



Feedback:

General Education Steering and Faculty  
Committee Initial Recommendations

Feb. 4, 2013

1. SUMMARY

The University of Florida obtained comments on these recommendations from the following sources.

- (1) Comments posted on the Faculty Senate Blog
- (2) Survey sent to all faculty and advisors
- (3) Emails from departments and units
- (4) The Academic Policy Council of the Faculty Senate

The views and opinions expressed herein do not necessarily represent those of the UF administration.

There are two levels of comments that we have identified in the feedback. At the higher level, are comments on the statute itself, and then, there are comments that deal with the particular recommendations from the steering committee. Of course, there is some overlap, but I will attempt to separate the two levels in this summary. First, I will summarize UF's general response to the statutes.

**General Comments**

Concerns were expressed with the negative consequences of the statute at all levels - the state, institution, college, faculty and student.

- a. The first reaction to the statute was, "Can they do that?" There was much concern that the statute represented a possible encroachment by the legislature on academic freedom. The previous general education statute specified the broad parameters for the general education curriculum, but many felt that the new statute was overly-specific and the purpose was not clearly articulated. There was significant confusion on what problem the new statute was supposed to address, there was no consultation with the institutions to isolate the problem and seek suggestions on how to overcome them.
- b. Many felt that the statute restricts the ability of individual institutions to distinguish themselves by curricular differences, that it would decrease the ability of UF (and other institutions) to truly distinguish themselves from other institutions by offering innovative programs.
- c. There was some concern that the statute could have negative impact on some colleges by re-distribution of teaching demands and budgets. There are so many different academic areas in the

modern university curriculum, that a mere five, or even 6, courses in each area, would not be able to include many of them. As a result, large, important colleges could suffer a significant decrease in student enrollments, whereas, other (possibly even smaller) colleges could be faced with additional strains on the demand for their courses.

- d. On the faculty side, overly-rigid restrictions on the general education curriculum could have serious negative consequences on faculty productivity by stifling creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship.
- e. Possibly the most prevalent concern was that the statute restricts the ability of students to obtain a broad education by taking courses that cover a wide variety of areas. By limiting a half of the general education curriculum to so few courses, the remaining half that is institutionally-determined would not give the student the ability to explore other topics and would result in less, rather than better, educated students. General education courses play a major role in the lives of students who often change their majors and choose their careers based on their exposure to new ideas in these courses.

### Survey Results

Regarding the specifics in the General Education Steering and Faculty Committee Initial Recommendations, we now summarize the 378 responses to a survey (see Section 3) that was sent to the campus. The respondents self-identified themselves into the following areas of expertise:

Area	Number of Respondents	Percentage of Respondents
Natural Sciences	127	34%
Other	75	20%
Humanities	72	19%
Social Sciences	72	19%
Mathematics	17	4%
Communications	15	4%

Respondents in the “Other” category include academic advisors, and faculty in engineering, health science, fine arts, architecture, and interdisciplinary positions.

1. A majority (71%) of respondents favored the return of the 36-hour general education requirement, with 25% preferring 30 hours. However, the respondents’ comments indicated that there is a strong desire for more institutional control over the actual courses that would count in the 36 hours.
2. The new law requires all state institutions to offer all the core courses designated in each of the five discipline areas. This would require UF and other institutions to develop and offer new courses. Three quarters of the respondents agreed that the statute should be revised so that institutions are required to offer only those core courses they already offer or are willing to develop. The comments indicate the possible lack of resources to be able to offer all courses.
3. Most respondents, 89%, agreed that the statute should be revised to include a provision allowing specific higher level courses to satisfy the statewide core course requirements in mathematics and the natural sciences areas (as suggested in the initial recommendations of the statewide

committee). The comments include strong support for this provision to be extended to all other categories (Communication, Humanities, and Social Sciences). This position is also endorsed by many advisory groups at UF, including Council of Associate Deans and the Academic Policy Council of the Faculty Senate.

4. The initial recommendation includes history in the Social Sciences area core courses. UF currently includes history courses in the Humanities area. Almost three quarter (74%) of respondents disagree with this decision and prefers history in the Humanities area. Many respondents responded that way because they felt history was not based on scientific principles that use quantitative data. However, the comments indicate some uncertainty in their position on this question, and that the classification of particular history courses depended on how they were taught. Many respondents feel that history deserves its own category since it is fundamental to both the arts and sciences.
5. Currently the statewide discipline committees are limited to selecting five courses in each discipline area. A large majority (81%) wants the mandate to be revised to allow for the inclusion of six courses in a particular area if the statewide steering committee determines the need to do so. Respondents emphasize more flexibility, so they would like to see even more than 6 courses – many asked how the numbers 5, 6 were determined.
6. House Bill 7135 mandates the new general education requirements be implemented for students initially entering a public institution in 2014-2015. A large majority (81%) wants this to be delayed to 2015-2016. The comments indicate that there is significant support for delaying it indefinitely. Other respondents believe the delay is necessary to make adequate preparations for the change – such as developing new courses, changing degree plans, and revising the catalog.
7. What, if any, specific suggestions do you have about the statewide committees' initial course recommendations for the 15-hour statewide core? The comments range broadly but mainly express concerns mentioned in a. – e. above. In addition there are concerns about “dumbing down” the curriculum, and the lack of any rationale for the new statute.

### **Department and Unit Responses**

The Director of Institutional Assessment offers some suggestions for rewording the competencies. These revisions do not change the content or intent of the competencies, only the way the competencies are expressed. In the Humanities, however, a few words are added. This proposal is in Section 4.

The Department of Astronomy noted the lack of any astronomy courses in the core and made a case for including astronomy. The letter “strongly” advocates for the inclusion of Astronomy as a sixth core course in the Natural Sciences, stating that “if the number of core-course choices cannot be expanded to six, then we suggest that an Astronomy course replace the course in Environmental science.” This letter is included in Section 5.

The Bob Graham Center for Public Service notes that there are no courses that focus on U.S. Government or Civics, and make a case to include POS 2112 American State and Local Government or POS 2041 American Federal Government in the Social Sciences list of courses. Their letter is included in Section 6.

The Academic Policy Council of the Faculty Senate supports the 30 hour limit and the expansion of the "higher level" language to all areas, not just Mathematics and Natural Sciences. Their letter is included in Section 7.

## 2. EDITS TO THE DRAFT CORE GEN ED COMPETENCIES

**Suggested Edits to the Draft Core Gen Ed Competencies**  
**Timothy S. Brophy, Director and Professor, Institutional Assessment**  
**University of Florida**

January 15, 2013

Dear Bernard,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the proposed general education competencies and courses.

In Table 1 that follows I offer some suggestions for rewording the competencies. In my proposed revisions I have not changed the content or intent of the competency, only the way the competency is expressed. In the Humanities, however, I added a few words.

Here are the general principles that guided my revision, and that guide all of my work on developing competencies and outcomes.

**Principle 1. *Use active verbs and present tense.*** The original competencies all start with “students will demonstrate the ability to...”. These focus the competency on demonstration of the *ability* to do something at some point in the future, and not on the actual demonstration of the behavior. This presents an issue later with assessment – if students are demonstrating an *ability* to do something, then the assessment will focus on *ability determination* and not the quality of or degree to which the observed behavior(s) meet(s) a professor’s expectations. The revisions use active verbs (like those found in our UF online resource, [Verbs for Bloom’s Taxonomy](#)) and are in the present tense.

**Principle 2. *Directly state the expected behaviors to be observed.*** In my revision suggestions, the competencies directly state the expected behavior(s) that allow the professor to evaluate the degree to which the competency is being met. By directly stating the behavior the competency generally is more concise while remaining clear to students.

**Principle 3. *Concision.*** The competencies should be concise, clear statements of what students should know and be able to do as a result of their general education core. These revisions shorten the originals considerably.

I also repaired a few split-infinitives and added an occasional indefinite article, but other than that, I only reworded the originals.

Respectfully Submitted,

Tim

<b>Original competencies</b>	<b>Suggestion revisions (As a result of their general education,)</b>
<b>Communication</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively</i></li> <li>• <i>Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze communication critically.</i></li> </ul>	<i>Students communicate effectively and critically analyze communications.</i>
<b>Humanities</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students will demonstrate interpretive ability and cultural literacy.</i></li> <li>• <i>Students will demonstrate competence in reflecting critically upon the human condition.</i></li> </ul>	<i>Students identify, describe, explain, and interpret cultural beliefs, practices, and products, and reflect critically upon the human condition.</i>
<b>Mathematics</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students will determine appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving, and demonstrate an understanding of mathematical concepts.</i></li> <li>• <i>Students will apply appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving.</i></li> </ul>	<i>Students solve problems using mathematical concepts and appropriate mathematical and computational models.</i>
<b>Natural Sciences</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students will demonstrate the ability to critically examine and evaluate scientific observation, hypothesis, or model construction, and the use of scientific method to explain the natural world.</i></li> <li>• <i>Students will successfully recognize and comprehend fundamental concepts, principles, and processes about the natural world.</i></li> </ul>	<i>Students apply the fundamental concepts, principles, and processes of the natural world to examine critically and evaluate scientific observation, hypothesis, or model construction, and the use of scientific method.</i>
<b>Social Sciences</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Students will demonstrate the ability to examine behavioral, social, and cultural issues from a variety of points of view.</i></li> <li>• <i>Students will demonstrate an understanding of basic social and behavioral science concepts and principles used in the analysis of behavioral, social, and cultural issues, past and present, local and global.</i></li> </ul>	<i>Students apply basic social and behavioral science concepts and principles to analyze behavioral, social, and cultural issues, past and present, local and global, and to examine behavioral, social, and cultural issues from a variety of points of view.</i>

**Table 1. Suggested rewording of the General Education Core Competencies for Florida Higher Education Institutions**

### 3. ASTRONOMY DEPARTMENT LETTER

**The Case for Astronomy as a Core-Curriculum Course  
Faculty of the Department of Astronomy, University of Florida  
1 February 2013**

We would like to voice our concern about Astronomy not being included in the suggested core curriculum for the Natural Sciences. Astronomy is one of the five main branches of natural science (along with Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Earth or Geological Science). Today astronomy embodies explicitly all of the other fundamental scientific disciplines. To teach astronomy we must incorporate physics to describe how stars form and generate energy, chemistry to describe how interstellar clouds become the birthplaces of new stars, geology and environmental science to understand the structure and evolution of the planets and sustainability of life, biology to define the boundaries and constraints of life beyond earth and among the stars, and mathematics to give it all quantitative form and predictive power.

Astronomy also captures the imagination of students and the general public. Students have a genuine interest in learning about the cosmos and want to take astronomy to fulfill their science requirement. Nationwide, "the college and universities with astronomy (or physics and astronomy) departments had 1.2 million undergraduates in 1988; 103,300 of them were taking introductory astronomy (Ellis 1988). This means that (integrated over a 4.5-year average curriculum) 35-40% of the graduates of these institutions fulfill their science breadth requirements with astronomy, generally as their only exposure to physical science," according to the National Academies of Science Commission on Physical Sciences, Mathematics and Applications Panel Report(1991): [http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\\_id=1635&page=302](http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=1635&page=302), [http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record\\_id=9839&page=167](http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=9839&page=167)

Furthermore, Astronomy is extremely effective at teaching the scientific process and critical thinking skills. After taking a one-semester introductory astronomy course, over 70% of the students report that "understanding science" is then viewed by them as more important, according to the same National Academies of Science Astronomy report. Introductory Astronomy courses are currently offered at all Florida Universities.

We strongly advocate that Astronomy be included as a sixth core course in the Natural Sciences. If the number of core-course choices cannot be expanded to six, then we suggest that an Astronomy course replace the course in Environmental science. General education courses in Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Geology and Astronomy can address how those natural sciences contribute to the study of the environment. For instance, the introductory astronomy course includes discussions of the impact of the greenhouse effect on Earth's climate. Earth Science/Geoscience/Geology should include significant time addressing the environmental sciences. Finally, faculty in physics and Earth science can readily teach an introductory astronomy class. Indeed, most faculty in dedicated astronomy departments hold physics degrees. Thus, all Florida College System institutions are readily able to teach an introductory astronomy course.

#### 4. BOB GRAHAM CENTER LETTER

Bernard,

The Bob Graham Center for Public Service would like to bring the following issue to your attention as a member of the state General Education Steering Committee. We note that neither POS 2112 American State and Local Government nor POS 2041 American Federal Government is included in the Social Sciences list of courses.

A number of surveys have shown that in general college graduates lack basic knowledge about our government and history (<http://chronicle.com/article/College-Makes-Students-More/64040/>) Colleges and universities surely share some of the blame for failing to increase students' civics knowledge ([http://www.americancivilliteracy.org/2007/summary\\_summary.html](http://www.americancivilliteracy.org/2007/summary_summary.html)).

The 2011 Florida Civic Health Index concludes that Florida's young people need to be more involved in a meaningful way in the civic life of the state. One of four recommendations of the report is to strengthen civic education in all of Florida's colleges and universities and expand programs that give students the experience and know how to organize, debate, and to engage with public issues (<http://ncoc.net/FLCHI2011>).

Senator Bob Graham, along with retired Supreme Court Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, have been in the forefront of those encouraging public schools to adopt a more robust civics curriculum. (For an interesting twist on the importance of civics go to their Op Ed in USA Today: Jobs and Civics Go Hand in Hand (<http://usatoday30.usatoday.com/news/opinion/forum/story/2011-11-01/economy-civics-participation-voting/51031150/1>))

The new General Education Core requirements, as currently proposed, are a missed opportunity to place more emphasis on civics. We suggest that American State and Local Government and American Federal Government be added to the Social Sciences list, in place of Comparative Politics. (We are well aware that a fair number of students come to UF with AP credit for one of these courses. It would hence be appropriate for students to be given a choice of one or the other of these courses.)

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sheila

Sheila K. Dickison, Ph.D.  
Interim Director for Academic Programs  
Bob Graham Center for Public Service  
220 Pugh Hall | PO Box 112030 | Gainesville, FL 32611-2030  
Ph. 352-846-1575 | Fax 352-846-1576



## 5. ACADEMIC POLICY COUNCIL MEMO



College of Fine Arts  
School of Art + Art History

Physical Address  
PO Box 115801  
Gainesville, FL 32611-5801  
352-392-0201  
352-392-8453 Fax

MEMORANDUM | February 1, 2013

TO Bernard A. Mair, Ph.D., Associate Provost for Undergraduate Affairs and  
Professor of Mathematics

FROM Maria Rogal, Chair of the Academic Policy Council and Associate Professor of Art

REF General Education Core Course Options proposal

The Academic Policy Council (APC) met on January 31st and unanimously supports the two recommendations outlined below. We submit these to you and ask that you include them in UF's response to this proposal.

1. That the recommendation (below) regarding the requirements for math and science core courses be applied to all courses in the general education categories.

*If a student completes a course in a subject area for which one of the general education core course options in the same subject area is a prerequisite, that student should be considered to have completed the portion of the core in that subject area. In some instances there may be courses similar in content in the general education program that are at a more advanced level, but do not include a core course as a prerequisite, in these instances the more advanced, similar course will be considered to have completed the portion of the core in that subject area.*

(December 2012 report, p. 6)

2. That the APC strongly supports the new statute requiring 30 credits of General Education courses. We do not support increasing this requirement to 36 credits.

Cc: Dr. Cheri Brodeur, Chair, UF Faculty Senate

## 6. FACULTY SENATE BLOG POSTS

1. Perhaps I'm missing something, but I don't understand the problem this proposal is supposed to solve. Conversely, forcing students into more large-lecture classes does not optimize learning. So what's the point?
2. Potential negative impacts of the proposed Gen Ed requirements on UF programs:

1) The "prerequisite rule" allowing an advanced course to replace the core requirement only addresses math and natural sciences, but does not apply to the Humanities, Social Science and Composition core areas. Not only is this likely to be very confusing, but it seems like the general effect will be a "dumbing down" of the Humanities/Social Science general education courses that our engineering students currently take.

For example, the two-course sequence in American History (AMH 2010, AMH 2020) is currently a common fulfillment for Humanities, either taken at UF or through AP credit. A student who takes both of these under the proposed rules will not get "core" credit for anything (Intro to Humanities, etc.). The overall result of this is a dramatic reduction in both flexibility and potential rigor (given the introductory level of the stipulated core courses) from our previous requirements.

Additionally, the College of Arts and Sciences is presumably going to lose enrollment in many of their varied Gen Ed courses and see large enrollment increases in any course listed in these Gen Ed core areas. One would also hope that the university will be devoting sufficient and likely substantial resources to the specified core courses since enrollment in these courses will be large; therefore without sufficient sections, instructors and TA help, the existing courses will be substantially compromised.

2) UF students, in addition to meeting all Gen Ed and Gordon Rule requirements, must also complete courses which satisfy an International and a Diversity focus. Most of the classes listed in the proposed core area lists for Humanities and Social Science do not meet these additional requirements. Of the 10 proposed courses in the Humanities and Social Science core, three (perhaps four) meet the Gordon Rule, four (perhaps five) meet the International focus, and none meet the Diversity focus. This will no doubt make advising for General Education courses that much more difficult (preview advising for Engineering students is already problematic enough) and will also increase the likelihood that engineering students will end up taking more than the minimum 5 courses to meet the Humanities/Social Science Gen Ed requirements as well as the 24,000 words needed to satisfy the Gordon Rule. With the new excess hours surcharge implemented at only a 12 or 13 credit excess, this is not a trivial matter at all for the students.

3) Many students currently place out of the composition requirement for ENC 1101 by either AP course credit or via exam (SAT, ACT) scores. Such students in the College of Engineering can move directly in our Professional Communication course ENC 3254. Since the exam scores will not show up as separate course credit and the Science/Math prerequisite rule does not apply here, will students still be required to take ENC X101 anyway if they have AP credit or if they have sufficiently high SAT verbal or ACT verbal scores to place out of ENC1101?

3. I have not given this enough thought, nor done enough reading, but here are my initial impressions. It is difficult to evaluate the initial draft recommendations without knowing what is the “problem” that the recommendations are designed to address and what are the General Education Core Course Options for our “target peer” institutions.

