from participation grade, to clarify relative weight of each.~~ [The attendance requirement has been dropped in order to comply with General Education requirements. Students no longer receive credit for attendance; the participation grade remains. Response, 1/10/2023]
- **Required Quest program Components:**
 - ~~All components appear in the syllabus. It is common for a Quest I course to include an analytical essay of at least 1000 words. This syllabus requires two such papers and refers to them “argumentative” writing. Please use “analytical essay” to align with Quest I expectations and use of the word “argumentative” as a part of the assignment description.~~ [The essays are now described as "analytical essays" in keeping with Quest I expectations.]
- **Assessments:**
 - ~~Please complete and provide more detail in the group grading rubric.~~ [The project presentation rubric has been completed.]
 - ~~Please complete the participation rubric.~~ [The participation rubric has been deleted; standards for specific participation grades ('A', 'B', 'C', etc.) are now described under "Description of Graded Work" > "Participation."]
 - Capstone:
 - ~~It remains unclear how the group capstone project presentations qualify as “original research” using a methodology from a humanities discipline. Students are expected to present as a group “their answer” to what question?~~ [I have simplified the group project. Students are now asked to select a philosophical question raised by the course, formulate/defend an answer to that question as a group, and then present that answer and defense to the class. Other changes are described below and in the revised syllabus.]
 - ~~The descriptions in the syllabus do not clearly indicate research method(s) or how much each student contributes to the research for the capstone presentation— instructions state that each student is responsible for a part of the presentation, however definition of those “parts” remains unclear. Please provide more detail in this regard.~~ [The research methods used will be those of original philosophical research (and thus the same as the research methods used in the two analytical essays). I have dropped the reference to "parts" of the presentation; students will share responsibility for the presentation as a whole.]
 - ~~The paper is a reflection rather than analysis or research report, so although it is an individual assignment it isn’t itself “original research.”~~ [The essay component of the capstone project has been converted into an

analytical essay similar to (but shorter than) the two other analytical essays described on the syllabus.]

- ~~Recommend including percentage range with rubric values. [Updated]~~
- ~~Recommend dividing explanation of presentation and paper, is one individual and one group work? [Clarified]~~

- **Miscellaneous Comments:**

- ~~There is a writing rubric offered in the syllabus that should be completed. [Updated]~~

Quest Checklist:

- Course description:
 - Does the Course Description explain sufficiently how the course engages the relevant Quest 1, Quest 2 and General Education Objectives?
 - ~~Please provide a statement regarding Quest in the course description.~~
- Methods of Assessment and/or Grading Rubrics:
 - ~~There are group assignments. Please provide a rubric or an explanation explaining how the individual students are graded.~~
- Annotated Weekly Schedule:
 - Is the amount of time that students need to prepare for class each week appropriate for a lower-division course? Sufficiently rigorous? Too rigorous? Not rigorous enough?
 - ~~Some weeks appear to have lighter reading assignments, but there are often assignments, such as reading analyses, due during those weeks. Will the students have enough out-of-class work for the expected workload of a lower division course?~~

4. **Course:** IDS 2935: The Universe and Humanity's Place In It (Quest 2 Temporary) [A]

Requesting: P, Q2 temp

Department: Physics

Submitter: Selman Hershfield

Link: <https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/17724>

Comments:

- The page ranges/reading time for Gregory textbook are not consistently present in the syllabus. See Weeks 1, 2, 6, and 8. It might also be helpful to have a brief description of the materials within the course pack. Several assignments are listed by author within the course pack, but it is difficult to know what to expect.
- Fabulous course. (At “midterm exam” description do you mean “humanity’s” rather than “humanities”)

Quest Checklist

- Course Description:
 - Is the question (“essential” for Quest 1 and “pressing” for Quest 2) that is the focus of the course explicitly stated in the Course Description and sufficiently highlighted?
 - ~~No. Clear Course Description, but does not use the word ‘pressing’.~~
 - Is the multidisciplinary content of the course explicitly mentioned?

- ~~Course Description explicitly states ‘interdisciplinary’ but does not list disciplines to be covered. I.e., History of Science, Physics, Astronomy, Philosophy, Natural History are not explicitly mentioned—but obvious from reviewing the course materials.~~
- Description of Graded Work:
 - Are the assignments clearly described? Are they appropriate for a lower-division course? Too rigorous? Not rigorous enough?
 - ~~Not enough information provided at this stage of course development, but there are a series of ‘problem sets’ (n=10) for homework that should be rigorous and suitable for Quest 2.~~

5. **Course:** IDS 2935: Personalized Nutrition (Quest 2 Temporary)

[CA]

Requesting: B & Q2 temp

Department: Food Science and Human Nutrition

Submitter: Zhiyong Cheng

Link: <https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/17603>

Comments:

- **Assessments:**
 - Please separate out participation from attendance to make assessment values and methods more clear for students.
 - Please provide more detail on the variation in starting point values across different assessment rubrics. In some cases, lowest possible score =1, in others =3. Would lack of submission still result in student earning points?
 - Group-based grading for debates: how will instructor account for different effort on the part of different team members?

