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The FGCU faculty and staff engaged in a robust process to obtain feedback on the proposed subject area competencies and core courses in the draft recommendations provided by the Steering Committee on December 20, 2012. The process included multiple means of soliciting input. These included:

- Several emails to all faculty and staff encouraging direct participation
- A Learning Management System discussion page organized by subject area
- Discussions facilitated by the Director of General Education, representatives from FGCU’s General Education Council, and representatives from the state-level subject-area faculty committees at the following meetings during the first three weeks of January:
  o Select departmental meetings
  o Faculty Senate
  o Three of the five all faculty college meetings
  o One college Leadership Team meeting
  o Dean’s Council
- Response from department chairs and program leaders to a draft summary report.

The following report provides summary feedback from the above-mentioned forums. An appendix offers all individual feedback collected.
Communication

Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively.
Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze communication critically.

ENC X101 English Composition I

FGCU Faculty feedback on Communication:

1. There is resounding support for having Composition I and II required of our students. Thus by only having Composition I in the state-mandated list, FGCU will likely include a requirement for students to take Composition II, or some version of a course or selection of courses that teach(es) students written communication skills.

2. The Communication competencies should be specific to writing, given the selection of the core course. As such, the competencies should be revised:
   - Students will demonstrate the ability to write effectively or "...demonstrate the ability to communicate through effective writing."
   - Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze written communication critically.

Humanities

Students will demonstrate interpretive ability and cultural literacy.
Students will demonstrate competence in reflecting critically upon the human condition.

ARH X000 Art Appreciation
HUM X020 Introduction to Humanities
LIT X100 Introduction to World Literature
MUL X010 Introduction to Music Literature/Music Appreciation
PHI X010 Introduction to Philosophy

FGCU Faculty Feedback on Humanities:

1. The Communication/Philosophy team leaders endorse Introduction to Humanities and Introduction to Philosophy as statewide core course options.

2. Introduction to World Literature (LIT X100) is too narrow to be practical as a statewide requirement, because it focuses on World Literature to the 17th Century (see statewide course description). The far better option is Introduction to Literature (LIT X000). LIT X000 arms a Gen Ed population with the critical terminology necessary to interpret poetry and prose. It seeks to ignite and foster a love of all literature in students. The focus is to ground students' forays into the world of college-level literary studies with the appropriate critical and theoretical context, and to help them build basic literary arguments with texts from various genres.

   To make Introduction to World Literature (with its period restriction) the required course would be a) to limit the number of faculty who would feel comfortable teaching the subject matter, b) to cause faculty to contort themselves unnecessarily to fit the state's requirement, and c) to limit students' exposure to English and American texts that would resonate with them. LIT X000 would be a more inclusive course in terms of staffing, subject matter, and student interest. Requiring World Lit as our sole statewide LIT course would be like requiring that all students take a single type of writing course (e.g., Nature Writing) instead of
Comp I and Comp II, which generally cover a multitude of types of writing assignments/genres, including Nature Writing.

3. The Steering Committee is encouraged to consider proposing a sixth course option in the list of Humanities courses to accommodate Introduction to Theater (THE X020). At FGCU this is a popular online course that is under revision to use open-access texts, thus providing cost savings and promoting distance learning.

---

**Mathematics**

*Students will determine appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving, and demonstrate an understanding of mathematical concepts.*

*Students will apply appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving.*

- MAC X105  College Algebra
- STA X023  Statistical Methods
- MGF X106  Liberal Arts Mathematics I
- MGF X107  Liberal Arts Mathematics II

---

**FGCU Faculty Feedback on Mathematics:**

1. The two Mathematics competencies may be too much alike. Wouldn’t students need to determine those models and methods in order to apply the right ones in problem-solving? The Steering Committee might consider changing the wording of the first competency to clarify the difference between the two: *"Students will recognize [or differentiate between] a variety of appropriate . . ."* might get at the spirit of this competency. Then it’s clear that Objective Two, *"Students will apply . . .,"* refers to a totally different skill. This will aid in the assessment process that will surely follow.