There are three key questions: (1) how will these changes affect the recruitment of matriculating students; (2) how will these changes affect the education of current students; and, (3) how will these changes affect the competitiveness of graduating students. In all cases, comparison of the draft recommendations to the core curricula at peer institutions is relevant (especially for point 3). UF must remain competitive for the best and brightest students both in terms of recruiting new matriculating students as well as preparing current and graduating students.

Has anyone prepared a summary (e.g., a chart or table) of how the draft recommendations compare to core course requirements at peer institutions? I think this is a necessary first step in evaluating the draft recommendations. Without this, we undertake the effort of thinking about this “problem” in a vacuum without consulting the relevant literature! Such a comparison may also help us better define the “problem” that the draft recommendations are designed to address.

4. The proposal limits the educational potential of our programs and the joy of the educational experience of our students. Forced into large classes that of necessity will be less challenging and less interactive, students will begrudgingly jump through these academic hoops, but likely will not emerge with a rewarding educational experience. Was there any presentation of a justification for these changes? Lots of mechanics but no justification. The very end of the Initial Draft Recommendations document refers to a requirement from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for “developing a new general education program.” So is this change proposed for the sake of achieving a change, regardless of its value?
5. This scheme is untimely and shockingly ill-conceived and runs contrary everything that nearly twenty years of undergraduate teaching in three R1 schools has taught me about pedagogical rigor, curricular innovation, and what students actually \*want\* to learn. They will live and work, they live and work \*now\*, in a world of increasingly diverse, overlapping, and conflicting ideas and ideologies. They want to understand how to navigate that world with self-assurance, discernment and nuance, whatever their official field of study or major. They understand that \*more\* and more engaging training in critical thought, reading, writing, and dialogue is the key to their success. If we communicate to them that somehow less must actually be more, with the excuse that we can’t afford, or don’t want to pay for, a better and more productive education, then we merely confirm their most cynical suspicions of the reasons for everything we do here. The ongoing reduction in the number and diversity of the courses that they are required to take and, effectively, in the courses that departments will be able to offer, means very simply that these students will be less prepared for the actual world they already know exists, even if the state’s legislators refuse to recognize it. This is not a path to top-ten status. Our notionally peer institutions will leave us far behind in the qualities of their students and their students’ successes in all fields of endeavor.
6. For graduate students, working as teaching assistants is an important way for them to master material, as well as to gain experience teaching the courses that employers require. In departments with a core course, most teaching jobs will be for that course, and graduate students will lose the opportunity to teach for a wider variety of courses or more rigorous courses. (The core course proposed in my field, Art Appreciation, is not the most rigorous Gen Ed we teach.) How much worse will this be for graduate students in fields that are not represented by core courses? Those students

will still find TA employment, but teaching courses that are not relevant to their own fields of study. Instead, those students will have to spend a great deal of time mastering unfamiliar material tangential to their studies. This will detract from their studies, slow down their progress to degree, and hinder recruitment. With the implementation of the Good Life course, we have already previewed some of these effects.

7. Having standards for general education requirements insures exposure to knowledge outside of the major. However, mandating specific courses reduces the diversity in exploration of topics outside the major and does not capitalize on students' interest that facilitates engagement in a course. Mandating courses does not leverage the very rich faculty resources at a large university such as UF or the unique ones at smaller Florida universities.

The effects of the changes on accreditation of academic programs may differ. Providing avenues for flexibility in the mandated courses may be necessary and should be included in the bill.

8. The University of Florida is unique in that it has a variety of faculty each with specializations in their field. That variety has led to some exciting Gen Ed offerings that lead many students to a career path they had not considered before. Taking away these options from students, not only lessens their educational opportunity, but takes away the prestige of being a University of Florida student. If our lower division course offerings are no different from other state institutions, why would students want to come here their first two years? Another consideration is that many "found" majors are directly the result of Gen Ed course offerings here at UF. I believe this is a serious issue that hasn't been fully explored. How will undergraduate majors be impacted if the Gen Ed courses that feed many undergraduate programs are discontinued?
9. From an educational perspective this restructuring of the gen-ed requirements is clearly a bad idea. But done is done, so I believe those most directly involved should work to ameliorate the consequences by expanding the requirements to allow equivalent content to be the criterion of consequence, not common number. If this does not happen, then the next steps will surely be exit tests, syllabus evaluation, a common text, and perhaps a degree requirement (can someone without a degree in English teach the required English class?). Present state law allows for considerable variety in these parameters in terms of what constitutes course AAA X000 equivalency through the common course numbering system. This system has its issues, but is very liberal in that courses of essentially equivalent content can be taught under more than one prefix (e.g., American government can be taught under history or political science). In this way disciplinary departments are encouraged to teach cross disciplinary courses. It will be a shame to lose that aspect of general education, which will surely happen because of both the reduced SCH requirement and the compartmentalization of instruction by the numbers!.
10. When I came to UF the general education requirement was more than 40 credits, Since then it has been whittled down to 36, and now the legislature wants it to be 30. I am opposed to this law because it is a naked attempt by the legislature to run the curriculum which should be determined by UF faculty for UF students.
11. The mantra that everything can be fixed by new laws and bureaucracy is amazing. So students now will all have the same course list. This is insufficient. Next we need a State exam to document that all students learned the same thing. Someone will have to make the exam, administer it, and grade it. So now there are more fees associated with graduation. People will fail the exam, and hire a lawyer. The

exam will be made easier or scored differently. End result ... more fees and government, but no improved education.

I think of innovation as having thoughts that are different than anyone else. The same truth learned in the same way by all sounds like stagnation. That is not my view of what a university education should be about. On the other hand, if only the course titles are standardized and the content can be anything that the instructor wants to teach ... then what is the point of this exercise?

The stated requirements are vague and lofty goals. The courses listed and proposed credit hours are insufficient to achieve them. Would you have us believe that a student who finished ENC X101 will be able to communicate effectively and analyze communications critically? How will I know that the goal has been achieved? Is there a quantifiable standard for "effective" and "critically?" Achieving cultural literacy is another lofty goal, but I have no sense of what defines cultural literacy. The USA is composed of many cultures. Should I be able to recite the Ramayana as part of cultural literacy? Federalist Papers? Magna Carta? Maybe I take literacy too literally, and I need to appreciate a dinner of Thai red curry, poi, and a Scottish ale. Can I really understand Hispanic culture without knowing Spanish? If all the goals are met in each section, what is the point of graduate degree programs?

Are the goals appropriate? Does it really benefit a family doctor to have the ability to run a probit analysis on insect dose-mortality data? They should be able to do so if they can "apply appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving."

Turn the problem around. I graduate with my B.S. from the University of Florida. The general education requirements state that I am now culturally literate. I can easily prove that I do not know all of Martin Luther King's speeches. I am therefore not culturally literate. I would like to sue the University of Florida and the State of Florida for failing to provide the education that it agreed to provide as set forth in the general education requirements. Furthermore, I can easily prove that all of the students have failed some part of these requirements. Having failed to provide contracted services, all students are entitled to both a refund and damages for the time lost in attending this university.

12. I appreciate that the committee has devoted considerable effort to this decision, however, making these changes will have a serious and detrimental effect on the quality of education that we can offer to our students. By needlessly limiting student choice in gen-ed courses, we are effectively curtailing students' exploration of topics that should inform them, excite them, and broaden their horizons. It is hard to imagine how students will benefit from narrowed options, rather, it seems clear that both students and faculty will lose the spark of connection that is generated in unique classes where instructors teach from the perspective of their particular passions.
13. The richness of diversity and exploration at UF will be greatly hindered if these "lists" hold. In addition, where will AP classes fit in this scenario?
14. As an art historian, our department is in the enviable position of having one of the new proposed courses be one that we currently offer (Art Appreciation). However, even though this may translate into large numbers of undergraduates taking our course and thus lead to benefit in terms of SCH's, I'm concerned about the effect it will have on graduate education. If we have hundreds of students taking Art Appreciation, all of our graduate students' teaching assistantships will be dedicated to that single course. They will not be able to teach a variety of courses as they do now, and ultimately their chances for post-graduation employment will suffer. Also, if I were a prospective graduate student, I

would steer away from UF if I heard that Art Appreciation was all I was going to teach. In sum, these changes have the potential to negatively effect graduate recruitment and education by limiting graduate students' teaching opportunities.

15. I appreciate the effort and work that has gone into the proposed plan and courses. I am concerned that the courses seem to be mainly in the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and takes general education courses developed by other colleges out of the equation. I know that subs are being considered. Another concern is that the proposed curriculum seems in-flexible. It seems limited in the number of choices. I understand the reason for the change from 36 to 30. I also like the idea of the 5 areas. I would argue to have more choices of courses within each of those 5 areas and not have the few choices currently being offered.
16. By limiting the general education courses to a limited core group, students will miss the diversity of general education courses currently offered that serve to entice students into specific areas of study and demonstrate the interrelationships between, for example, biology and the history. It is often a key general education course that triggers a life-long interest in a subject. An undergraduate may enter UF as a freshman with a goal of medical school, but after a plant pathology course, such as "Plants, Plagues and People", they are suddenly turned-on to another view of microbiology that resides in the plant world, rather than the animal world. We should be promoting experimentation and introduction to a variety of disciplines, not rigidity to a limited core.
17. I was very, very sad to hear about this decision. This new policy is clearly not in keeping with a vibrant, diverse educational environment that we want and expect from the University of Florida. How do we attract students to our University as we push to become a "top 10 school" with a narrow curriculum that is enforced by the state legislature? Also, last time I checked we were a land-grant university with an agricultural college. Where are the classes that educate non-major students about entomology, plant disease, soil science, horticulture, etc.? I was under the impression that the point of the "push to become a top 10 school" was to actually get better? Maybe I am missing something.
18. The draft recommendations would amend Section 1007.25 of the Florida Statutes. This section can be found here: [http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App\\_mode=Display\\_Statute&Search\\_String=&URL=1000-1099/1007/Sections/1007.25.html](http://www.leg.state.fl.us/Statutes/index.cfm?App_mode=Display_Statute&Search_String=&URL=1000-1099/1007/Sections/1007.25.html) . The following sentence occurs in paragraph (3) of this section; emphasis added by me: "Each general education core course option must contain HIGH-LEVEL academic and critical thinking skills and common competencies that students must demonstrate to successfully complete the course."

The mathematics course MAC 1105, College Algebra, is one of the proposed core courses, but unless "high-level" is redefined to mean "high-school level", MAC 1105 does not meet the "high-level" criterion. The course name "College Algebra" is a euphemism for "high-school algebra taught in college". Its content, from a recent UF syllabus, is "Solving inequalities, linear and quadratic equations; complex numbers; polynomials; graphs; rational functions; logarithmic and exponential functions." Even if UF were to upgrade the content of MAC 1105 to the current content of our MAC 1140, Precalculus Algebra, most of the content would be high-school-level. To be sure, many students struggle with this material, but that does not make it "high-level".

19. It is unfortunate that our bureaucracy confuses course titles with course content. There is more than one way to obtain literacy in a subject area than to take a course with a particular title. Students

benefit when courses are structured around their interests; providing relevant context often makes it easier for students to learn. But we are to abandon these successful courses in the interest of uniformity or standardization? A principal impact will be reduction of richness in undergraduate educational opportunities available at UF. Must we really have the same curricula as community colleges? What does this accomplish that would not be more simply accomplished by drawing up lists of equivalent courses?

The impacts of this change will extend beyond students to faculty and departments. Faculty have substantial investments of intellect and time in existing courses. Large-scale reassignment of faculty teaching assignments is a colossal waste of time. Yet failure to do this will disrupt department staffing. I estimate a potential loss of 40% of this department's SCH production if we can no longer service general education courses. I hope that UF will have the wisdom to interpret the footnote on page 6 liberally, and allow for general substitution of courses.

20. For a variety of reasons it is clear that a restricted list of General Education courses presents problems. At a time when UF supposedly wants to become a "Top-10" university, bringing us down to the lowest common denominator is not a good idea. The flexibility and ability to specialize is very important to maintain the excellence of our graduates. And such a requirement is not appropriate for some of the exceptional high school graduates UF enrolls. However, if such micro-managing interference in our curricula is inevitable, the paragraph at the end of page 6 is a must. We certainly do not want students reverting to lower-level mathematics and natural science classes. I would also argue that such a reasoning on prerequisites should also apply to the other categories.
21. For a variety of reasons it is clear that a restricted list of General Education courses presents problems. It is of course easy to argue with the proposed course lists themselves but the Social Science list, among others, raises concerns: neither POS 2112 American State and Local Government nor POS 2041 American Federal Government is included.  
A number of surveys have shown that in general college graduates lack basic knowledge about our government and history (<http://chronicle.com/article/College-Makes-Students-More/64040/>) Colleges and universities surely share some of the blame for failing to increase students' civics knowledge ([http://www.americancivilliteracy.org/2007/summary\\_summary.html](http://www.americancivilliteracy.org/2007/summary_summary.html)). The 2011 Florida Civic Health Index makes the case that Florida's young people need to be more involved in a meaningful way in the civic life of the state. One of four recommendations of the report is to strengthen civic education in all of Florida's colleges and universities and expand programs that give students the experience and know how to organize, debate, and to engage with public issues (<http://ncoc.net/FLCHI2011>). The new General Education Core requirements are a missed opportunity to place more emphasis on civics.
22. These changes hardly seem commensurate with today's announcement that the governor "is committed to working with UF and the Florida Board of Governors to help UF become a top 10 university." Attracting and retaining the best faculty will be exceptionally difficult, if faculty are to have their teaching efforts evaluated based on the ability to attract students to their courses, while the students are being actively disincentivized from selecting any but a small number of predetermined courses. Retention may also be negatively affected in the departments that do "win" the designated core courses, as faculty are likely to be stretched thin trying to meet the increased teaching demand for these courses, while still giving priority to their research programs. Attracting the best and brightest students will be more difficult, if those students are to be given severely limited choices of courses with which they may meet their core requirements. And, as previously noted, an "increase in

innovation and creativity” will be actively discouraged for both faculty and students: faculty, whose interesting and innovative courses will not be recognized for the core competencies that they teach, and students, whose curiosity and willingness to pursue a “well-rounded” education will not be recognized with credits towards their degrees. We will neither improve our rankings relative to other universities, nor provide our students with the kind of educational breadth that they will need to become contributors and innovators, by funneling them into such a tightly-molded and narrow curriculum.

23. The tendency of the Florida legislature to take the authority to legislate specific curriculum is, and has always been, alarming. While having a core of common courses among the state universities may have advantages, especially for transfer students, the criteria that limit students’ choices is simply impoverishing to their educations and needlessly controlling. The reduction in credit hours for the BA further limits their opportunities to expand the foundations of their knowledge and their tools for reasoning and experiencing life as our culture unfolds. One size never fits all. I had a fantastic seminar last semester with a small group of students who ranged from Ph.D. level to undergraduate non-major; the students evaluated the course extremely high, both officially and in conversation. I myself found it to be one of the most satisfying courses I have ever taught. Experiences like these will all but vanish, or occur only for students who are willing to take extra hours, provided faculty are willing to risk offering such courses in an environment where their very existence is discouraged.

The legislation effectively eliminates any chance of new course offerings, highly relevant special topics courses, innovative curriculum developments. And yet, faculty are evaluated on innovation in practically every area where they \*can\* be evaluated. The legislation is at best a damper on innovation, and at worst, an annihilator. The situation becomes more and more Kafkaesque.

Equally alarming is the elimination of areas of study that may not be popular on a massive scale. Though it begins with core curriculum, gen ed courses, it’s not hard to imagine this philosophy pervading our major courses of study, and even graduate programs, where highly concentrated specialization by a few people in obscure areas are essential for the survival and growth of valuable pockets of knowledge.

This plan also flies in the face of RCM; we have been encouraged to create courses that would generate high enrollments for our departments in order to demonstrate our “value” and generate revenue. Only a few of those courses will survive this initiative. Wasted time, wasted resources, wasted energy, increased frustration and impotence for departments and individuals.

24. Thanks for dealing with this to those who have worked at it. But my major comment is just that this move to a core of courses that everyone must choose from adds one more layer of stultifying ‘education by committee’. Gen Ed classes that are born anew from faculty passion and creativity can engender the necessary competence but with creativity that taps into societal and global culture as it changes.

I look at this list and compare it to the Gen Ed offerings we have had over the years and cry hot tears of BOREDOM! Without the innovation that arises from competitive, consumer driven offerings — we all lose.

25. Two things regarding the cap of 120 required credit hours for the BS degree.



1. My undergraduate degree required 140+ credit hours and though not easy this was quite do-able. For a quality educational experience that will make our students competitive for graduate schools and business opportunities, they need a lot more than 120 credit hours.
2. National accreditation committees, such as ABET for biomedical engineering, have comprehensive requirements that are strictly enforced. It will be difficult, and likely impossible, to satisfy all the ABET requirements in 120 credit hours. Thus I would expect many departments to lose their national accreditation, thereby decreasing those departments' national reputation/ranking/status, which will discourage top students and faculty from attending this University.
26. This is completely incompatible with the current RCM model. How are the majority of departments going to sustain their SCH-derived funding with these restrictions?
27. I would like to thank the committee for their work on this challenging task. Although the humanities and social science courses represent a breadth of important disciplines, I am disappointed to see that none of the proposed courses in these areas addresses directly the pressing topics of ethnic, racial, gender, or sexual identities. To prepare students for entry into today's multiracial, diverse, and globalized society, it is a vital learning outcome of the humanities and social sciences to teach students how knowledge about the world is filtered through different perspectives. Courses in African-American Studies, Women's Studies, Queer Studies, Latino/a Studies, Asian-American Studies, Jewish Studies, and related areas enable students to understand the complexity of American culture and communities.

## 7. SURVERY RESULTS

### 1. How many credit hours should comprise the general education requirement? (The credit hours will be divided into the five discipline areas already defined.)