Quest Checklist:

- Description of Graded Work
 - Are the assignments clearly described? Are they appropriate for a lower-division course? Too rigorous? Not rigorous enough?
 - ~~Yes, and appropriate level of rigor. Suggest including a rubric for evaluating writing assignments.~~
- Methods of Assessment and/or Grading Rubrics
 - Will the course include group projects? If so, has a method of assessment or a rubric for group projects been provided?
 - ~~No, though there is an assignment “Group Discussions, In-Class Debate, and Position Paper.” This does not appear to be a group assignment, though it includes group discussion and a debate. May want to refine wording to clarify if in-class debate is group-based. If it is group-based, then should include guidance on grading the group work.~~
- Annotated Weekly Schedule
 - Do the Weekly Summaries indicate that the course focuses sufficiently on the multidisciplinary content mentioned in the Course Description?
 - ~~Yes, with a heavy emphasis on nutrition. Would be interesting to see more epidemiology in particular.~~

- Is the length of each video or film that students are required to watch outside of class provided in the Weekly Schedule?
- ~~N/A, but may consider including some videos in reading list. Week 1 would be a great place.~~

6. **Course:** IDS 2935: People and Places in a Changing Climate (Quest 2 Temporary) [CA]

Requesting: P, WR2000 & Q2 temp

Department: Geography

Submitter: Esther Mullens

Link: <https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/17691>

Comments:

- Final semester projects (written and oral) lack indication of assessment method. Please provide information regarding how this will be assessed.
- Recommendation: The “lowest grade/s waived” statement in the Graded Work chart might be more effective on the Canvas page than in the chart.

Quest Checklist:

- Description of Graded Work
 - Does the graded work include experiential learning activity and self-reflection?
 - ~~There is a section on experiential learning in the syllabus that include in class discussion, in class activities, and the final project. Usually I would not categorize in class discussion or the final project as experiential learning, although the students will no doubt learn a lot from these activities. The in class activities look more like what we might call experiential learning. You might want to rephrase these as “Data Visualization Labs” and to elaborate on the details of the roleplaying activity. I would also suggest to make use of resources on campus such as those at the Florida Museum of Natural History which seems to always have a number of activities and exhibits on Climate Change. For more information on experiential learning see the Center for Teaching Excellence’s Instructors Guide at <https://ufl.pb.unizin.org/instructorguide/chapter/experiential-learning-activities/>~~
- Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs)
 - Do course learning outcomes align with the relevant Quest 1, Quest 2, and General Education learning outcomes? ~~Even though Quest classes are by requirement interdisciplinary, they have one general education designation like P, B, S, H. They can also have an international (N) or diversity designation (D) on top of these. I checked with the Quest director on this and he recommends choosing on of either Physics Science (P) or Social and Behavioral Sciences (S) for your course.~~

7. **Course:** IDS 2935: The Evolution of Eating (Quest 2 Temporary) [CA][A]

Requesting: B, N & Q2 temp

Department: Agronomy

Submitter: Rosalie Koenig

Link: <https://secure.aa.ufl.edu/Approval/reports/17694>

Comments:

- **Assessments:**

- It is unclear whether the literature review paper is a group project rather than an individually written paper. The group presentation description that follows the literature review description creates some confusion. Please provide more detail. [Made modifications to the syllabus for the assignment to more clearly state that both the written and oral presentation are group assignments and individuals in the group will receive the same grade. Response, 1/10/23]
- The Quest 2 review checklist has an excellent description of how the group work will be assessed. The grading of the individual student is not described in the syllabus. Recommend including information provided in the Quest checklist within the syllabus. It would be useful if the instructor would add a sentence to the graded work description of the presentations to assure students of the individual responsibility borne in the activity. [Clarified the assignment (group) and added some language to the written rubric to indicate that it will be used for both individual and group writing assignments.]
- The syllabus includes a writing rubric and a participation rubric. The writing rubric gives complete descriptions of how the evaluation will be done. Recommend including the same for the participation rubric. [Provided more descriptions for participation in the updated version.]

- **Miscellaneous Comments:**

- Recommend proofreading for typos. [Updated]

Quest Checklist:

- Required & Recommended Course Materials
 - Are all required and recommended course materials properly listed?
○ ~~Yes, but consider including the edition of the textbook.~~
- Methods of Assessment and/or Grading Rubrics
 - Will the course include group projects? If so, has a method of assessment or a rubric for group projects been provided?
○ ~~Yes, the group written and presentation project. Yes, but only for the group presentation. Recommend including details on how group performance is evaluated on the written component.~~
- Annotated Weekly Schedule
 - Is the length of each video or film that students are required to watch outside of class provided in the Weekly Schedule?
○ N/A. Consider adding content using other forms of media.
 - Is the amount of time that students need to prepare for class each week appropriate for a lower-division course? Sufficiently rigorous? Too rigorous? Not rigorous enough?
○ ~~Reasonable, but consider reducing the amount of assigned reading. Seems to average approximately 50 pages a week. Recommend closer to 30-40 and could reclassify some of the readings as optional. Ultimately your decision though.~~

Courses requesting removal of General Education (No vote required)

1. ECO 3101 – Remove S
2. ECO 3532 – Remove S
3. ECP 3203 – Remove S
4. ECP 3302 – Remove S
5. ECP 4403 – Remove S