2. Because there are only four courses in the list, Elementary Calculus (MAC X233) and/or Calculus I (MAC X311) should be added to accommodate students in programs within the SUS that require/expect students to master higher level math content. Examples at FGCU include STEM and Business majors. This underscores the importance of the proposed “higher level” language.

---

**Natural Sciences**

*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.*

*Students will successfully recognize and comprehend fundamental concepts, principles, and processes about the natural world.*

- BSC X005  General Biology
- CHM X020  Chemistry for Liberal Studies
- PHY X020  Fundamentals of Physics
- ESC X000  Introduction to Earth Science
- EVR X001  Introduction to Environmental Science
FGCU Faculty Feedback on Natural Sciences:

1. The proposed Chemistry course, Chemistry for Liberal Studies (CHM X020), presents a tremendous strain in terms of resources for FGCU’s Chemistry program, because it would involve developing a new course, hiring additional faculty, scheduling of additional labs (if a lab is added/required) and lecture space, and acquiring additional lab resources (if a lab is added/required). In lieu of this course, General Chemistry I (CHM X045) should be allowed.

2. Faculty are concerned about the generated effects of having mandated courses that are significantly different in content from those we currently teach at FGCU. We worry such shifts will be inconsistent with faculty disciplinary strengths, and resources. A few examples include:
   a. We have much faculty effort dedicated to teaching Marine Systems; there is no state-mandated course with a comparable subject area.
   b. We offer many sections of Environmental Biology of Southwest Florida (BSC X051C). Introduction to Environmental Science is on the state list, and this is something we teach but to a much more limited audience. Our faculty could handle such a change—the same people qualified to teach Environmental Biology of SW Florida are qualified to teach intro Environmental Science. However, the former course is critical to our students’ sense of place—environmental scientific principles and methods but focused here in our region. This change, therefore, doesn’t create a staffing hardship, but would cause a disruption in our FGCU Mission-driven philosophical approach.
   c. Our Physics / Astronomy teaching effort is very demanding of our small faculty in these disciplines. These faculty teach General Physics I and II and College Physics I and II, and these serve as general education courses. The constituents in these courses, however, are almost entirely required to take these courses for their STEM majors. We would not have the staffing to teach Fundamentals of Physics as a mandated course, as we would be obligated to continue to support the STEM majors.

3. Very few Universities offer Earth Science (ESC X000); FGCU does not have this class on the books. In fact, only three other SUS institutions offer this course (UF, UNF, FAMU). Instead we all offer Introduction to Geology (GLY X000 or X010; at FGCU this is called Physical Geology), which is required for numerous degrees. To clarify, Earth Science is a combination of geology, astronomy, and meteorology. Introduction to Geology has little to no astronomy and meteorology content. Introduction to Geology would be a better general education course because of the following: 1) it is offered at every SUS school, 2) it is required for all state-wide geology programs and environmental engineering programs, 3) it is required for some Environmental Studies programs, and is commonly taken by Civil Engineering majors, and 4) Earth Science is not required for any degree in the SUS. Lastly, FGCU does not have the staffing to cover a mandated Earth Science course, and would have a difficult time altering our commitments to these other introductory courses.

4. The Natural Sciences section of General Education should include lab experiences. The current General Education program mandates completion of a science course including a lab. The new General Education curriculum should not be a step backwards. The laboratory component of a science course provides students with the opportunity for hands on learning and for the opportunity to better understand the work and process of science. Lab experience is a vital part of science.

   For example, the lab for GLY X100 (or X010) is integral in students’ learning, as it is for most Natural Science courses. Without integration of the lab they cannot get the breadth and depth of the material covered in the courses.
Social Science

Students will demonstrate the ability to examine behavioral, social, and cultural issues from a variety of points of view.

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.