#	Answer	Response	%
1	30 credit hours (new state mandate)	93	25%
2	36 credit hours (UF's current number of hours)	267	71%
3	Other (Indicate specific number of credit hours and explain your reasoning)	18	5%
	Total	378	100%

Other (Indicate specific number of credit hours and explain your reasoning)

0

12

36

48

40

30-36, with exceptions should be made based on a minimum SAT/ACT score

Sufficient credit hours for credible claim that student/graduate has sufficiently broad exposure to areas of human knowledge to be a well-informed citizen and educated liberally. Perhaps 40 credit hours would be enough but needs further discussion.

#### Comments

General education courses make for well-rounded students and distinguish a university from a technical school. Reduce the hours would be ill-advised if UF wants to remain a well-respected and competitive university.

I am faculty in the medical school. I don't teach these topics.

given that the credits for degree does not change this is a pointless and potentially harmful change. Students are going to have accumulate the required 120 credits. The program provides the breadth that students will not on their own choose.

The less the better, but the content itself should not be mandated across universities.

Are these the important questions facing higher education? I went to a liberal arts college with no core curriculum and didn't feel impoverished for it. There are certainly problems with the way higher-ed is working in the state--an over-reliance on a contingent (adjunct) workforce, ballooning administrations

and shrinking faculty support, but the question of gen ed credit hours seems just a distraction from all that.

This should be left to each degree program to determine the balance of classes offered. I am for balance in the curriculum but these requirements as well as the maximum hrs for a degree make it difficult to prepare students in Eng with all of the skills they need. Since this is labeled as a critical area for the state, it should be a focus. Our department frequently discusses new material/subjects the students need but we never add them because then we need to subtract another critical class.

I like the idea of a broad level of knowledge for all our our students

Students really benefit from the range of courses that they take for general education. It opens their minds to things beyond what they perceive as high schoolers and gives them awareness of new fields that they might consider for alterative and back-up majors.

Students already fulfil much of gen ed through high school courses through AP and IB. A university education should include exposure to a variety of disciplines, and a tougher gen ed requirement ensures that studenst will take some college courses outside of their major field.

economics should be listed as an additional Humanity or Social Science

I see no reason to reduce the number of general education credit hours. This disrupts established program curricula and has an adverse effect on critical tracking. There are courses in the general education inventory that are critical to the financial health of some of the colleges - the reduction in general education credit hours will adversely affect college budgets given our RCM budget model. This also gives the perception that general education is not valued by the legislature.

with 2 courses in communication: 1 composition (writing skills) and 1 other

A "university" degree should be based on a broad foundation.

I see no reason for UF to dumb down our degree requirements. It serves no useful purpose with regard to the academic preparedness of our students after they graduate. Diminished requirements would not be to, or for, the student's benefit.

I teach undergrad and grad courses in a core STEM discipline. The US students are, on average, far superior to their foreign classmates, not because of superior math/science skills, but because of superior skills in reasoning, relating their work to societal needs, etc. Part of their advantage is the breadth of ged course content. It would be foolhardy to decrease that requirement. I emphasize again, I do not teach in any of the ged areas.

30 credit hours or less should be OK as each student is not going to pursue these courses for higher education.

What we have now is insufficient to meet the general education of an informed citizenry. Knowledge is expanding and we need to prepare students to appreciate that fact. What we have here is a throwback to the 1950s. It might be fine at the high school level, but not in a research university. UF is being dragged down by inferior schools.

As long as these 30 credits must be taken at a state college or university, and cannot be satisfied by accelerated high school credits (e.g., AP, IB, AICE, dual enrollment and/or CLEP), then this lower

number of credits for gen Ed is ok.

Gen ed should extend through a student's second year.

This should not be a statewide requirement. The universities should offer diverse models of education, not just one. We should have experimentation and competition, not central planning.

I suspect this is not a useful question since state institutions do not seem to have any power to appeal or reverse this decision.

The more credits you squeeze into Gen Ed requirements, the fewer credits students have to explore and to pursue major requirements.

As we allow students to define an area of study earlier and earlier they are losing the broad base that defines a Liberal Arts education

General education requirements are well set here at UF at 36 hours. I see no reason to reduce that number.

30 hours, but NOT prescribed by particular courses, which just defeats the purpose of a college degree

By cutting down the number of courses in the general education requirement, we are robbing students of opportunities to experience different disciplines and becoming well rounded. Cutting gen ed requirements pushes us in the direction of a vocational school. We are a university.... not an organization that preps people for only one task.

Allows more credits to be taken in the major curriculum of the student..

This has the feel of a bureaucratic solution to a problem that may not exist. However, it is good to know that our legislators have something to do.

Given the large number of transfer credits that most of our undergrads arrive with, it makes little sense at UF to decrease the gen ed requirement from 36 to 30.

1. The English composition requirement should be 6 hours. UF graduates are poor writers. 2. Far too many Gen Ed requirements can already be satisfied through AP and similar courses, which have been dumbed-down to well-below what "college level" should mean. We need a way to make sure students take as many true college-level courses as possible.

Perhaps a lower number of credit hours is more reasonable since "demonstrated competency" is what matters rather than "number of credit hours".

Each institution should come up with their own plan for their value and socialist approach has never worked!

I object to the homogenizing of classes. This ignores local strengths, and makes a less varied education for students who will need all the flexibility they can find to solve life's problems.

It appears the state-wide general education requirement lacks an equivalent to UF's international/diversity requirements.

Reducing the general education component will dilute the intellectual and educational value. Our

primary goal is still to educate and enrich the person, not train them for a specific function in society (which is constantly shifting anyway).

decreasing the general education requirements is a bad idea. In fact, I would argue that students should be required to take more composition courses, or at least not be allowed to satisfy their Gordon Rule via AP or IB.

Students must be encouraged to think broadly if they are to be competitive in a rapidly changing, diverse, global economy.

It is not only about marketability. I believe that 50% of one's classes a students first 3 years should be electives and general education. Senior year should be only (well, can be) of the student's major. It is important for any major/future career and just as importantly, in order to be a well informed citizen with critical thinking skills, to study well outside of one's narrow major focus.

The decision to require less hours is financially driven, not education driven. Exposure to a wide range of topics and areas is vital for developing and promoting thinking "outside the box", innovatively, and creatively.

State high schools standards are so low that even many UF students are woefully ignorant of science and mathematics.

Their writing is also atrocious. We certainly should not reduce the science, math or writing Gen Ed requirements.

International and diversity still critical to discussion

An undergraduate education is the last opportunity in most students' lives to learn about the variety of physical, biological, cultural, and social systems that make up the world. Without a firm grounding in these different structures, students will not be prepared to innovate in their future careers. If the gen ed requirement is reduced, students will have fewer tools at their disposal to be successful in their chosen profession.

The state mandate of 30 credit hours for general education courses is sensible and will hopefully improve time to degree.

The objectives of the reduction to 30 credit hours is not stated in the document. A concern is the student being able to take all of the required courses within the 30 credit hours.

Minimum

Minimizing the requirements for students does not help them in the long run and dilutes the purpose of a BA or BS degree. I see no point in reducing the minimum requirement. The point of a University is not simply a mill to produce workers but also a process to educate citizens.

At a time when students are asked to compete in an increasingly globalized and diverse workforce, it makes little sense to cut back on General Education requirements and also restrict the flexibility of course choices.

30 credit hours is laughable

Students benefit when they have a strong liberal arts foundation.

Students already are deficient in many areas as AP/IB is just not preparing them. I don't see a benefit from lowering the number.

Keep it the way it is.

I think the extra two courses will allow the students to selected subjects they might not otherwise be exposed to.

There seems to be no persuasive reason to reduce the number of credits nor to change the requirement as it now exists.

What is the Good Life should be part of this 30 hours since it is a required course. I also think that higher level communication courses should fulfil the statewide communication requirement.

Students come in needing a great deal of general preparation and exposure to broad concepts at the college level. Increasingly in the last few years we have seen more students coming with credit by dual enrollment or exam and they are usually less prepared. They are instantly placed in classes for juniors, and often lack the skills to keep up with the level of the course. I am having to do more remediation in the upper division than ever before.

At the least, we should argue to keep the current required number of hours. As the flagship, UF should be able to set its own standards, even at the Gen Ed level.

The additional 6 credits will give individual degree programs 2 courses of lee way to allow for International and Diversity courses. The 6 credits may limit the impact of the Core GE change, and also may allow for individuation needed to ensure the integrity of specific degrees.

I support the current number of core hours, but not the restriction of the available core courses to a limited set of 5 or 6 per core area. The breadth of education that students receive at UF will determine the quality and value of their degree: limiting students to a few specified classes and reducing the general studies portion of their degree will ultimately reduce both the quality and marketability of a UF degree.

We already lessened the number of general ed requirements under Lombardi's watch and in response to the legislature. Before long a student will have the equivalent of a study course at a technical school rather than a college education. Is that what we want? Such a move is educationally unsound.

We should continue to educate the student in a comprehensive way and not merely become a vocational training institution.

There is no reason to reduce gen ed credits.

This type of cookie cutter mandate is not the way to being a top 10 school.

This is a reduction that will not benefit students.

GenEd is the common project that binds students into an intellectual community at UF, and into an informed citizenry of the United States.

The General Education requirement has an important role in broadening the student's academic experience and introducing them to disciplines outside their primary area of study. I don't see a

compelling academic reason to reduce the requirement.

If 15 of the core credits are to be specified out of a very limited list of classes, and yet comprise half of the GenEd requirement, then students will have exposure to only a small fraction of the potential subjects they currently can encounter as part of the GenEd requirement. This substantially reduces the breadth of experience with different subjects that students currently enjoy as part of their degree.

If UF truly wishes to in the top 10 institutions it needs to raise standards not lower them

30 credit hours if minimums for SAT/ACT are set and assuming the total credit hours required for graduation/ B.S. degrees remains the same and that the reduction of required credit hours for communications will be coupled with a major/college professional composition/communication required course.

36 credit hours with the 6 hours being based on a minimum SAT/ACT scores for math and composition/communication.

Cutting Gen Ed back so far is egregious.

should be a state minimum, and universities can increase if they wish. State creates a floor, not a ceiling.

Reductions reflect a dilution of academic standards and achievement. This is the wrong direction for Florida.

A broad base helps students be flexible enough to adapt to changing demands in the workplace.

UF should be able to create their own standards.

If there must be concurrence with all institutions, it should be minimal. Even less than 30 would be better. Uf could then have more control over more hours.

Foreign language study should be a requirement for a college degree. It is imperative for international commerce, trade, and communications in STEM disciplines.

Right now, we have 3 hours composition, 6 hours math, and 9 hours each physical/bio, social, and humanities. By eliminating 6 hours, we create an imbalance among these categories.

At this time, they are not getting enough arts and humanities to have a well rounded education.

As long as the additional 6 credit hours are at the discretion for College's degree programs to use (not bound up in UF requirements such as What is the Good Life, international, and diversity credits).

The general education requirements should not be reduced. They should remain as is.

a well rounded student is critical to compete successfully in a global economy

I personally believe that 30 is enough, although it is difficult for me to conceive of why the minimum general educational requirement shouldn't be in the hands of the departments themselves. Certain programs have more room in their curriculum, and a greater need, for general education classes. I would say 30 is a fair bare minimum but am uncertain as to the need to instate this rule at the legislative, rather than departmental, level.

Students should be exposed to a wide spectrum of educational opportunities to give them a solid basis to move forward from. Reducing the number of credit hours for a very basic education will only weaken that base and offer up less qualified individuals to graduate programs.

From my perspective as a college educator for 25 years, succeeding generations of college students have been entering with less and less "general knowledge." They do not bring a solid general education from high school. This bill will exacerbate that problem. Less (and more regimented) general education means both a less educated citizenry and an less flexible workforce.

General education gives a baseline to what constitutes a college education. Reducing the gen/ed requirement is a step towards converting the bachelors degree to a vocational or trade certificate.

UF's requirement of "the good life" course is not one I would like to see state wide and is one I'd like to see removed from UF.

no comment

To remain competitive worldwide, reducing credit hours below what Universities in other countries offer would be counterproductive. To sufficiently answer this question, the committee should compare GRE, MCAT and other standardized test scores between states and between US students and students from other countries.

Thirty is enough GE, ten or so courses. Let students specialize in what they are interested in, or explore other areas that not in the core if they want to.

The proposed new mandate significantly weakens the whole concept of "general education."

The impact of the proposed changes will have a marked effect on course offerings. Why should UF compete and offer the same courses as community colleges when we produce more graduates with STEM degrees. We are encouraged to be innovative and offer new courses but apparently that will not be an option with the amount of wasted time reassignment of faculty. We should be striving for excellence and not further diminishing the richness of an education at UF.

36 is a barely acceptable minimum. A well-rounded, fully formed adult has to be aware of more than their own specific field. Further, it is irresponsible for us to presume that a myopic focus on the specifics of one discipline will prepare a young person for 50 years of work in a future whose only predictable feature is inevitable and drastic change. Only those who, employing multiple perspectives, are flexible, adaptable, and well-rounded, can be expected to succeed over the long term.

What problem(s) did changing from 36 to 30 hours solve? And whatever the problem was, did it affect UF and if not, why is the change being required of UF?

Students should be allowed the flexibility to take courses suited to their interests, needs and skill levels. The 36 allows for more flexibility.

The 36 h general education provides an excellent opportunity for the student to explore in diverse fields of study.

Departments depend on these credits under the RCM system. Reducing the number of credits would impose significant harm to many small departments. It is also absolutely inconsistent with making UF a



top 10 institution. How will UF distinguish itself from other state universities if the students are all taking the same courses?

only because it would save us the hassle of revising every single UG major

An educated person knows more than simply a vocation. He/she should be prepared for life, resposponsilbe citizenship, and knowledge to contribute constructively to public discourse.

The general education requirements should be set by the individual colleges in the individual universities. It is not possible for a blanket set of courses be identified in all of the state campuses, especially not by a committee that may not understand the requirements unique to each college. Further, it is interesting that the classes identified for the 15 credit core courses (not suprisingly) are predominantly from the courses offered by the committee members.

We do not need to further "dumb down" our college educated students.

Reducing the number of required courses only encourages students to sign up for more "easy A" courses. Not all students, of course. But many of them will squander their education if we allow it.

Students already place out of far too many of their Gen Ed classes, and lowering the number of hours will dilute their education still further.

**2. The new law requires all state institutions to offer all the core courses designated in each of the five discipline areas. This would require UF and other institutions to develop and offer new courses. Should the statute be revised so that institutions are required to offer only those core courses they already offer or are willing to develop?**

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Yes	282	75%
2	No	96	25%
	Total	278	100%

### Comments

These new courses are too broad for college-level study.

An ability to count on-line courses from other institutions in disciplines not offered by the home institution would be desirable.

Why does Tallahassee think that it knows how to develop a meaningful curriculum? Because one representative from each University came to a meeting about general education? The people actually teaching the classes have a better sense of how learning works and what skills and experiences will benefit the students they teach every day than do politicians who already cast a jaundiced eye on higher education in general.

The problem with this is that it puts certain colleges at a disadvantage like the College of Agricultural and Life Sciences. None of our general education courses are on the required lists. I would suspect other colleges, with course not on the approved list have a similar issue.

There are new battles that will have to be fought with some core courses that we do not currently offer (Intro Humanities, Intro Environmental Sciences). Our current system gives students more flexibility to pursue their individual interests and will not result in new disputes over who can/should develop courses.

To limit to ones you are willing to develop would effectively remove the statute. Also, your statement above is incorrect. For math and sciences the statute states that a higher level course counts as having taken the low level courses listed in the statute, thus we do not need to create a new course in math and science. What they should do is to extend this clause for all the sections. If that were the case then UF shouldn't have to add any new courses.

should be some minimum consistency to college curriculum available at EVERY institution.

Not all institutions have the faculty to meet this provision in the law. Clearly the legislators thought that all institutions had personnel who could teach all of these courses, evidence of how disengaged they are from the reality of higher education in our state. Since this is an unfunded mandate, this would cause hardship for institutions who might have to hire faculty with the expertise to teach required courses.

Is there state funding for developing all these core courses? If not, UF should not be required to create these classes.

Surely each institution already offers appropriate courses which can be identified.

There is no useful purpose achieved by making "cookie cutter" standards. Although this might improve the offerings of some universities in some areas it will diminish the quality of offerings at others. The only thing to be gained will be to make it easier to transfer from one institution to another, but this just means bringing all down to lowest common denominator.

Flexibility drives innovation throughout our economic system; education is no different in that respect.

These courses should be added if they help student to get an employment later on not just to have more credit hours of study.

Absolutely, yes. These are stupid courses that should be offered at the high school level. They are an embarrassment for a research institution. We will lose even more faculty and we will have even more problems in trying to replace people. The other big problem is that people who are here were not hired to teach in these areas, which makes one wonder what precisely they will teach. UF is going to be dragged down to the lowest common denominators/schools in the SUS.

These general courses should not be a particular hardship to develop for any state college or university.

Students need many options for completing this coursework

If the law is going to be in place, then requiring these 25 courses out of the hundreds we teach is not burdensome.

I don't understand this question. How would students acquire the courses necessary for graduation if they were not available at their school? I will say that if a class is required for all institutions, the legislature should provide funds for the development of missing courses.

Core courses should be expanded so that a larger variety of them can be offered- That way, every institution in the state will be able to cover the requirements.

Use online curriculum for those courses not offered. Have schools divide up core courses not offered and use online format to make courses available to all students in state

Some of the proposed core courses are fine, but many institutions do not offer them all. The state should not mandate ANY specific courses. We have no problem now accepting courses in these areas from other colleges. Transfer credit is not an issue. The new statute only insists that every person must take (and be interested in) the same subjects. This does not serve our diverse population well.

--

Most of the larger universities may have courses that fit these categories under different names. There should be an expedited path to renaming appropriate courses to fit the mandate. In some cases, the requirements may necessitate a college hiring instructors to teach these gigantic courses. Would there be money provided from the legislature for hiring these additional people needed to fulfill their mandate?

There already exists a provision whereby a student that takes a more advanced course can apply completion of that course as proof of having passed the lower division core course. I would also stipulate that taking a core course at any of the universities is to be taken as proof that the student has passed said course at all Florida universities.

Sounds like a tough sell to the legislature. I'd put efforts into changing other aspects, not this one.

Thanks to budget-cuts, faculty are already spread too thin at all the Florida public universities and colleges. Forcing every institution to develop courses it does not have will be an extra burden, and will likely cause several institutions to cancel other classes, in which faculty are teaching something they have expertise in, in order to staff these Gen Ed courses, which may not be in their areas of expertise. This is a poor use of resources, and the newly-developed courses may be poor.

Unless I am missing something, UF offers many courses in each of the five discipline areas. So why revise the statute?

Let the institution do their own work as they have already regulated by the ABET!

Online offerings at many schools would allow students to meet the requirement.

Each school has valuable areas of faculty and subject expertise that should be tapped to give students the BEST QUALITY, not the most homogenized, education.

Unless the state gives UF more funding, it is unrealistic to expect UF faculty members to offer any new courses.

A statewide mandate does not take account of the diversity of function of the different institutions. UF caters to the most academically able (by and large) students and that may have a different set of requirements from another Florida university or college.

Much of this will be moot at UF, as most of our students will be able to meet the proposed core via

AP/IB. This will ultimately hit CLAS and CFA the hardest.

I understand the need for core competencies, but the specific courses that meet these competencies should be left up to the individual institution.

The new law should be revoked.

Standardization of classes offered does not mean standardization of content. This is not guaranteeing similar content is taught. This puts a strain on departments that are already at maximum limit for teaching, and no new money is being offered to hire faculty or lecturers to help develop and teach the new courses.

The GenEd concept is a good one, but a broader range of opportunities, as already exists at UF, should be permitted. It makes sense that students leave university with certain defined skills, but each university should be able to carry out that mission in its unique way that takes advantage of its special resources, particularly their faculty and departments. This should not be "one-size fits all." A system can never be uniform except perhaps uniformly bad. A quality educational system is rich.

If the law stands as written, it will result in the dumbing down of the curriculum to the lowest level, thereby reducing the value of a UF degree.

The current law is very limiting. It limits flexibility and puts the burden on CLAS and eliminates other colleges from developing CORE courses.

If the institution does not have these specific courses, who is going to develop these courses? The faculty/student ratio is already too high, so without new faculty, this only creates another burden on current faculty.

Offering these core courses will handicap UF's ability to innovate with the direction of scholarly research. And, being forced to offer these core courses will effectively undo decades of innovation at UF that has produced a rich variety of gen ed course offerings that go far beyond the abilities of the elementary courses proposed by the Gen Ed task force. Why should we erase the notoreity of UF as Florida's flagship institution?

The law's provision on this point is sensible. The general education courses required under this law should be available to students at whatever institution they attend.

If we are going to implement this silly statewide plan, then all courses should be at all institutions. Otherwise, why are we doing it?

To require all is a big waste of resources.

The intrusion of the legislature into curricular issues is alarming.

All designated courses should be developed and offered at all institutions only after some rationale and justification has been presented and documented that shows that the General Education at each institution will be improved via this approach.

Overload is bound to occur in the identified courses if all are not included.

you are eliminating many great options out there

Or are able to develop?

This provision severely limits the courses that can be offered as general education requirements since many campuses don't offer some of these courses. Thus, great foudn majors are lost as a student won't take an Anthropology course if it's not a gen ed course. Also, some of our depts may have to give up great courses to offer more sections of gen-ed mandates.

With such limited choices already I think UF needs to at least offer all the core courses if possible. This might be an opportunity to expand the on-line course selection.

I think each institution should offer at least one of the core courses for each discipline. They can develop the others later, but they would be overly limiting students if they didn't offer at least one.

This is another dumb idea developed with minimal faculty input to minimize the state's costs at the expense of student learning.

To require that all state universities and colleges offer the exact same courses is too rigid. It ignores the variety of courses that some schools have, UF in particular, and it basically loads up a relatively small number of departments by imposing the entirely arbitrary limit of five courses in each area. Note that communication has only one offering and mathematics four, not five. Why should the other areas be limited based on math?

All institutions should be required to accept the courses, but it is a burden to require all post-secondary schools to offer the courses.

Not all institutions have the same expertise on staff. It is unreasonable to expect every state institution to offer the exact same curriculum. This applies in both directions: those that have higher diversity of expertise should be allowed to offer MORE choices for core curriculum. The ability to easily transfer credits among state institutions would be much better met with a simple designation of "Easy Transfer" courses, which would be accepted throughout the state.

To designate a tight core of classes allows no choice on the part of students and does not allow educational units to organize appropriate courses based on the strengths of those units.

Yes, to prescribe a curriculum is outside the expertise of our legislatures. Curriculum should, must continue to be kept by the faculty. Each institution's student profile and geographic profile needs to be taken into consideration. This cannot be adequately prescribed by our elected officials in Tallahassee.

If students were able to take online core courses not offered by their school from other state schools at the same price per credit hour that they are paying at their school, then I would change my vote to no.

Furthermore, each institution should be allowed to determine how many and which courses will count toward each Gen. Ed. category.

No, the faculty should decide what courses best suit the students' needs, not legislators.

We offer a considerable range of general and more focused courses, which is crucial to our AAU standing. UF should not make its curriculum look more like that of a community college with vague new courses such as "Introduction to Humanities," whatever that means.

Standardizing the universities is a good idea, though UF should have some of its own core courses. We need to differentiate ourselves and challenge the top students we have.

Rigidity in proscribing exact courses with identical syllabi turns college into high school. The benefit of college is the ability to explore a wide range of basic subjects with creative and engaging teaching. Few tenure-line faculty will be interested in teaching overly proscribed courses that are identical to those at other institutions without having some freedom and flexibility to make the class interesting.

Why choose one school over another otherwise? Each school has an area that they specialize in like the land grant mission for UF and FAMU.

However there should be equivalent courses that are already in course catalog that can count.

Unless they are willing to give us the money to hire the people to teach the extra classes! HAHAHA!

This systematic approach does not allow each University to offer different courses which will still meet the general requirements but are also responsive to changes in faculty and student cohorts, interest and expertise.

Unless the state will budget for new course development and faculty to teach the courses, the current courses should be allowed to substitute. There is no way students are going to have the same experiences across the state, given the varying quality of institutions as well as students and their interests. The legislature should embrace diversity. Was there anything WRONG with the system before? What is the rationale for this change and where are the studies to support it?

This seems like a needless duplication of efforts.

There is much reduplication in the new requirements as I understand them, and so UF should only offer courses already in existence. The entire project seems like a great "rush to the bottom." At UF we can teach rich, diverse courses in the humanities and we should not be hamstrung with having to staff general survey courses.

Students should be allowed to have all choices available to them. If we only have 2 or 3 of 5 options in a category, departments teaching those courses already will have an unfair advantage in maintaining higher enrollments. If we offer 5/5, there is more opportunity to distribute the teaching of these courses among departments.

The various institutions are different and have different missions. Requiring a uniformity in these tight budget times makes no sense.

Not necessarily. If the state law is guided by principles in what should be covered as common concepts for all Florida students, then, if a university is not currently teaching one of these core concepts, it should develop the course. Emphasis in this process should be placed on common core values and concepts that should be taught to all Florida students.

Whatever is considered a "core" class today might not be considered to be a "core" class tomorrow. Let the colleges and departments decide this. There is precious little value in imposing a core set of courses that apply to all departments, and equally to all universities within the state! We have numerous accreditation standards -- whose subject-matter knowledge is far more relevant and contemporary than outsiders' opinions -- that force us to guarantee the breadth of students' courses.

I think there should be a consistency of basic courses across colleges and universities. It does not help to require students to repeat courses that are almost identical, but not quite. If it is a basic class required by all institutions, then it should be the same across all institutions.

As the flagship (or a flagship) in the state system and the most selective of campuses, we can and should expect that students entering UF have already mastered the very basic skills and knowledge the proposed menu of classes seems to be offering. The more specialized and advanced courses already on the books should suffice.

The replication of courses across the board is for the administrative convenience of the SUS. It is not based on pedagogical factors. All curricular changes should be driven by pedagogy, not convenience.

State budget priorities should include any additional course/faculty required of the new statute.

Note, I had to read this twice... my first reaction is to disagree with the first statement and reply "no" so you might want to keep that in mind when reviewing responses

There is no need to force everyone down to the lowest common denominator. Why not let each institution develop general education courses that match the strengths, needs and interests of its own students and faculty? In any case it is a fantasy to suggest that the same course numbers taught at different institutions would provide the same content and have the same educational impact.

Legislative bodies are not, and should not be, in the business of dictating specific course content. That is a right accorded to faculty in university constitutions. It should be the right of university faculty to decide which courses fulfill the broad requirements laid out by the legislature.

As long as some core courses are available in each of the five disciplines then a student should be able to meet their lower division requirements.

I disagree with the premise that there should be common core courses in the first place. Regardless of the merits of this idea, they are bound to be taught very differently at different institutions. I don't see the point. But if we are going to do it, it should be consistent. UF offers most of these courses or could easily develop existing courses into them.

no comment

Currently, grades are absolute arbitrary at US universities. In other countries, grades are somewhat standardized across the country. By developing a standardized course set, graduate schools, professional schools and industry will have a more accurate read on the academic success of applicants. For example, it is impossible for me to judge the potential of PhD candidates because neither grades nor reference letters are standardized and referees refuse to provide honest written accounts.

That sort of defeats the purpose of a core, doesn't it.

We are a flagship school, and must be offering courses that challenge the students whose aptitudes bring them to this point.

Requiring all universities to offer all courses consumes resources at a time of declining support from the State. Considering that there is no evidence that the proposed courses provide a better general education core than courses that now meet the general education requirements, the requirement has

substantial potential to waste resources.

As faculty, we choose to belong to a given University, not a state wide system. While the basic competencies in the sciences should be encouraged, this, in my opinion, should be implemented at the high-school level or community college level. Not at the major research universities. It lowers their overall quality and ability to excel in specific areas.

A law should not mandate what courses should be in the curriculum. This must be the decision of the faculty of individual institutions.

How will new students be recruited into agriculture if all of the required courses are in fields only offered at all state institutions. UF will lose its land grant mandate to train students in agricultural fields! Gen Ed classes facilitate students' exploration of areas new to them, that they were not exposed to in high school. These fields will lose a huge recruiting mechanism.

we have enough to do right now, thanks. Unless they want to fund the people to develop and teach these courses.

Academic freedom extends to the design of curriculum by individual universities and colleges. There is no "one size fits all" when it comes to general education. It must not be mandated from above. General education should reflect the individual values of each campus and fit each institution's "culture."

See above comment. The individual colleges in the individual universities know the requirements of their students better than any one else.

If we have a statewide core, then UF and other institutions should offer the full array of options.

The state does not know better than the university. A large university such as UF offers students a wider variety of quality courses than a very small college. Why does the state want to deprive students of these opportunities? It seems rather like the old Soviet Union, dictating to every student exactly which courses they must take.

This artificial attempt to legislate curriculum will lead to lowest common denominator courses and dampen pedagogical creativity.

The State legislature should not be dictating specific courses. The universities are equipped with very good talent to guide the education of our students. That is the university job and not the legislator's job!

We understand that moving large bureaucracies like universities can "take an Act of Congress"; we suggest that the statute be revised as a strong recommendation with appropriate incentives (funding restrictions for non-compliance.) If enacted, universities would not only be forced to provide courses that don't work in their institutions, but they would also be able to blame the new law. We would also lose the inspiration of courses that achieve the same end, only better.

As long as institutions produce effective teachers each should provide courses they do well but produce the results required by students.

**3. Should the statute be revised to include a provision allowing specific higher level courses to**



**satisfy the statewide core course requirements in mathematics and the natural sciences areas (as suggested in the initial recommendation of the statewide committee)?**

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Yes	336	89%
2	No	42	11%
	Total	378	100%

**Comments**

Again, this will require us to remove some class that the students ACTUALLY NEED.

This should also be the case with other disciplines - Communications, Social Sciences, and Humanities. Taking a higher level ENC course should exempt students from ENC1101.

should be for all areas

There are courses that would benefit students' general education that are of a higher level and more applicable to the student. These students should not be burdened financially or academically by requirements below their goals.

University faculty know best what works for their respective campuses and for the state systems. The legislators should listen to the statewide committee!

No, too many students are coming in with poor foundations in math and science.

Surely you do not intend to require a student who completes a degree in science or mathematics to take in addition a course at a lower level.

This would provide students the option of more advanced training in a subject area in less time, rather than having to take a watered-down common core course first. The current legislative approach will discourage students from taking more advanced courses (why pay twice?), resulting in a dumbing down of our graduates.

Only if the same is allowed for the other areas. i don't see why this should be the case only for mathematics and the natural sciences. This logic i presume is based on the erroneous notion that these areas "build" on precursor courses, but the same is true of all the areas of knowledge. As I say below, the people who came up with this plan are clueless about research and education.

This will help clarify what students can take. Most STEM disciplines are affected by this, since the basic science courses developed for this requirement are too rudimentary to satisfy STEM requirements.

If the goal is to give students a common curriculum, such exceptions are not sensible.

I am not qualified to determine this.

I don't know, this is out of my field and I don't feel comfortable making any suggestions - but it wouldn't let me submit unless I picked yes or no

Of course. It is nor reasonable to make someone take "Math for dummies" if their skill and interests

place them far beyond that class. Let them take calculus, statistics, etc. as we have done for years.

This should not be limited to mathematics and natural sciences. I would be pissed off if I was forced to pay for a lower level course for which I was clearly already competent. I would also be mad as a parent to have to pay. If my child got an A in Multivariate Statistical Analysis and an A in Experimental Designs, then they should be assumed competent to perform a t-test for comparisons of means. Maybe they took advanced mathematics in high school, and therefore already knew basic statistics.

Makes great sense, particularly for those majoring in the sciences or math. Not clear why this exception doesn't apply to all five areas!

The statute should be revised even further so that in math, nothing below pre-calculus satisfies the core-course requirements. MAC 1105, "College Algebra", is a high-school level course. This makes a mockery of the statutory requirement (Sect. 1007.25) that Gen Ed courses "must contain high-level academic and critical thinking skills ... that students must demonstrate to successfully complete the course."

A student who demonstrates competence in a higher-level course of math or science presumably has already done so in a lower-level course. (Or am I again missing something here?)

Different program should have given permission to offer their appropriate math or natural science courses to meet their own needs!

This should be expanded to all 5 categories.

Related AP courses in high school on which the student gets a 4 or 5 on the AP exam should be allowed to satisfy the corresponding core course requirement.

A core curriculum should be that - all students take it. Higher level classes do not necessarily have more educational value.

For example, Calculus I should satisfy the math requirement as it has precalculus as a prerequisite. This is common sense.

I have no opinion on this but had to enter a yes or no in order to submit this survey.

It would seem reasonable for this standard to hold for all courses, not just those in mathematics and the natural sciences.

The new law should be revoked.

That is another way to reduce the classroom time students have, and reduces the students exposure to a wide range of ideas and topics.

Again, expand, not restrict, the range of courses that permit satisfying the requirements. Otherwise UF and the state educational system will go into decline and become a dull ghost of its current self. We will never achieve top-tier status if we go this route.

This should be extended to other humanities courses, specifically Art History.

Yes. It's silly to have requirements just for the sake of having requirements. Those students who have responsibly used their high school years to take AP calculus, should be able to opt out of the math

requirement. However, the level of AP science classes is still too low to justify opting out of Gen Ed science. They can take a 2000 level class fulfilling the GenEd requirement.

This would allow other colleges at UF to develop courses that meet the 30 credits. It also allows for more flexibility in scheduling and advising students.

I think this should be true for all areas and not just mathematics and natural sciences. Many high school students have already "specialized" via attendance at magnet schools. They should not be penalized for already having attained significant knowledge in core areas. Will AP courses be considered substitutes for core courses?

Yes. Students majoring in STEM fields already have a strict regiment of courses to complete to receive their major, most of which are far more sophisticated than the proposed gen ed courses. Students should be able to count their higher level courses towards the gen ed requirement so that they have more flexibility in their schedules to pursue other important topics engaged with the social and cultural implications of their work.

The idea that all state university will be completely identical in terms of their General Education requirements is totally absurd. Such a proposal does not allow schools like UF to take advantage of our special strengths (e.g. medicine, agriculture, etc.). Ridiculous!

It would be ridiculous to, for example, require chemistry majors to complete a lower-division general education chemistry (or other natural sciences course) in order to demonstrate that they have met the Gen Ed learning outcomes.

Yes...this should be an option all areas, not just math and the natural sciences.

This is critical to avoid massive excess hours charges for students in engineering and sciences.

Further, like the precedent set with the Common Course Prerequisites, the provision should allow for substitution of higher level courses in all academic disciplines, not just mathematics and the natural sciences.

If specified upper division courses were accepted into students' degree audits, it would make tracking students' progress toward degree easier for everyone.

This opportunity should also be extended to the other categories. Many UF students come in with 45 hours of AP/IB/dual enrollment credit and are ready to be challenged in more advanced courses. It seems a waste of resources to require them to complete what amounts to an introductory course.

Absolutely! Some institutions would be "dumbing down" to meet these requirements. We should be raising the standards/requirements not lowering them.

Students should be encouraged to take higher level courses when they can.

This seems logical to me. However, I do not teach in those areas. I don't know if this will have the effect of flooding upper division courses with poorly prepared students.

Why was it dropped in the first place? But where are the decisions going to be made -- at what level?

I am unsure and defer to my colleagues in those fields.

The level of mathematics and natural science courses is too low for engineering majors. Many degrees already require greater than 120 credit hours, adding additional lower level credits may require limiting specialized advanced requirements, and potentially downgrading the integrity and competitive value of a degree.

Yes, students should be allowed to take classes that faculty decide meet the requirements. These have always included diverse class titles taught by faculty in diverse disciplines in many colleges at the University.

This seems like a necessity in order to accommodate both science and non-science majors.

Out top-flight students do not need many (if any) GenEd courses in these or other areas. It makes sense for them to take ability-appropriate courses.

I believe the language should also allow a higher level course to be used in the other disciplines. For example, in the Humanities area, a higher-level, broad based Humanities course such as HUM 2305, *What is the Good Life*, should be able to satisfy the core requirement for Humanities.