PSY X012  Introduction to Psychology
SYG X000  Principles of Sociology
WOH X040  20th Century World History
CPO X001  Comparative Politics
ANT X000  Introduction to Anthropology

FGCU Faculty Feedback on Social Science:

1. It is the consensus of the Sociology program that Social Problems (SYG X010) is a more appropriate core course in a General Education Program than Principles of Sociology (SYG X000). Social Problems covers more specific issues that would allow the recommended competencies to be demonstrated. Some of the material covered in an "Introduction to Sociology" course would not lend itself to historical aspects or local issues, for example, since it focuses more on grasping the principles of the discipline in the abstract than applying them to specific behaviors or occurrences. The added advantage of social problems is that it makes it possible to draw on the theoretical perspectives and principles in covering relevant topical issues. This could also be done in an intro class, but one would be able to cover only a small part of the syllabus if one adopted that approach. And, the topical structure of Social Problems (seen for example in textbook design) would more easily align with the recommended competencies. Lastly, many more students take this course across the SUS and FCS.

2. It is the consensus of the History program at FGCU that the recommendation of 20th Century World History (WOH X040) is inappropriate as one of the core Social Science courses. The course is too narrow and restrictive in its focus on a single century in human history. Each of the other recommended social science courses are broad in scope, and it is especially ironic that the history course has the least historical perspective and content of all the proposed courses. It is impossible to understand the historical processes of the 20th century without understanding issues such as the rise of free-market capitalism, the industrial revolution, European colonialism and imperialism, all of which pre-date the 20th century. Students cannot understand key 20th century events such as the Holocaust, World War I and II, decolonization, the Cold War, civil rights, and feminism without understanding the deeper historical roots on which these movements were predicated.

It is important for students to know about the ancient past, the medieval world, or the age of discovery and exploration, or the renaissance and reformation, to list just a few critical historical topics which will be missing if only the 20th century is covered by historians. There is no other place in any of the subject lists where the pre-20th century world is discussed at all, and this will sadly restrict the ability of students to understand the range and breadth of human experiences—surely one of the key goals of social science learning competencies. Some historians would even question whether the immediate contemporary world (the post-1960 era in particular) can even be properly explained by historical methods, which depend on distance in time and access to a full range of primary sources. How can students learn about historical
causality or change over time when such a small period of time is the only topic of consideration.

More appropriate to a well-rounded General Education program would be a course that has no chronological restrictions, such as “Introduction to World History,” where a range of time periods and geographical locations can be engaged. Alternatively, “Introduction to History” would be an appropriate type of course. It could present the basics of historiography, historical methodologies, and writing history papers, and the historical content of the course could center on the time period and geographical expertise of the instructor teaching a given section.

3. An understanding of how different political systems around the world function should be an important aspect of our general education program, but the choice of Comparative Politics as a state-mandated general education course will impact our department (Public Affairs) significantly. Our faculty is adapted to delivering many sections (6-8 per year) of American National Government, and now this particular expertise has been rendered less valuable by the selection of Comparative Politics. This is a problem of academic creative destruction. We have to create or recruit new Comparative Politics expertise while shedding American National Government teaching capacities. We would probably do this by means of recruiting new adjuncts and discontinuing other adjunct assignments. We will also have to redistribute teaching assignments among our core faculty, with our comparativists now having to bear far more of the general education teaching load.

Even with these adjustments, however, we would almost certainly lack the faculty resources to meet the demand that would result from making Comparative Politics one of five social science general education courses. The administration would need to make more faculty resources available to our department in order for us to be able to meet the new teaching obligations that would arise from this change.

The difficulty of the proposals now under consideration arises from having a short list of required General Education courses, which is going to create an onerous teaching commitment for any department that offers one of these courses. Indeed, we would face faculty resource constraints even if our Social Science General Education course was changed from Comparative Politics to American National Government. Ultimately, a satisfactory resolution to revising General Education requirements must lie with increasing the number of courses that can satisfy a particular area (e.g., social science) requirement.