The brighter students must be challenged. We should not be hampered by statewide rules

There is no sense in making a chemistry major take an introductory core class designed for non-science majors. If a person takes a more advanced class within the core areas, that should satisfy the core requirement.

Emphatically yes. Many students have AP credits and should go forward not backwards in these core areas.

Many students now complete programs such as the International Baccalaureate and should be allowed to take courses that meet the requirements at a higher level.

Absolutely, to not do this is to dumb down the curriculum and a student's experience.

Students should take courses at the university to meet these requirements. So if they have tested out of the introductory level, then taking a higher level should also count.

Not only for mathematics and natural sciences, but in all areas the completion of higher level courses should indicate the mastery of lower-level material. The high level of UF students means that they would be wasting time and money taking some of these lower-level courses.

Another area included here should be Communications.

This is unclear: Who defines higher level? If someone comes in with a few semesters of AP Calculus, then I would assume that this "counts" for general math.

And in the Humanities and Social Sciences, provided that the students take these course at UF.

Actually I thought this was already part of the plan: A student who completes a higher level course with overlapping content would receive credit equivalent to completion of the 'dumbdown' (gen/ed) class. Isn't that how this is going to work? If not, then God help us all. A bright student facing the choice between real introductory chemistry and dumbdown chem would have to take the dumbdown version, because of the gen/ed requirement.

It is a more effective and cost-effective way to potentially meet the required courses.

It makes sense that a higher level course should be an acceptable substitute for a lower level course. Especially when you consider that students take AP courses in high school.

Though I am not certain exactly what this means. Presumably higher level courses would have the general course as a pre-req, no?

no comment

The standardized set of courses should be standard...

If students have already fulfilled the requirement by high school, ap, or dual enrollment they should not be forced to take higher level courses unless they want to.

And the same provision should apply to the other categories. For example, why should CBH 3003 Comparative Psychology, which has PSY 2012 as pre-requisite, not satisfy the statewide core course requirements in social sciences.

This is absolutely critical. Many incoming freshmen start with calculus 1. To make them take algebra is a waste of everyone's time and money. Just one very minor example.

It would first be nearly impossible from a logistics position to coordinate all of these courses across the state and it is likely that overtime the content would vary based upon the expertise of that given institution (which in my opinion it should). If you have a strong chemistry department, then the course at that university would naturally evolve into a more advanced course. The same would be true where an institution had a strong marine biology course. Difference is good and should continue!

If at all this law goes forward, there should be flexibility for institutions.

Don't understand this... why would a higher level course count for gen ed and not a lower level?

DEFINITELY. It seems that some of these very basic courses would be "dumbing down" our curriculum. If we have courses that meet the spirit of the 'overview' or 'introduction' it seems they should count.

Anything providing campus flexibility is desirable.

If we have to use the 15 credit core courses, optional higher level courses should be identified to substitute for the lower level courses. Many of the students on the UF campus come with many AP credits which would allow them to skip the lower level 15 credit core courses. Without this option, they would have to still take the lower level courses, limiting the number of upper division courses they can take.

Absolutely. If students already have equivalent credit they should not be required to retake courses but the requirement should be met with a higher level course so ALL students have University level coursework in the core areas.

Good students should be allowed to take more challenging courses. This is important for the United States in developing more expertise in STEM fields.

It's the future.

If legislature will decide it will not work. How much does the legislature know about "a good degree" is in different areas is totally not clear. We want to provide people with education not redistribute limited resources to impoverish some who could do really well. This will not get us to have flagship University or a great University system.

Of course, many high school students will take courses that are higher level than the required courses listed here. Again, this is a problem with mandating classes. We are now forced to work with thousands of students who have gone well beyond the requirements before they even came to college, yet we still need to help them fulfill this mandate that was not designed with their needs in mind.

UF already provides strong advanced coursework - and our selective population of students is well-prepared to take challenging, advanced courses.

I don't know enough to answer with confidence but we certainly need to enhance scientific literacy.

This should be the case for all disciplines, and not just higher levels.

Yes, as long as students are not allowed to skip/requirement/high school-based test "OUT" of these core courses.

Yes, if students are capable of working at a higher level in the specified area, they should not be discouraged to do so.

This should be implemented in all five areas

It is a bad idea to force students to take lower level courses than they would otherwise take just to satisfy the requirement.

Why wouldn't we want to encourage students to take a more rigorous course? I would like specific higher level courses to satisfy the core course requirements in my area, too. For example, we survey the entire global history of art in three semester-long courses (ARH 2050, ARH 2051, ARH 2500). Any of those is more rigorous than Art Appreciation.

I thought this was allowed with the new proposal. This provision should apply to the other groups as well (humanities, social science, and communication. Specifically, it makes no sense to have students take ENC1101, a course we currently don't even allow many students to take because they "place out of it"

Also, should not higher level writing courses count?

To revise the statute in this way avoids the more important question: should the universities and colleges be uniform across the state. I do not believe this serves the purpose of the greater education of students in the state of Florida.

If the respective colleges and departments agree. Yes.

This would lead to students in non-science or non-technical fields having less exposure to essential math and science material.

should be applied across all categories.

See above

**4. The statewide discipline committees decided that history courses should be included with the Social Sciences area core courses. UF currently includes history courses in the Humanities area. In what statewide discipline area should history courses be included:**

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Social Science	100	26%
2	Humanities	278	74%
	Total	378	100%

**Comments**

Putting history in social studies is fine, but there should be a more flexible range of courses than an overly vaged World History course as proposed.

At the intro level, possibly more appropriate in humanities, but not a strong opinion either way.

If it's done right, it's part of the humanities. If it's done like high school history, I guess the case could be made that it's a social science, but we should be smarter than that.

Social sciences are just that sciences. In fact, the National Academy of Sciences considers Psychology a STEM science. History, a very important discipline, is not a science in the same category.

I am torn here, since I'm not sure that music/art "appreciation" should be with the humanities. I suppose it depends on how history is taught/viewed.

don't know, don't care. Your form is inadequate that it lacks the ability to abstain from giving an either-or-answer here. Cornell U. solved this by having 5 'cultural' areas rather than 2.

Not qualified to judge

The exception could be history courses dealing with specific Social Science disciplines

While the humanities encompass all disciplines that study the "human condition", history more accurately falls within the social sciences.

History must be evidence based. It should be a discipline of social science.

Introductory history courses contribute more to one's cultural literacy than to one's ability to analyze historical events in a social context. Therefore, the core history course would seem to more naturally belong in the humanities.

I have trouble defining history as a "science."

History is part of the Humanities and it only makes sense to keep it there. Devoting two of five Humanities courses to Fine Arts seems quite skewed - perhaps it could be either Art or Music which would free up a slot for History.

Absurd to include history in the social sciences. That tells me that the committee were either not historians, or throwbacks to the 1960s when there was an effort made to render history a science. I am also stunned to see that the world is supposed to begin in 1900, as though nothing of consequence took place before that date. The emphasis on "world" is good, but now we have an education where students are unaware of the fact that institutions like slavery were part of US! Embarrassing!

I don't think it matters, and History is too important to social science not to be an option there. It could easily be counted as Humanities, too. There is no right answer here.

Shouldn't historians determine this?

I don't really know how to answer this question

History is not a social science. That should matter. Beyond that, the humanities course include both music and art appreciation, which is overkill. The social sciences requirements leave out important fields such as geography. It makes sense to move history to humanities and to add to social sciences.

It does not make a lot of difference and practice varies nationally.

Actually, it should count in BOTH humanities and social sciences. It is the key core element for general education requirements.

It forced me to answer the question - no fair. Put History where History wants to be.

social sciences have some "science" aspect to them. Something to quantify. History does not meet that criterion.

Depends on how the course is taught. A ceramics class that focuses on artistic traditions in China, Greece, and Byzantium with a focus on how the culture of these societies are preserved in the decoration of the pottery. This might be humanities. Using the same examples one could look at manufacturing technique as an indication of technological advancement and decline in each culture. That might fall more into Social Sciences. Same artifacts, different focus.

In UF's case, we're probably better off going with History under the social science list.

It could be put in either category, but since the committee recommends putting it in Social Sciences, apparently because that meshes more easily with the classification at many institutions around the state, there is no reason to resist it.

For this does a choice really matter? I feel that in many ways social sciences and humanities are one in the same.

Why mess with it?

The new law should be revoked.

Neither categories seem like a good fit. History seems like a mandatory subject all should have, like



communication, so it should be its own category. If it was its own category you could provide options such as: world history from xx-1900, world history from 1900-present; American history; etc

History is not a social science. I can only speculate why someone would make such a stupid recommendation. My best guess is that it's politically motivated.

Psychology and anthropology are sciences and use scientific inquiry to examine man's activities. History is not. History is an examination and interpretation of man's activities.

The inclusion of a 20th-century world history course among the core social science courses does not transform History at UF into a Social Science discipline and is thus should be a non-issue for History at UF.

Social Sciences appear to be a better fit.

History is simply not a science of any kind.

If the long-range plan is to articulate with the Florida K-12 curriculum, and because certification in Social Science is a requirement to teach history in Florida secondary schools, history courses should fall under social sciences at the post-secondary level as well.

Most universities, our peers and aspirational peers, consider History one of the Humanities. Apparently the Florida legislature knows better!

Leave it alone & leave these decisions to educators.

Students need history and social sciences. If history covers social sciences, it would have to teach methods that only some historians use (such as economic historians). Students should be exposed to history primarily for content, and with some qualitative questions of method, though if an instructor wishes to introduce quantitative questions, that is an individual choice. Intro exposure to quantitative methods of working with living subjects should be taught in Gen Ed Social science

The social "sciences" aren't scientific; neither is history. Probably history should be split between areas - political history put with economics and political "science," intellectual history (art history, music history, history of science and tech) in humanities.

Ideally, Humanities, but then again, Art and Music belong in Arts, not Humanities. I don't think the placement is that critical, actually.

History, as a discipline, is by definition a Humanities discipline. Changing it would be highly contested in the field.

The State allocation of courses does not benchmark with national standards. Why, for example, are both "Art" and "Music" required in "Humanities"? Their faculty are much smaller than that of English and History departments. Diluting curriculum with "Intro to Humanities" that leaves only 2 real Humanities courses in the mix. History belongs with Humanities, and the whole Humanities component needs to be structured around 5 longstanding disciplines in that broad field to parallel Social Science.

History is not a social science. Period.

Either one

I don't have an opinion on this.

not sure it makes a difference

The beauty of the study of history is that it is an art and a science. The fact that we are having this debate is precisely why history is important--and it reveals most clearly why the entire mandate is fundamentally flawed. Are we to teach college students that the history of humanity is one thing only? No! We must teach them that humanity is complex! (Aggravating that I must choose a category or else my survey won't be submitted!! So I'm just entering social sciences but I don't mean it)

History is neither fully Humanities nor fully Social Sciences. But this proposal is stupid---it is closer to Humanities.

No opinion on the above, but the form does not allow a blank answer.

While history does straddle the two disciplines, quantifiable and social scientific methods are less frequently practiced today than they once were.

History should be in both Humanities and Social Science.

depends upon the course

I thought that conventionally history was viewed as falling within the social sciences. Is this controversial?

Social science = society and human nature

Humanities - study of the human condition.

History courses can fit both but the more traditional classification is humanities.

While History has significant social science components these days, a general World History class fits solidly in the humanities in my opinion.

no comment

Students should absolutely be required to take breadth courses and therefore, the credit load should not be reduced. Breadth promotes big picture thought, which is key to the success of social science, natural science and the development of strong leaders.

This should be up to the institution.

This one is hard to answer with a definitive black and white classification. Some history, when taught from the perspective of language, art and literature should definitely be under the humanities. But, if a historical account was obtained through a more unbiased objective basis as would be the case in a social science, then the course would fall into a different category. For me, this isn't black and white!

I'm not qualified to answer this questions. Depends on the nature of the course. History was a social science at my liberal arts college...

I don't have a way to know this.

A 'No brainer' in my take on the classification of history.

I do not have an opinion about this one. Not my field, so I do not know which is more appropriate. You forced me to answer but to me the two choices are EQUAL.

History is considered by most universities (and by national bodies, such as the NEH) to be a humanities discipline, and the statewide requirements should reflect that basic fact. On the other hand, for strategic reasons in determining which five courses to list, you may have to keep it in the social sciences.

The University should decide their curriculum not the State.

Why not both? (or rather, either,) as clearly it is.

I don't believe it really matters to the future teachers which department teaches the course.

It seems to me that those involved in those courses should weigh in here; the question is also what is replaced.

I do not think it would hurt for all social studies students to know history but I do not know what the requirements are at present. I am even surprised that SS are not considered humanities...

What difference does it make as to where the courses are housed? What a waste of time and paper work!

Wherever an institution feels like it best fits within their curriculum. There is no reason why this should be mandated.

Again, strict mandates forces us to make artificial categories. Universities shouldn't be forced into this choice.

Keeping History with the Humanities strengthens the array of important Humanities courses (literature, culture, history, language, and their interrelations). Social science should offer separate focus on the analytical disciplines - sociology, psych, poli. sci., anthro. (+ social geography, social linguistics).

I was a history/poli sci major and I can tell you that History is a humanities discipline. It doesn't test hypotheses nor use scientific methodology. As such, it doesn't resemble the social sciences.

Part of the problem was that by limiting each area to 5 courses, the arbitrary shunting of History freed up two fine-arts courses in Humanities. This could be solved by being more flexible in the number of courses designated in each area. Why was 5 the chosen number?

We should follow national standards as set by the NRC.

Seems logical to include them in the Social Sciences.//

It shouldn't matter

No comment. This is ridiculous to be spending serious time arguing this point. What exactly was the issue that was being corrected by causing all this time to be spent making the whole state change the

courses they teach.

History has traditionally been considered one of the humanities, and not all history is influenced by the social-science model. It makes more sense to place it in the humanities in terms of what it has been, what it is, and what it is expected to do for the student in terms of fulfillment, capacity, and perspective. I note that the recommendation for courses only includes 20th c. WOH. Both the time limitation and the inevitable superficiality of WOH undercut the value of the discipline.

However, to be honest, I don't think it really matters. As long as history does not fall between the cracks as it almost did.

History is a discipline within the humanities, and putting it anywhere else just shows ignorance.

The survey is forcing me to choose one or the other, but I would defer to the History department unless we need room in Humanities for other courses.

Although I clicked on Humanities above, perhaps it would be better to judge courses individually, since some History courses could conceivably have a Social Science orientation. I know that some departments teach some courses with S and some with H, as judged by the GenEd committee.

Humanities -- and the Humanities \*must\* be broadened and extended to comprise more of the required credits. These are foundational disciplines of human intellectual and cultural endeavors. They are not merely supplements to a "practical" higher education.

some history courses focus on humanities and some focus on social science. Some cross these discipline boundaries. The logical step would be to put each history course in the appropriate category as defined by the topics covered.

I don't care, I was forced to choose one to complete the survey.

This decision, however, should be at an institutional level. Colleges and universities should be empowered to have different approaches and taxonomic structures to educational disciplines and courses.

I answered because the form obligates me to.

But I believe you should consult with the department. Historians will answer this question. History touches upon both the humanities and the social sciences. This is the interdisciplinary aspect of history, and other disciplines that you are suppressing with these courses. A strange plan, to destroy interdisciplinary freedom for the sake of misunderstood streamlining. I never thought to see such arbitrary pedagogy from the capital. Disappointing.

either area is fine.

Don't have enough information

I teach in the social sciences and study history. They are discrete disciplines in every respect. Treating history as a social science devalues both.

Does it really make a difference?

History is not a science.

The social sciences have traditionally been composed of courses that help students to better understand human development, family life, community development, and the mechanisms that govern social institutions. History courses tend to focus more on the evolution of ideas and methodologies for storying human life/social institutions. The social sciences focus on enhancing human life and social institutions. History belongs with the humanities.

Why does this matter?

Neither. History should be its own major. Duh.

**5. Currently the statewide discipline committees are limited to selecting five courses in each discipline area. Should the mandate be revised to allow for the inclusion of six courses in a particular area if the statewide steering committee determines the need to do so?**

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Yes	306	81%
2	No	72	19%
	Total	378	100%

**Comments**

This is not the magic wand that'll fix all the problems this proposal creates.

Give students more choices

More inclusion is good, and gives students options to explore different areas.

Offering additional choices (i.e. Astronomy as a Science, Good Life or Classics as a Humanities, and

I also feel strongly that additional choices should be offered to meet the communications requirements for general education. ENC1101 is not a "one size fits all" course and many of our high performing students need greater challenges.

There are courses not included that would benefit every student, particularly in communication, humanities and the sciences.

Flexibility should be considered, on an institution-specific basis; however, a tuition burden increase should be taken into account in making such decisions

Sure, I suppose so. However, what is the difference, really, between 5 or 6 in this case? Are you trying to see how far you can push the legislators to increase the number of statewide core courses? I don't mean to sound cynical, but this does seem to be a small difference that addresses an outcome and not the problem.

What is magic about five? (or six)

Again, there is no value to taking a cookie cutter approach to education, or to the structure and function of our educational institutions.

This statewide committee is clueless about university education at a quality research institution. This looks like a laundry list for high school, not a research university and utterly misses the point of a current, quality education that matches with other comparable schools. I would not trust this committee to make any more decisions--they will destroy UF.

Yes, these options are very limited now. I can't imagine an educated person knowing nothing about American or Florida Government, for example.

More variety is good business for everyone.

The fundamental problem with the current system is its bloat, so we should resist the temptation to increase requirements to 6, then 7, and so on. Moreover, the more courses that fit the requirements, the more students will be able to avoid them altogether with AP credit or the equivalent. And a small number of courses creates some element of a "core" curriculum, which has other benefits.

Further expanding the offering will tend to further dilute the core information that every study should have....ie, students will find it easier to escape more rigorous, less "sexy" topics/areas

More options are better for complete coverage and for students.

Mandating a small number of specific courses is ridiculous. Different people have different interests, and larger universities like ours are able to offer a wide variety of courses to fulfill GenEd requirements.

Flexibility is good

If the goal is to produce a large set of student clones then you should make up your mind as to the ideal clone. I would also recommend a state-wide competency test for all graduating students. This would insure that everyone shares the same competencies as well as the same course list. Such tests are the norm at grade school level.

again, I don't think it's worth fighting that point with the legislature.

It strikes me that this action provides greater flexibility to said committees which i take to be good.

I would like to see the number of possible courses expanded, even beyond six.

More than 6 courses would be even better. In this way a school would be able to meet at least one of the courses.

It is just wrong to make education a flat, uniform grid when each school has different strengths and programs. Diversity of approach offers many opportunities for value that benefits student so much more than one uniform set of classes. It seems VERY REGRESSIVE to do this. Does the state think this will be cheaper somehow in the long run? Can you imagine Ivy League schools doing this? How can we be told to be a great university with this approach?

The current course choices seem somewhat arbitrary to me. For example, why is Religion not listed among the Humanities options?

Five seems to me enough

The new law should be revoked.

Surprisingly, astronomy is not included as one of the five courses. It provides a uniquely valuable synthesis of physics, math, chem, and biology, and is easily applicable to students everyday life, their understanding of the moon, the sun, the stars, and the earth as a planet in the broader context of the solar system. Environmental science is not a "natural science." Astronomy and the other natural sciences must inform environmental science. Astro is popular, stimulating, inspiring.

The limit of 5 (or 6) selections is incredibly stupid. Students learn best when they are interested in the subject. Universities offer a variety of classes, so that students can find something that excites and effectively engages them. While a limit of either 5 or 6 is bad for education, a limit of 6 is less bad than a limit of 5.

Again we want to offer choices and improve flexibility. This also will allow more colleges at UF (other than CLAS) to develop and offer the CORE courses.

The same number of courses should be allowed in all areas.

YES if there is a need.

This kind of fudging undermines the intent of the state law. It needs to be kept in mind that there are opportunities for students to take other general education courses beyond the core courses.

A major concern is if this can be successfully accomplished by the student within time allowed.

Not just six. There should be many options available to students so that it is not a cookie-cutter process across different schools. Higher education is competitive and we are not just competing with our own state - we have to make all Florida schools appealing to non-Floridians if we ever want to achieve "top 10" status for our Universities. This proposal does the opposite.

I believe that individual universities should determine their curriculum.

More flexibility is useful for the students.

This one is hard to answer. I think it is absolutely crazy to limit each discipline area to only 5 or 6 courses. We have progressed past that, students should be allowed many more options than that limited number. That is the main problem with this entire new rule. What purpose does this serve other than make record keeping and transferring courses easy?

it should actually be more than 6

6 is as arbitrary as 5. Why not 10?

Yes, ECO2013 should be a social science course part of the core curriculum.

Actually I prefer not to answer this question but the survey insists that I put something down.

would provide greater variety for students

Already answered. Why just six courses?

Additionally, any higher level course, in any Core category, should be allowed as substitution for the lower course (not just in mathematics and natural sciences).

I have great difficulty agreeing that the list should be extended to six, because I deeply disagree with limiting the number of courses in each area, at all. This will greatly impair our ability to attract students and compete with other top-rated universities, where students may meet their core requirements with a wide variety of course options. It will also remove all incentive for faculty to develop new undergraduate courses, as there is no opportunity for new courses to provide credit.

That said, I don't believe the state should mandate any curriculum.

Actually, institutions should be able to develop an infinite number of courses that could count. Decisions like this should remain at the institutional level.

It should be up to the faculty.

The more choice and diversity in choices for students, the better.

The current list of courses is extremely limiting and will devastate departments that do not have a class within the core area, in the current SCH model. At the same time, it drastically reduces the flexibility of students in selecting courses that interest them, for example in areas which may not have been well covered in their high school - the joy of coming to university is that one can then experience new subjects, rather than being limited to a high-school-like list of class options.

There should not be a limit on courses in the discipline areas. More than six may be needed in a university as large as this.

Some exceptional courses offered here did not make this list. We've built curriculums around them. Why are these investments not considered?

Five? Six? Two? Twenty six? The entire notion of numbering the disciplines is flawed. So no, I don't see a difference between five and six.

The more courses the better. Needs vary greatly.

I don't see why there should be a limit at all.

Given that I suspect that no rationale was behind the number 5, what difference does an additional course make?

No opinion on the above, but the form does not allow a blank answer.

There is no compelling need to limit courses to five.

Not really sure about this. What are the pros and cons?

Flexibility is a good thing.

In the natural sciences, the proposed list of core courses does not include astronomy. Astronomy



would be an ideal addition to this list since it covers many subject areas from the other sciences, but in a uniquely synthesised curriculum that is didactically rigorous yet very popular with students. Omitting astronomy from the natural sciences core impoverishes this discipline. A list of 5 courses in other discipline areas is very likely to similarly limit their breadth, usefulness, & value.

More data and a rationale are required to even know how to answer this question.

What an odd question. If the committee decide to do it should it do it. Is there anyway to answer no to this question?

6? Why not 10, 20, 50?

Changing from five to six courses does little to address the fundamental problem with the proposed core courses. It is completely unclear why these courses provide a better general education core than other courses on the list of general education courses at UF.

As written, this statute makes a huge chunk of undergraduate education a cookie cutter. That is not the point of a college education!! More flexibility is needed.

The entire mandate should disappear. Making a 6th course does not help this situation.

But this will not help the many departments earning RCM credit by enrolling gen ed students.

seems to make good sense. 5 is a nice number, but that's not a good enough reason.

Maximum flexibility is a pre-requisite to a good program in general education.

The individual colleges in the individual universities know what their students need better than any one.

If we're stuck with no variety, then five is less of a burden for the universities to provide than six.

Even six courses is far too low, but it is one better than five.

The core mandate should not be further limited by a statewide steering committee.

I was forced to choose the answer by the system but I think this is not the way to go since none of us really know the clear impact of either choice. This detail seems not to be really relevant since core courses should be discipline dependent.

The more courses in each discipline, the better.

I doubt that a limit of 5-6 courses will be sufficient. Given the breadth and expertise at UF, it seems that limiting the course selection would represent an unnecessary burden to some departments while excluding others.

That is what I said in the previous question's response. But then the question could be asked: "what is special about six courses?"

Of course. We need to limit the reduction in choice available to students.

We all need more flexibility, especially if we are going to be asked to disrupt our individual course

systems.//

There should not be a restriction. This is unwarranted meddling. Doesn't the legislature have important issues to consider?

And take away yet another area where students can choose for themselves something that interests them.

Please see my comments above regarding the need for more Gen Ed courses.

I don't know

The more undergraduate student choice the better. The more varied opportunities for graduate students to gain teaching experience the better. This would allow us to include some departments and good courses that got 'left out.'

Six or more even, as appropriate.

The natural sciences should be broadened to include multi-discipline courses such as astronomy which incorporates physics, geology and chemistry.

The five course requirement should be abolished. Six courses would not be an improvement.

And, most importantly, if the colleges and departments are on board. Please do not decide this and force departments to fit into a narrow slot.

Are you giving us two options, 5 or 6? What of the rich selection of Gen. Ed courses already offered? I have had students studying languages and taking an introductory course on Astrophysics. Are you going to improve on this? Really? Who is supposed to benefit from this tiny Gen.Ed. requirement?

How can the extent of general education be condensed down to 5 courses? In selecting those 5 courses, does that indicate that any other courses are not valid or not as valid as those 5 courses for general education purposes?

this should be struck down in its entirety

More flexibility is better than less. But this plan simply lacks supporting pedagogical evidence.

I don't see what difference 1 more course is going to make.

Astronomy should be included in the Natural Sciences core.

<b>Statistic</b>	<b>Value</b>
------------------	--------------

Total Responses	94
-----------------	----

**6. House Bill 7135 mandates the new general education requirements be implemented for students initially entering a public institution in 2014-2015.&nbsp; Should this be delayed to 2015-2016?**

#	Answer	Response	%
1	Yes	306	81%
2	No	72	19%
	Total	378	100%

## Comments

The later, the better. More time for faculty members to abandon this sinking ship.

delay it to infinity

With the prospect of having to develop/modify courses to accommodate the core requirements, more preparation time would serve to support quality education, rather than simply meeting a minimum standard

Better to cancel the whole policy

This timeline is too fast for careful implementation. It feels like a "rush job" because it is! However the legislature does need to put a final end date on this process, or it risks allowing the process to go on too long. However, I believe that an additional year for preparation is absolutely necessary to do this well, especially at a complex institution like UF.

Over a year should be enough.

It also mandates coordination with local institutions of primary education, which will take time to achieve. Unfortunately, such coordination will effectively mean that the universities (and ultimately the governor and legislature in their micromanagement of universities) are dictating the primary education curriculum and/or content.

Who precisely is going to teach these new courses--answer? No one. They are not going to be implemented in time. As I said, this committee is clueless about teaching, research and general education--a disaster!

Generally, rushed requirements are poorly implemented. Remember the disastrous CLEP law that wasted \$7M and unfairly rewarded ETS?

This is huge change, and everyone needs time to implement it competently.

Implementation will have its problems- the longer time we have to iron out the problems with these issues, the better it will be for all involved.

From the meetings I've attended about this, it seems there is no way we can get this done - and done even remotely well - on a short time frame.

It shouldn't be instituted at all. Never,

Rushing this may leave the institutions unprepared. This is especially true if new courses need to be developed.

again, I don't think it's worth fighting that point with the legislature.

The new requirements are bad, for many reasons. Therefore the longer their implementation is delayed, the fewer students' educations will be harmed by them.

I have no basis for answering this Q.

It should be cancelled. It's an educational boondoggle that should embarrass Florida nationally.

I'd assume that a major change like this might need more time to implement.

It would be better to take some time to consider these changes

I have no preference about this except that the core should be decided in plenty of time to implement. If that means 2015, then perhaps that is better.

These changes will cause a major disruption in the current curriculum structure. More time needs to be provided to make these changes and to assure the highest educational standards for the students.

The new law should be revoked.

This is too soon for such a major change. The earlier start date really doesn't allow for proper discussion and implementation.

The bill is idiotic and an invasion of politics into higher education. The longer we can stall it the better. Hopefully, once people realize how stupid it is, this bill will be overturned.

This really is an unproductive piece of legislation. I'd like to see it delayed as long as possible.

From looking at this, it's not that hard to offer the courses.

Need more time to develop a more comprehensive and attainable program for the students.

I suggest delaying it FOREVER.

Implementing this too quickly won't help anyone. Of course, we've been presented no evidence that this new plan will help students anyway.

I would request that the mandate be rescinded.

Given the impact on the University of Florida, more rather than less time is needed to adjust all of our programs.

Delay as long as possible (forever)

More time should be devoted to examining the implications and intent of the new requirements.

It depends on if it's finalized soon or not. It needs to not be rushed into the catalog copy and orientation planning.

I can't imagine the work that will go into these changes.

This legislation needs to be reconsidered and revised. As I suggest below, if the point is to have core curriculum, allow each institution to design their own core curriculum, one appropriate to their

mission, student body and faculty expertise.

It should be done away with, as politicians should not be making policy on education.

Might as well get it over with and see what needs to be changed.

Some incoming students may have made their decision to come to UF because of academic offerings and requirements. Being limited to these small areas and courses to meet requirements may not be of interest to them. A disgruntled student is less likely to be happy and stay at UF.

Obviously, we are in 2013 now and since most faculty have no idea this is happening, it cannot be responsibly put into place that early. I question whether it can responsibly be put into place at all.

Why delay it? This whole business has been rushed through (see the timeline in the document). I'm surprised it's not being imposed for 2013-14. That would certainly not be fair to students applying and making plans now, but it seems to be how things are being done. The lack of deliberation (in both senses) is appalling to me.

Absolutely! To make all the necessary degree changes to meet catalog deadline, etc. it must be delayed to 2015-16.

Frankly, it should be repealed, but delayed will at least give us a year to fix the critical flaws in this legislation.

It should be delayed indefinitely.

It should be removed from the books.

It should be delayed Indefinitely.

Some of the proposed requirements are vague or otherwise problematic. Research schools such as UF need to ensure they won't lose accreditations as such, so the more time for revising these proposals the better.

Particularly if institutions are required to offer all of the core options - this would allow for effective development of new courses.

If this new curriculum is going to be implemented, universities must have time to adequately develop and staff the courses; and consider the impact of these changes on the teaching resources, departmental budgets, and available classroom space of their university. That is not a small task.

Too many things need to be amended

Because as usual the legislators will not have done their homework and realized the full ramifications of these changes until the problems start cropping up.

If delayed we would have more time to implement it effectively and efficiently.

We need time for course development - quality instruction takes time. It would be wise to offer new courses starting fall 2014 and then make the implementation of the rules in the following fall.

It is not practical to implement this so quickly for all the students. It should be phased in.

Please educate those outside of the university environment that much time will be needed to change course plans, to readjust advising, to change the catalogs, and to study how this will impact upper division credit hours.

No opinion on the above, but the form does not allow a blank answer.

Enough time should be allotted for any additional courses to be adequately developed.

What difference does it make? If the legislature meddles with higher education then I don't see that it matters when their changes take effect. Another year of reprieve does not help much.

It's more important to get it right than to get it quickly; the additional time will allow better planning and communication

Or indefinitely.

There has been inadequate time to assess the impact of these changes on the value of the educational system offered to students, and ultimately the impact on Florida's universities' competitiveness and relevance. In addition, any new mandates must have identified funding support, and so the system-wide costs of these changes must also be properly assessed.

If conversation is required, a delay is probably reasonable.

Does it make a difference really?

This should be delayed as long as possible. We do need time to comply, but further, we should be working tirelessly to try to convince the legislature that this is a bad law that will hurt students throughout the system.

Too many restrictions, too little time.

It simply takes too long to go through the paper work of generating new courses and even upon starting this process NOW, we will not have enough time to generate the new course material by the fall 2014 year.

depends on how much they expect will change. Won't many of our students use AP credits to get out of these requirements?

Let's not rush the program without sufficient thought.

It should be delayed indefinitely. Just because some misguided (wealthy) parent has convinced some misguided people in Tallahassee, it doesn't mean we should change the quality education that our students are already getting.

Doing something well is ALWAYS preferable to doing it fast and doing it fast generally means it won't be done well.

Foot-dragging will not make this work any better. Let's find out how bad it is as soon as possible, so we can repeal it after that and return to the normal, high-quality education that has made the United States the world leader in higher ed.

This wrongheaded meddling of the state legislature in curricular matters that should be decided by educators, not politicians, should be delayed as long as is possible in order to allow for revision and reconsideration.

I do not think it should be implemented at all. The State should decide whether the school is doing it's job and reward it if it is or dissolve it if it isn't. The State committees and legislature should not dictate what they think is a solution. They are not trained to do this. They should concentrate on what they are trained to do, if anything.

Yes, if course development is taken seriously

Has there been a public debate about this?

I think the financial impact of having to add courses (if it comes to that) or even having to change departments needs consideration. What are they going to do about class sizes if there are a limited number of classes to choose from and full student enrollment ? I have been in one of those "giant" everyone has to take this class - poor quality education.

The requirement should be delayed as long as possible.

Too many details still need to be worked out, and offering some flexibility for the different institutions will be important to the success of the revised requirements.

As usual, the Legislature is clueless about the amount of time it takes to create courses, staff them, and find space and times to teach them. Wait until the schools are ready by listening to them.

At least until 2015-2016.

There is no provision for "don't know." If we have to do it, let's get it over with. If it might be overturned or modified, let's delay it.

This would provide adequate time for the development of new classes.

As long as possible to allow time for the lawmakers to re-evaluate what they are trying to accomplish. If not, UF should institute another layer of graduation requirements that expand general education at higher levels, much like CLAS does now.

Please press for a delay, as implementation at the Community College and University levels, will be necessary. besides,... secondary schools will have to jenn-up their classes/advice and preparations, too. Therefore, a short 'delay until the 2015-16 academic year would be better for all concerned.// {BE SURE THAT THIS LAW WILL BE APPLIED PROSPECTIVELY, TOO}

It shouldn't be mandated

This should be pilot tested to see if it will even work. There are going to be ramifications and I don't believe we are able to see them until it is implimented.

If the recommendation stays as it is, the longer it is kept away from our students, the better.

Many of these courses are yet to be created; we need to time to do this properly.

There should be time to make the appropriate changes.

From my perspective as a faculty member, the sooner we get going the better (unless you think delay will lead to getting the bill repealed). Fortuitously, we have a new online Art Appreciation that is ready to go to the curriculum and Gen Ed committees very soon. This law is going to have a significant impact on the rest of our curriculum, and while we wait for implementation, we are stuck in a holding pattern. We can't begin revising our curriculum until we begin to see how this shakes out.

It takes time to develop courses to meet new requirements.

Need time to develop and revise courses

Clearly, the current scheme has not been well-considered or -designed. Time is needed for more public comment and for a more meaningful contribution from scholars and teachers.

the more time we have to plan for it, the more smooth the transition

But it should further be abolished.

If this allows for feedback before finally being implemented, Yes. I do not see what the rush is. Personally, I would like to see, indeed I think we should all read, in the bright light of the Sunshine, the rationale behind this initiative.

If we're going to have to incorporate this illogical, pedagogically indefensible plan, better to swallow the castor oil and get it over with.

This top down overmanagement needs time to be implemented.

## 7. In what disciplinary area cluster is your expertise?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Communications	0.039683	15	4%
2	Humanities	0.190476	72	19%
3	Social Sciences	0.190476	72	19%
4	Natural Sciences	0.335979	127	34%
5	Mathematics	0.044974	17	4%
6	Other	0.198413	75	20%
	Total		378	100%

Other

Medicine

Engineering

Engineering

Libraries



My expertise spans multiple areas: natural sciences, mathematics, social sciences

I teach natural science in dept. classified as social science.