We believe that the focus of Social Science General Education should be comparative and global, but this can be done through numerous courses that distribute teaching responsibilities across a broad range of departments and faculty members. This involves revising the extant legislation. We urge this approach.

4. The omission of an Economics course in the recommendations for core courses in Social Sciences is highly problematic. Economics courses help students understand how public policy decisions affect them (financially and otherwise). They need this basic understanding to make personal financial decisions, whether they are business majors or not.

Further, having Economics in the General Education course offerings is an established best practice followed by almost all tier-1 universities. We put Florida students at a relative disadvantage by excluding economics. Without an understanding of the basic principles of economics, a large segment of Florida students run the risk of being ill equipped in making decisions on a daily basis that most of the time involve some aspect of economics.

Most public policy has direct and/or indirect economic effects on the lives of individuals. An understanding of those effects will lead to more intelligent civic engagement and better policy choices. By excluding economics from the core course options, Florida students will not be prepared well for reasoned civic engagement.

Economics is the social science that best connects with STEM disciplines.
The American Council of Trustees and Alumni recommends Economics as one of only
seven subject areas that are essential for a general education curriculum (along with
Composition, Literature, Mathematics, Science, US Government or History, and Foreign
Language). Note that economics is the only social science discipline on that list that is not
included in the current draft of the Gen Ed core.

Dropping economics from the Gen Ed curriculum would have a disproportionately
adverse effect on students choosing to major in one particular college (Business) as they would
lose their ability to count the two required economics courses toward their Gen Ed
requirements. Further, having economics available as an option for students to fulfill their social
science requirement provides an opportunity for students outside of business to be exposed to
the subject. Some of these students may decide to pursue economics as a minor. To the extent
that this occurs, the learning environment in our economics offerings will benefit from the influx
of diverse views brought by these students who otherwise might not be part of our program.

Thus, it is recommended that the Steering Committee consider proposing the addition
of a sixth course option that would include Economics, specifically Survey of Economics (ECO
X000), or Micro-Economics (ECO X023), or changing the current list of courses.

---

Proposed “Higher Level” Language
*For the mathematics and natural science core course options, the following policy should apply:

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.

---

FGCU Faculty Feedback on Proposed “Higher Level” Language:
1. For clarity, the “higher level” language should be changed as follows:
   “. . . 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.”
2. This “higher level” language is vital to majors within Biology (as one example) if they are to
   complete their degrees within the allotted 120 hours. It would also make no sense for a Biology
   major to take both BSC X005 and the state common prerequisites for a degree in Biology.
3. The proposal to add wording to the Mathematics and Natural Sciences categories is imperative
to prevent significant harm to STEM students. In addition, there are students in particular
Humanities programs that may also be forced to take extra credits and, potentially, deal with
the Excess Hours fee—Music majors as well as, potentially, Art majors.

---

FGCU Feedback on Proposed Competencies:
1. On the Nature of Science: before students can accomplish the first competency, they need to
   understand the Nature of Science and how science is distinct from other disciplines. This is far
   more important for a General Education program than having students analyze the scientific
method (which tends to get memorized). For those unfamiliar with the distinction between the scientific method and the nature of science, key concepts involved in the nature of science include the ideas that:

a. science has limits
b. science contains inherent uncertainty
c. science can be misused and contain biases
d. and science is a social process

Reliability in science lies in understanding its nature.

Having a general education outcome based on the nature of science also dovetails nicely with the Next Generation Science Standards for K-12, which can be found at nextgenscience.org.

A revised competency reflecting these concerns might read: “Students will demonstrate an understanding of the nature of science through model construction, data analysis, explanation development, and argumentation via evidence.”

FGCU Feedback on Assessment:

1. Since we will share outcomes and courses across institutions, will we be sharing assessment instruments or approaches? Who will develop them or decide on them? The skills-based competencies (e.g., in the Humanities, “Students will demonstrate interpretive ability . . .” and “Students will demonstrate competence in reflecting critically upon the human condition”) will require assessment beyond simple multiple choice instruments and probably preclude large enrollment Gen Ed courses. These changes require pedagogy and assessment that will be more expensive, assuming we are committed to quality General Education programs.