BME, which is math and natural sciences

Law

Engineering

Business

Life sciences

I'm in history- which in some places is considered as humanities and in other places as social sciences

Law

but my home dptt is classified as humanities

World Language

Academic Affairs

Engineering

Fine Arts

Engineering

Medicine

Architecture

I am jointly appointed in the humanitie and social sciences, hence my problem 'compartmentalizing' the two in the gen ed recommendations

Business

Engineering

Interdisciplinary

I'm an academic advisor, not a faculty member.

Advisement

Health sciences

I currently teach a general education course that provides credit in both biological sciences and humanities.

Fine Arts

Agriculture

Engineering

Medicine

Engineering

Health Sciences

architecture: a STEM discipline, with humanities, with Art---

ARTS!!!!!!!!!!!!

Engineering

Engineering

Engineering

Medicine

Engineering

Arts

Health Sciences

Health sciences

Health sciences

Agriculture

Engineering

Medicine

Education

Physical science and engineering

Health Sciences

Education

Forest-based recreation and tourism

Geography - I'm a natural scientist in a social science department.

operations research; industrial engineering; management sciencena

Fine Arts

Medicine

Fine Arts

**8. What, if any, specific suggestions do you have about the statewide committees' initial course recommendations for the 15-hour statewide core?**

The idea of general education is to get breadth in education. There is no need to specify courses for this. Students should be able to get this breadth while exploring topics of interest to them, keeping the existing flexibility.

Replace the World History course with a choice of American or World history.

The emphasis on quantity and subject areas is misplaced - quality of these courses is the key. You can mandate all you want - if the courses are bad, this won't help students achieve a baseline level of education.

I think the committee should consider the same option of using higher level courses to fulfill the requirements as done in math with regard to social sciences and humanities.

It leaves some disciplines out. It includes some disciplines that are already quite overcrowded and have large numbers of majors. I would encourage that the committee consider adding more underenrolled majors, with the larger universities potentially offering all...some smaller schools may have the core of 5.

None of the courses are in Education... I would recommend that there be some flexibility within Psychology courses (i.e., educational psychology could count towards the core).

I would like to see more options in the communications category.

More focus on Science and math and less on art and literature. we as a country are falling behind in math and science because we spend too much time on non science courses

none at this time.

they are setting the bar pretty low with only 5 courses total. Should be 6-7.

Include a course in Agricultural Sciences. Numerous appropriate Ag courses are available on-line, so all students at any institution will have access.

The communications option is weak, advanced high school students are not served by re-taking what may essentially be their high school course. Additional options should be added, such as technical writing, or writing for sciences. Health based natural science courses would also serve the student population, particularly when considering the chronic disease and obesity epidemics our population is facing.

The statewide core, if uniformly addressed, may allow students to more easily transfer core credits between institutions, again reducing the tuition burden caused by inability to transfer credits

Not enough choices of courses in communications.

Include Economics as one of the 5 social science courses. Business students have many pre-professional classes and STA X023 is the only one of this GenEd list.

I recommend that the competencies be revised for greater clarity.

The course recommendations should respect the expertise offered by the faculty at different institutions. That expertise is muted if faculty are mandated to direct much of their teaching efforts to a very few, very bland, very general, introductory level courses. There is nothing to indicate that the mandated courses prepare students for upper division coursework. In my field (soc sci) the list of courses does NOT match the stated goals; in particular, the study of past societies & cultures.

In the natural sciences there should be allowance for (at least) 6 core courses, so that "biology" could be logically split into one providing information at the level of the natural environment, population dynamics, and organismal biology, and the second on cellular and molecular/biochemical aspects of biology.

My recommendation would be not to force all institutions to be the same. They clearly have dramatically different missions in benefitting the State; why not allow flexibility in establishing the core?

If there is to be a gen ed course for Humanities, there should be gen ed courses for "Science" and "Social Science." That would of course never happen since one draws distinctions between the different areas that comprise the latter. It is frankly insulting and unintellectual to create a university level "Introduction to the Humanities." Mathematics should not be stand-alone but part of Mathematics and Natural Science, as it is in other institutions. History is not a social science!

Include more courses in each area. Make sure accelerated options (see above) may not be used to satisfy this requirement.

I come across students who are about to graduate from college, but are still unable to express themselves in complete sentences. This should be considered unacceptable and could be corrected/prevented by strengthening the English component of the curriculum.

Art and music appreciation is too much from the fine arts at the expense of the rest of the humanities and social sciences.

A confusing standard comes from the Humanities: "Students will demonstrate interpretive ability and cultural literacy." "Interpretation" is too general a term to be useful since it applies to all disciplines. We should be developing the aesthetic sense of our students, giving them the tools to express ideas about art. Ideally, they would be given the choice to practice an artform - the most direct means of learning. Theatre is the only performing art excluded - why?

Expand the possibilities of potential courses to include a broader spectrum of possibilities..

Allow universities teach their strengths. Each state college or university should be able to offer courses that are unique so students have value in obtaining their education from the institution they choose. The core learning objectives can be met without having the students all take the same few courses. Give them a choice so they get exposed to new ideas.

Stop simplifying and dumbing down requirements and expectations to accommodate individuals who are only there because it is expected (e.g. "everyone goes to college"). Academic institutions are accepting (and graduating) students who would be much better served by being directed towards a trade/technology. Our students should definitely be held accountable for their performance, BUT if they cannot meet academic requirements, they should be directed to an area where they can be successful.

Social Science should include a basic philosophy class option.

Requiring everyone in Florida to choose courses from a very small list is not good. Everyone has different interests and abilities. Our educational system should cater to the diverse population in all of Florida. Allow students to choose their Core courses from all those offered at their chosen institution of higher learning. You can't legislate knowledge. It is immoral to try and force people to learn specific things just because some lawmaker thinks it's a good idea.

English Composition is not really communication per se. Yes, it helps people to organize their thoughts and also teaches students how to critique writing. But you are missing the oral communication component. Students should be required to take Public Speaking (SPC X608) at the very minimum. Right now, you really are not offering communication courses.

The big question is Why?

I doubt students learn much of anything in courses like these, that will end up having several hundred students in them each semester. They will undoubtedly end up as online classes, unlikely to inspire further learning in most students.

I am amazed that all the students will be able to effectively communicate orally and written after a single semester course.

I am very curious as to how students will be evaluated on their cultural literacy. I assume this is global and not limited to the culture of Christianity in European immigrants to Florida. The other objectives are similarly vague and subject to multiple interpretations.

why only one course for communication?

Too many for this 500-character box. Students will be taking fewer college-level courses, a bad idea. Judging by the math core-course suggestions, the level of the requirements is way too low. Judging by the last "sentence" on p. 6 of <http://www.fldoe.org/articulation/pdf/gesfcir.pdf>, at least one committee-member doesn't know what a sentence is, or proper English usage, and the rest don't care. Such persons shouldn't be teaching, let alone making decisions about what students should learn.

I am against "cookie cutter" requirements. Let the faculty at each institution determine what is best for them.

One suggestion: There are presently just four core courses listed for the Mathematics area. One other course that seems a suitable addition is PHI X100, Logic. This currently counts for Mathematics credit, and it is, so far as I can tell, taught everywhere in Florida, so it would be easy for institutions to comply with and would give students a bit more flexibility.

I cannot find in the summary for this survey, nor anywhere online re: Gen Ed, a definition or description of this "15-hour statewide core"? So I am at a loss regarding provision of suggestions as requested.

Far too narrow. This exercise greatly diminishes the College experience.

This is a really bad idea and regressive. This is not the road to great education, but to class-in-a-box. Really dreadful idea.

Add other categories including international, diversity, sustainability, and innovation.

I would make sure that higher level courses can satisfy these general ed requirements. For example, if a student starts out with Calculus in freshman year math, then Calculus (which is higher level than Algebra) should be allowed to fulfill the Math requirement. Similarly, a "hard core" Physics class should be allowed to replace an easier Fundamentals of Physics course.

They are too basic for UF's students. This is the fundamental flaw with this proposal--the legislature is, as usual, trying to treat all SUS institutions as equal.

Science and math should not be omitted from the requirements for any degree. Critical thinking skills are paramount for any "educated" citizen and to the future of our state, country and world.

I believe that 50% of one's classes a student's first 3 years should be electives and general education. Senior year should be only (well, can be) of the student's major. It is important for any major/future career and just as importantly, in order to be a well informed citizen with critical thinking skills, to study well outside of one's narrow major focus.

The mathematics courses are extremely narrow minded, and do not reflect properly the skill set needed by students when leaving college. Why not include data mining/analysis techniques? For Natural Sciences, why not include an introduction to programming (C++ is widely used in a large number of professional sectors), and an introduction to data analysis/calculation using Excel, another very widely used program?

Would like some type of 1 credit course regarding well being or adjustment into college. This will help retain students and prevent early drop out, and reduce mental health concerns.

Implement astronomy, which is already widely taught with many very capable, excellent teachers, textbooks, and which is very popular. Students will WANT to take it and they will be excited by it.

Astronomy has long been one of the five core natural sciences. Astronomy should be included among the natural science core gen ed options. "Environmental science" is not really a natural science, but rather an interdisciplinary field combining multiple sciences. Further, concepts from environmental science will already be covered in geoscience, biology, chemistry, astronomy and physics.

These courses seem very limiting. Not much variety or choices

They are too limited

If the committee feels that it must mandate a 15-hour statewide core curriculum, I would like it to give more leeway to institutions to develop these courses on an individual basis. For example, it could mandate 15 credits of core courses in a handful of areas (like art history, philosophy, anthropology), but it should not go so far as specify the names of the course. This will impede our university's ability to evolve with new changes in the fields.

what the heck is chemistry for liberal arts? gen ed shouldn't mean that we've lowered standards.

Only four courses are currently listed in the Mathematics area. It would be sensible and useful for students to add a course in Logic, such as PHI 2100 Logic. This course is taught throughout the SUS and at UF already has a GenEd-M designation.

I find the rule very confusing and difficult to determine how this (15 of the 30 credits must be chosen from a determined set of 25 courses (the General Education Core) consisting of 5 courses in each of the 5 categories) can be successfully accomplished. Significant additional thought and consideration is imperative.

The breadth of the natural sciences is very poorly represented in this proposal and this proposal makes it impossible for students to take advantage of UF's excellent programs in medicine, veterinary, and agricultural sciences (which are lacking at the other Florida schools). If the point of this ruling is to castrate UF and "bring it down" to the level weaker Florida public universities then it is successful. If the point is to make UF better then it is an epic failure.

Why are we doing this? Is there evidence that this is a better curriculum plan than what we currently have? This seems purely political.

To allow each university to develop its own curriculum.

It is not all clear what purpose this new core actually serves.

Expand the Communication area to include AML2070 Survey of American Literature (for which credit can be earned via AP Literature & Composition) and ENC1102 Writing about Literature. Expand Humanities to include THEX000 Theater Appreciation. Natural Sciences should include a lab component and GEOX200 Physical Geography. Social Sciences should include POSX041 American Federal Government and POSX112 American State and Local Government and GEAX000 World Regional Geography

This idea would reduce the wide variety of general education courses available at our large university. I suppose there would be a cost savings, but this would significantly reduce students' option to choose courses of interest to them.

If the intent is to have students participate in a common core of courses, then why not let each university and state college design their own core within a specified number of credits. One size does not fit all. I have every confidence UF could come up with something innovative for our students and one that faculty would enjoy teaching. UF should lobby to get this legislation changed--it is detrimental to our status as an up and coming public university.

We do not offer any of the listed courses so this will negatively impact demand and enrollment for our Gen Ed offerings.

None

The course selection may be too limiting and may not provide the needed course prerequisites for higher level courses in a student's major. If core courses are to be required, provide flexibility and variety in the offerings.

These are both weirdly ambitious and general. One course in world history--when an American student (with quite a high GPA) told me a couple of years ago he thought the civil war happened in the 1960s.

If I understand correctly, the 15-hour core means that a student can take one course in each area and then all but one of the rest in one of the areas with five choices. Of course, if the choices are expanded to at least six --as they should be -- then a student could take all the remaining credits in that area. Then you'd need a rule about those areas, etc., etc.

I don't remember this issue ever being brought to the faculty - as usual. As with everything in Florida, this is a top-down affair. I don't think this plan makes sense for UF or for the state. It's obviously yet another way to streamline college so that the State isn't bankrupted by Bright Futures

I support the idea of creating a Core to help smaller colleges. The larger universities, with a greater pool of talent from which to draw, should be allowed to continue to offer and develop GE courses that enhance and advance the Bachelor's degree experience. Allowing higher numbered courses to substitute for all categories of the Core will ensure that unique program needs are supported.

They would be fine, if we were simply designating those courses as routinely transferable among Florida institutions. However, they are inadequate for meeting core educational needs.

There should not be a state-wide core. Period.

Core principles can be addressed by courses in departments outside the narrow core discipline. Exposure of undergraduate students to faculty from these diverse depts stimulates interest in disciplines without large undergraduate programs. Restricting classes that undergraduates can use to fulfill their core makes UF no better than an online degree mill.

Where are the communications and media and society courses?

Fusing Arts & Humanities makes no sense, as they are longstanding separate colleges for good reason. Many faculty in Art & Music schools are artists and performers rather than academics, so how could we staff this proposal? Many faculty in Art & especially Music do no substantial writing in their careers, and have no experience teaching writing. Humanities faculty are best qualified to teach Humanities courses.

The Communicatoin area only includes written communication (composition). If the definition of Communication is only to include written communication, the earning outcomes should be re-written. The Social Science area is missing a number of fundamental disciplines - economics, religion, geography. More latitude should be given here. Suggest adding microbiology to the Natural Science area or include as an option for Biology

Too limited, and in the case of communications, too basic.

I would like to strongly advocate for the inclusion of 'Introduction to Astronomy' as a core option in the natural sciences. Studies have shown that astronomy is an ideal ``gateway" science, which sparks student interest in not only in astronomy but also engineering and science more generally. Astronomy is one of the most popular general science options at universities nationwide - and is an excellent vehicle for introducing basics like the scientific method.



They need to develop a mechanism that will allow flexibility without compromising academic rigour so that some specialization by school strength so that these strengths are not lost.

While the state discusses increasing STEM degrees, some of these changes will have a negative impact on engineering time to degree, particularly if the higher level courses don't count.

The 15-hour statewide core courses should focus on communications and math and not encompass all 5 categories.

World Literature as a category was abandoned thirty years ago as racist and unbalanced. Why regress?

They are too low in terms of student expectations for many of our students. At a university this large, it will cause unwieldy class sizes, and give students fewer options to take higher level courses in the disciplines.

I do not believe that it is a good idea to mandate specific courses that would be taught at ALL universities.

Will dumb down the curriculum of most Universities.

Require a course in Architecture, such as Architecture History for nonmajors or Architecture and Humanity

We developed HUM 2305. That should be sufficient "introduction to the humanities." It is interdisciplinary and covers everything that the list of 5 humanities courses covers.

Geography spans both the social sciences and natural sciences. However, we are not represented in either cluster's 5 course list.

Please do not write the arts out of the curriculum.

In effect, tell the legislature to deal with areas in which they have expertise. University curricula do not appear to be such an area.

Back up in this process and provide a clear set of values that are to be achieved in this change. Then educate each institution on these values. Currently, this proposal seems to achieve the purpose of dumbing down the stronger universities and elevating the weaker universities.

Legislation to mandate changes in curriculum is difficult especially if this is to be system-wide. Educators need flexibility and such core courses make it impossible for faculty to teach their specialities. For example, World Literature is hard to teach unless team-teaching is employed since members of my department may be experts at one of the "world" literatures, but not all. Each institution offering such common courses would be faced with similar obstructions in fulfilling this requirement.

mandating which gen classes is counter to challenging our students to be the best since they may already have experience in a particular area and thus it becomes a waste of time. There is no one size fits all model that allows a university to create the best most competitive students for an international workforce

It is fundamentally inappropriate for the State Government to micromanage the educational mission of

our universities.

It is clear that the legislature is in good faith attempting to provide a service for our students. However, I feel that their good intentions are somewhat misguided. With all of the internal and external accreditation requirements that already exist, another set of "rules" is not only excessive, but it forces us to become even more rigid than we already are. That conflicts with our goals to become more diverse with our course offerings.

As important as the state/community colleges are, they serve a different role than does a comprehensive research 1 institution like the UF - which is why students want so badly to come to UF after completing two years at one of the two year colleges. Allow UF to preserve it's 'elite' and selective standards. Too much standardization will force the best and the brightest to seek a more rigorous college education at a private university or outside the state.

drop the whole thing. this is another not useful idea developed mostly by people who have no idea what the needs of students or constraints of universities are

It is not at all clear to me that the "same course" can be taught at two different universities. Can a small regional campus really offer the same science courses as the University of Florida? If this is really plausible, then I think that reflects poorly on the UF faculty (sorry!).

Having this requirement will mean fewer students take the excellent gen ed courses that we already have on the books and have worked hard to develop. I do not support the new requirement.

Linguistics should be an option in the social sciences. It would be arbitrary to leave it out while including anthropology and psychology. Similarly for Religion under the Humanities. I'm frankly shocked not to see it there. I also wondered about the absence of a course in Economics, though this might be covered by Political Science in a general course.

It is too narrow: see comments above.

This is the first I've heard of this and I am unaware of why the recommendation was made. Once again, I would urge the committee to look nationwide and worldwide to see where students rank - if we are to truly become a top institution, reducing credit hours for the sake of saving money is counterproductive.

#### **9. What, if any, other concerns should be considered in determining the statewide 15-hour core of the General Education programs?**

General education programs need more, not less rigor. If our students are to learn anything during their time in college, they need to be pushed in areas in which they are not specialized. That is the goal of a university education.

Also, how is this going to be equitable among units at each university? this HAS to be addressed. Depts. offering this core course, regardless of its quality, will get huge enrollments and thus resources from the university and unit without the core courses get left out of shaping the direction of students educations and left out of resources.

The quality of the courses and who is doing the instruction is a concern since these courses will be used in all the state high education institutions.

This statewide core seems to be a "one-size-fits-all" approach. Such approaches rarely work well, especially for something as intangible as higher education. The principle of subsidiarity makes the most sense for our community of scholars. Decisions should be made at the lowest level possible, not the highest. Henry Zmuda COE/ECE

The process of the aforementioned legislation change is lacking sufficient public debate and disclosure. It is an example of an unprecedented top-down policy insensitive to the variable strengths and specializations of each educational institution.