Additional Questions/Concerns from FGCU:

1. The programs this legislation intends to help the most are actually helped the least by it. The few undergraduate programs where completion of requirements within the 120-hour rule is a real issue are almost all from the STEM areas. STEM students have a decent amount of overlap between their current General Education offerings and their common pre-requisites and major requirements. The structure of the new General Education curriculum will reduce the amount of overlap, actually causing these students to take extra courses. The extra 6 hours that this law “gives” to students in these programs will not actually help them complete their degrees faster, because the new framework eliminates much of the opportunity to “double dip” Gen Ed and STEM common prerequisites requirements. STEM students will simply have to take the same math and science prerequisites they are currently taking; it’s just that they will no longer be covering Gen Ed requirements with them. So students in those majors will take exactly the same time to degree under this new system, if it is designed well. If it is not designed well, they will take longer.

2. If the “higher level” language is adopted, who will make the determination of whether local courses are indeed “higher level?” Who will these appeals go to?

3. The Steering Committee is encouraged to think about how the core course selections work within the current trend for top high school students to earn General Education credit through dual enrollment and AP courses. As currently proposed, some of the core Gen Ed courses have AP equivalents, and some do not. Students fulfilling a significant portion of their General Education courses in high school, would likely lessen the rigor of General Education.
4. Currently, the majority of FGCU students overlap their Communication and Computation Skills with General Education. It seems the new General Education program will limit students' ability to continue this "double dipping" with Gen Ed Humanities and Social Sciences.

Implementation Concerns:

1. By BOG Regulation 8.014, each baccalaureate degree program must be 120 hours unless granted an exception by the BOG. This 120 hours includes common prerequisite (Regulation 8.010), general education, and specified computation and mathematics requirements (Regulation 6.017, formerly Gordon Rule). Currently, foreign language is not included the 120 hours, but it may be in the future.

2. Some programs, especially those that are mathematics- and science-based, have very few or no unspecified electives. This means that we must double count courses to ensure that all state and university requirements are met within the 120 hours. The common prerequisites are determined by faculty committees and the Articulation Coordinating Committee (see Common Prerequisite Manual at www.flvc.org). The Common Prerequisite Manual includes approved substitutions for some courses, which allows institutions and students to be flexible yet ensure that the content is covered.

3. In SCNS terms, a course is identified by a particular prefix and number. Both SCNS and degree-audit mechanics (CAPP, DegreeWorks) look for a particular prefix/number match. Consequently, WOH X040 20th Century World History will not be satisfied by WOH 1023 World Civilizations 1500-1815, which is what FGCU currently offers. There are also issues related to equivalency and field reviews.

4. There will need to be considerable time allocated for revising our degree audit and advising processes to accommodate such a drastic revision in General Education requirements. Our basic distribution structure has not changed since opening, so this is new territory.

5. The current articulation guidelines, based on Florida Statute 1007.23, essentially divide the 120 hour program into 60 hours and 60 hours. For any baccalaureate degree program, the first 60 hours consist of general education, common prerequisites, and unspecified electives. The last 60 hours consist of university requirements (for example, IDS 3920 Colloquium), required courses and electives for the major/concentration, and unspecified electives if necessary to get to 120 hours. FGCU cannot require any hours beyond 60 in order to accommodate articulation. This is true for both transfer and native students. In reality, students may take these courses at various times in their academic program, not necessarily during the first or last 60 hours.
Appendix:

Faculty feedback from Angel forums and direct email communications
The draft recommendations for subject-area competencies and core course(s) include:

**Communication**

*Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively. Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze communication critically.*

**ENC X101 English Composition I**

In the discussion forum below, please provide your feedback on the implications of the recommended competencies and core courses. Keep in mind that the state-level recommendations are pertinent only to the state mandated 15 hours of the 30 hour General Education Curriculum, and that we will have the opportunity to develop additional course offerings in this subject area in our General Education program. Also, the most valuable feedback in this stage of the process is that which conveys concerns or questions about program- and/or department-level implications.