It will cost faculty time by disturbing existing structures. We would have to revise our majors paperwork because Earth Sciences is equivalent to one of our gateway courses Physical Geography. This needs to go through approvals, catalog, etc. It would impact the faculty work already done to bring a course on-line, now likely to have low enrollments due to not being "one of the 5" natural sciences.

Why are there no "International diversity" requirements or "writing" requirements?

I am concerned for departments that currently teach large general education courses, who are not included on the list (Astronomy, Geology, Classics, etc.). This will effect their RCM revenue greatly. Conversely, I am concerned for the departments offering the selected courses and their ability to offer enough sections for general education while also providing a diverse range of classes for their own majors.

The legislature should allow universities to determine curriculum without political interference. This proposal will align community college programs with universities and ignores the fact that these institutions appeal to different kinds of students and should be allowed to maintain differences in terms of curriculum.

There is a lack of diversity in these courses, which is critical to the individuality of the universities.

Just a humble opinion - but I believe that at least one introductory course in basic economics (or business) should be a required for all students.

More important is the clause that the max hours be limited to 120. ABET accreditation requires much more than that so there is a real danger than our accredited programs will lose their accreditations. The intent of the committee is to raise the bar for the schools with low performance and expectations of their students, but they need to change the policy so that it does not bring down the schools with already higher performance and expectations.

Could dramatically impact enrollment of studntns in departments not covered by the listed courses; why not allow other courses that address disciplinary expertise?

There needs to be a methodology in place to ensure that the core courses are updated regularly (potentially annually), in order to keep abreast of changes in the knowledge base

What is the point of this? Requiring community colleges to offer all these listed classes may only add to costs. What are the "cost savings" resulting from this top-down exercise?

I'm still unclear on the reason for this change. It appears to be politically motivated - it certainly has no basis in educational improvement. Some of this may be our fault in higher education - we need to pay better attention to the quality of our general education offerings, and their significance to students in

the 21st century. A review of our general education inventory reveals many courses that are no longer taught or simply no longer relevant - and NONE develop technological knowledge.

The description of each core area requires that students think critically. Yet, most students have not been trained to do so. In other words students have no conception of what constitutes critical thinking. All students should be required to take a rigorous course that defines critical thinking as a discipline, explains the process of critical thinking, and provides experiences for students to practice their critical thinking skills.

Major concerns include the loss of investment of faculty who have developed interesting courses on a variety of topics to fulfill gen ed requirements--they will be directed to focus on intro courses, or else these courses will be taught online or by instructors. The loss of RCM reimbursements as departments watch their enrollments dwindle--to be followed by a decrease faculty. The disconnect between teaching gen ed courses and faculty research expertise at a major research university.

One should consider that this is being forced upon the universities by non-educators who have not considered thoroughly the ramifications. This will do nothing to further the preparedness of Florida's children to compete on an increasingly international stage. It seems to be just another step in an ongoing dumbing down of the Florida educational system to match the prevailing political ideology currently controlling state government. They must realize we will get what we pay for.

Throw the entire thing out and get some qualified researchers/educators to come up with the plan. This is a pathetic extension of high school. It is so embarrassing that we will lose even more faculty to other schools and be unable to replace them. UF is being dragged down.

We have become aware that one size doesn't always fit all in Florida. Standardization can lead to mediocrity.

Don't let the course distribution kill existing departments by using requirements to steer students toward some departments at the expense of others. Departments to which students have little pre-university exposure should be given preferential treatment in the core course distribution. This distribution is vital for, say, philosophy, because students get no exposure to philosophy before college. Phil's primary source of majors is students who gain an interest in phil through core courses

The legislature should stay out of such decisions.

The focus should not be on introductory courses in specific disciplines, but rather to genuine general education courses, which would stress the different modes of inquiry in different disciplines. Real general education courses would not overlap with the introductory course for a particular major.

This process was completed in a backwards fashion. It began as a cost-saving measure instead of a philosophical discussion of what core abilities should be cultivated for all Florida students. Therefore, the result was a turf battle where participating faculty made sure their disciplines were represented in the required list. This measure robs students of choice and individual schools of their identity earned through merit, denying a difference in quality from institution to institution.

Expand the possibilities of potential courses to include a broader spectrum of possibilities..

The approved courses should be varied so students do get a general education in each subject area. Consider common general learning objectives for each course for consistency.

We've got to stop the legislative meddling in education. If we don't stand against it, they will continue to destroy what we should really be doing--educating people. Making people choose from a very limited list of GenED courses and (as has been proposed) trying to force Florida residents to choose STEM majors (by raising tuition in all other majors) does a disservice to Florida residents. Soon there will be no place for liberal arts, creativity, individualism, inspiration.....

15 core hours is not enough variety for students. Isn't the general education requirement to give students the opportunity to experience different disciplines. For example, as an undergrad I had never even heard of the field of Interpersonal Communication. I initially was just taking it to meet a Social and Behavioral Science requirement. I never dreamed that I would focus on this discipline for my career.

I hope other colleges within the universities are included in developing the specific courses.

UF offers a broad range of interesting General Education Courses that have all been approved to fulfill specific distribution requirements. Students may no longer have room in their schedules to take these more interesting "boutique" general education courses. These general education courses are generally designed to showcase interesting aspects of a field so that the student can use the course to help choose a major. That is unlikely to happen with the huge survey courses proposed.

Most graduate students that I have seen are still not able to really complete the objectives set forth under Natural Sciences. Yes, they typically have some idea about what to do. But if they could really use the scientific method to explain the natural world, and thereby design and conduct experiments then they should be able to replace any senior level scientist. So how these lofty goals translate into quantifiable outcomes that are better than the existing core university curricula?

1. The low level of AP (and similar) courses that can be used to satisfy Gen Ed requirements. The FACT that a course taught at one Florida public university or college is NOT equivalent to the same-numbered course taught at another. The whole basis of the articulation agreement is flawed. This is a large part of the reason that public higher ed in Florida is so poor. We are forced to accept credits and prerequisites for students who aren't ready to move on to the next course.

I regret the impact this decision will have on the departments that are already struggling to attract students. I hope the additional courses that will be included with the pre-established ones will represent a wide range of disciplines. Better yet, it would be nice if this list of additional courses could be more "organic" and include the flexibility of our current list of gen-eds.

Will new requirements affect our accreditation?

See above comment.

Also, under "Natural Sciences", what the heck is "Chemistry for Liberal Studies"? Given the criteria for demonstration of competency (see "Initial Draft Recommendations document"), I assure you that NO student who makes "A" in a course like consumer chem or chem for nurses can measure up!

Finally, all articulation agreements made can't and won't make CHM I at UF the same as CHM I at FSU. Heck, this can't be done for different CHM Is at the SAME school. And this is good!

Agriculture offerings are neglected in this proposal. Most of these are science based and it is crucial that students gain an understanding of where their food comes from and how agriculture impacts their lives.

Ask, would Harvard do it? Would other GREAT state universities do it? How does this really advance the idea of quality in higher education? I can't see how this helps.

Engineering students already have an extremely tight curriculum. I think it's great to try to ensure that engineering students get a broad education, but you can't increase the number of credit hours beyond the current number. And if you eliminate some engineering courses from the curriculum, we may not get accreditation the next time around. So this issue needs to be investigated thoroughly before these new requirements are applied to engineering undergrads.

The new Good Life course should be addressed as part of this new scheme--what is its place amid these core courses?

Undergraduates should be prepared for an ever changing and dynamic future with many unknowns. A diverse background in the "liberal arts" and science will at least expose them to the tools available and the thought processes they will require to be successful. To provide them with any lesser "education" would be malpractice. Moreover, the world's successful future will depend on the occurrence of such "educated" citizens. .

It is not only about marketability. I believe that 50% of one's classes a student's first 3 years should be electives and general education. Senior year should be only (well, can be) of the student's major. It is important for any major/future career and just as importantly, in order to be a well informed citizen with critical thinking skills, to study well outside of one's narrow major focus.

I am shocked these types of courses (especially if it was an introductory course) would not be included in any GE category: public speaking. Music (learning/playing an instrument; singing). Foreign languages. Physical education (nutrition; food preparation; PE class) Business..... To provide a more well rounded education these seem very important.

It is not obvious how educators will interpret the broad categories of Earth Science and Environmental Science. These are very ambiguous--just the opposite of what we want for a relative uniform curriculum. They will cause confusion, and in fact will lead to a decline in quality.

If this law stands, UF should find some way to obey the letter of the law, without dumbing down our curriculum or reducing student choice. E.g., Maybe we could offer six sections/versions of "Intro to XXX", with different emphases, so that students could still choose a version of the course that would be particularly interesting to them.

This entire process is a joke and violates faculty control of the curriculum. It is time for the UF administration to take leadership in restoring faculty supervision of the curriculum.

The timing should allow for an assessment of the impact of these changes upon the funding models at the schools (i.e. RCM at UF) to avoid dramatic, unintended consequences. Obviously this mandate is going to cause a significant shift in student credit hours amongst departments and colleges.

The core courses seem to be restricted mainly to the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences. As a member of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences - this is very limiting and seems to restrict some of our

general education courses from being included. I am sure that other colleges at UF that offer general education courses feel excluded.

Do not agree with the premise nor the process that lead to this decision.

I do not understand what problems have led the FL legislators to create this statewide committee. If I knew what problems they were responding to, I would be able to give more constructive input from my own extensive background to fixing higher education in Florida. I would like a more open dialogue with the legislature and board of governors that takes our expertise as professional educators seriously. I do not understand what pedagogical experience these individuals have.

The first concern listed above should be considered before moving forward to 'other concerns'. The rule can have a detrimental effect on the student if not properly thought out.

This proposal will undoubtedly weaken the special strengths of UF and damage departments which are already more focused on graduate education. The long term consequences of this have NOT been adequately discussed. There will be negative, long-term consequences for UF and for the state if this proposal is successful. I am very sad to see this going through

As comments on the Senate blog have indicated, the incursion of the legislature into our curriculum is alarming. Is it even legal? The list of "vanilla" courses does not take into account race, class, gender and other issues considered too "fraught" for a general mandate. Course titles oftentimes are not indicative of quality of content. I am personally appalled that this mandate will dictate our academic programs.

The University of Florida currently imposes requirements for International and Diversity focus courses as well as Gordon rule requirements. These are not consistent with the propose core classes, as fewer than half of these meet Gordon Rule writing requirements, less than half meet an international focus and none at all satisfy diversity credit. This will cause serious advising problems and inevitably lead to students taking excess courses to meet these Gen Ed requirements.

Enrollment in a potentially large number of current Gened courses will be adversely affected, perhaps resulting in the termination of the course and a resultant lack of diversity in course offerings.

this mandate does not advance higher learning.

This project is the folly of an uninformed legislature. Is there a problem that fits this "solution"? The foreseeable consequences - intended or unintended - are to the detriment of students, faculty, departments, institutions, and the system. I see no alignment or articulation with the K-12 initiative, which would at least lend legitimacy to the outcome.

Same as above.

There are excellent instructors at each state university. How can a statewide core take advantage of these great instructors!

Hard to imagine that State and Local Government and Federal Government were omitted from the Social Science group. Research has repeatedly shown that students know little about how government works. We are educating the next generation of citizens!

This requirement is a needless, mindless leveling down of a requirement that is not at all appropriate for a university with students of the quality that enter UF. Additionally it does not allow for faculty

development of new and interesting courses

Some of the current courses students enjoy most may end up being eliminated due to the limits imposed by the state, especially if new courses have to be developed.

We do not offer any of the listed courses so this will negatively impact demand and enrollment for our Gen Ed offerings.

Looks good to me!

These changes are going to have a major impact on graduate education and the sorts of work that graduate students do while in their programs. I would suggest that special attention be paid to this part of the picture. Also, I would encourage the state to refrain from issuing any syllabi requirements. Those decisions are best made by the faculty and the university curriculum committees.

The best gen ed courses are not canned courses with predetermined syllabi. They are courses that emerge from the specific scholarship and issues that are ongoing and change constantly. Certainly, such courses can and should be formulated to meet broad goals that qualify them for inclusion under the gen ed rubric. But lockstep courses rarely generate much enthusiasm over time. And any course that does not include substantial student writing or similar detailed work (and feedback) is useless

I am hopeful that the spirit of the legislation is not to limit the post-secondary experience, but ensure that the Core courses are accepted at all Florida institutions.

(1) Students need and expect greater flexibility, not less. (2) Quality of instruction is contingent upon the expertise and interest of available teaching faculty. Forcing all students through a small number of courses will require more faculty dedicated to those courses, pushing faculty into teaching courses in which they have little interest. Forcing disinterested students into large, generic classes, taught by disinterested faculty is NOT a recipe for a "top 10" university.

State mandated curricular control is wrong headed and should be avoided at all costs. Curricular decisions like these should remain strictly in the hands of individual institutions.

This micromanagement technique is merely meant as a way to reduce the number of faculty. It is a purely economic decision and reduces the quality of our educational system. It is highly unlikely that UF could meet any "top 10" criteria should this type of curriculum fiat become the norm. It is an educational power grab for the sake of redirecting funds away from a truly liberal arts education and the new intended focus of vocational training - we'll have a state of widget installers!

If students are still going to be required to take 3 credits of international and 3 credits of diversity, the institutions should try to have some of the core courses fulfill these also.

This is not a good policy. Innovation should be the hallmark of a top 10 university--not standardization to the lowest levels

The State needs to consider the different cultures in different Colleges & disciplines, and ensure that we could meet staffing needs and offer students the writing instruction they need in GenEd.

The ability of campuses to have expectation for their students that are unique to that campus and allow students to develop a common general education experience.



Apparently we are catering to the lowest common denominator with these courses. We need more rigor.

This entire idea of making all universities and colleges offer and require the same 15-hour core set of courses is misguided and is micromanagement of the worst kind.

Is this really an issue the legislature should be writing laws about?

How reducing the General Education requirement will impact providing students with a well rounded undergraduate experience. One should ask will reducing the general education further corrode the bachelors degree.

Standard syllabi don't work and never have.

Does one size really fit all?

If Yale and Harvard and Oxford can have different requirements, why can't the state institutions?

That there was not enough time for broad faculty engagement and input before courses were selected and proposals finalized. This does not bode well for how Florida is viewed in the nation – with significant legislative manipulating of the higher education system, seemingly on a whim. Why weren't we, as faculty, notified that this was being discussed before it became law?

It feels like we are being asked to teach high school. I

Departments should not be prohibited from offering one of the core courses just because they traditionally did not offer a course of that particular prefix. Faculty in Geography are very capable of teaching ESC X000 even though traditionally, we teach under prefixes of GEO, GEA, GIS, and MET.

One-size-fits-all prescriptions dictated directly from the legislature to the university system are always problematic, and this is no exception.

Overall, this is a very bad idea. The students at UF have a variety of backgrounds and needs. Standardizing the GE programs means that the students will not receive the optimal set of courses that us advisors suggest they take. It takes away one of the benefits of our large universities.

This is pandering to the least common denominator. Lowering expectations.  
No diversity. No arts.

Seems to me that UF Gen-Ed has covered the core pretty well in the past. May need tweaking a bit but the bottom line should be - what is the best way to educate students? Harvard has played with its Gen Ed a bit over the years and has survived. Surely we can too. You need to go beyond departmental protectionism which will be in the minds of many people. There may be winners and losers, as there are with RCM. In the end, the President may need to tweak RCM for equity purposes.

Removing uniqueness of educational content and missions of each Florida institution; the origin of this change does not seem to have been motivated within the universities themselves but is, rather, politically motivated; RCM will dictate decisions in General Education, rather than strong values in educational excellence; removing any opportunities for Colleges to deliver a required first- or second-year course within major (essential in Engineering, for example, to ensure retention of students)

What will students gain being taught core courses e.g. World Lit? Shallow, broad treatment of literature yields little substance when instructors must stretch into areas where their expertise does not reach. Cursory treatment of World Lit gains little but probing deeper into areas of expertise will yield greater instructor performance. Who has the training to teach such a survey course? Doctoral degrees focus on narrow areas of expertise so let us teach those specialized areas over worldsurveys.

Given University of Florida's high university ranking, despite being handicapped by lower funds as compared to its contemporaries, it does not appear that imposing new requirements on the university makes sense. Appropriate leadership in this case would defer to those who have extensive subject-matter experience in the area, and who have been producing good results even in the face of declining resources.

I am concerned with the courses chosen for each area. In many, these do not seem like high level courses (i.e., MAC1105) but rather remedial high school courses. If the state wants to have a common list of courses, it needs to be a rigorous list, not remedial.

see above

There needs to be more time to gather considered input from all stakeholders: there may be many unintended consequences of hasty changes.

General education core should be somewhat variable depending upon the specialization of the student. Mandating a set of courses will erode the flexibility in general education and I do not see a merit for such a mandate.

The enormous impact on quality of education at UF!

Think about the AP courses. Will they be accepted for these requirements?

Consider effects beyond narrower student education:

- 1) departments / colleges will either 'win' or 'lose' by being selected to offer THE gen-ed course in their subject area
- 2) new faculty recruitment will suffer - candidates will steer clear of having teaching options tightly mandated
- 3) ditto for graduate student recruitment - students benefit from teaching a diversity of courses in their field
- 4) Current faculty have devoted much effort to developing gen-ed courses - this will be wasted.

As noted above, it is not surprising that the 15 credit core courses identified include a large number of the courses offered by the committee members. Perhaps we should take a look at what is best for our students, not our committee members.

This is micro-management at its worst. What will happen is that the state will have a mandated set of courses. Students will have to take them whether they are any good or not, whether they fit their needs and interests or not. Such mandates undermine attention to quality.

It makes sense to mandate that all university students must have x credits in physical sciences, x in natural sciences, x in writing, x in math, x in humanities. But mandating the exact course titles is ridiculous. I assume educators in other states are laughing at Florida over this.

What about the education of the students? Teaching less is not beneficial to the students. They are almost uneducated as it is. fewer courses will make them less educated, not more.