**Composition II**  1/18/2013  9:51 AM
Author:  
Score:  --  Rating:  --  Flag:  --

Following up on my earlier post - Comp. II should be the only course in the FGCU list to ensure that student take Comp. I (State list) and Comp. II (FGCU list).

**Communications**  1/17/2013  5:42 PM
Author:  
Score:  --  Rating:  --  Flag:  --

Comp. II needs to be in the FGCU list: We all know that our students need support in writing and understanding what they read.

**RE: Communications**  1/18/2013  11:46 AM
Author:  
Score:  --  Rating:  --  Flag:  --

Agreed. Employers comment that our students lack writing and reading comprehension skills. English Comp II should be included as a GEN ED course.

**Forcing universities to choose Comp II as one of 30 Gen Ed hours...**  1/15/2013  7:59 AM
Author:  
Score:  --  Rating:  --  Flag:  --

The requirement of all universities for Comp I is really a process to force universities to require Comp II as part of the University's 15 flexible hours in Gen Ed. While this will have the same effect as the previous model of Gen Ed (where we chose the courses, and of course, we included Comp I and Comp II), it is forcing us to choose these 6 hours of communication in a smaller field - a field of 30 hours rather than 60 hours. Although I am confident that FGCU would make the choice to add Comp II to the Gen Ed list, I would be very concerned if the state went through all of this work and then kept a process where a state institution (state college) would grant an AA degree without Comp I and Comp II. If our students cannot communicate effectively, the rest is pointless.
I am confused by this; are you trying to eliminate Composition II altogether? If so, I ask that you reconsider. Students must know how to write, communicate, research, and think critically in order to succeed in any other course they take. If you have seen how many of our students write when they first come into college, you know that they are severely lacking in these skills. Studies have shown that students make bigger gains in these necessary skills during Comp I and II than they do during any other course or year. Even with the two courses, we are barely able to cover what we need to in order to help them succeed to their fullest potential, especially because we spend a lot of time in Comp I just trying to break bad habits they have picked up in K-12. If anything, they need to spend MORE time in Composition, not less. I feel that taking away a Composition course would be detrimental not only to the students, but to the faculty of other subjects because then they are then spending time teaching basic writing essentials that would have been picked up in Comp. and less time on Biology, History, etc.

Again, I realize that there is a current emphasis on STEM courses and careers, but that does not mean that communications should be eliminated. The ability to write and communicate well only enhances the potential performance in STEM careers, not cripples it. The same goes for anything in the arts and humanities, which also has been demonstrated time and time again. Florida's students have already been hurt by taking away the arts and by the emphasis on formulaic five-paragraph writing structures which only stifle their abilities and creativity. Let's not continue to hurt them more by taking away classes that allow them to grow.
COMMUNICATION

What if a student places out of English Composition I? There is no additional draft statement listed, as it is for mathematics and the natural sciences, so I was not sure what the thought process on that was.

(1/10/13)

Add Composition II to the state list

(1/17/13)

*****

One common theme that I have observed is a weakness in some students when it comes to communicating as well as analytical and critical thinking. So, it is my belief that more courses in oral and written communication as well as Philosophy, where analytical and critical thinking are cultivated, would be very beneficial for the students.

(1/10/13)

*****

After the meeting that you had last Friday, Maggie Hambrick, Maria Roca and I spoke about the verbiage of the “Communication” part of the document. As the communication being referred to is really about Composition class, two suggested changes that we’d like to see are:

1. “Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively.” Should be changed to, “...demonstrate the ability to write effectively” OR “...demonstrate the ability to communicate through effective writing.”

2. “Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze communication critically.” Should be changed to, “Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze written communication critically.”

(1/25/13)

*****
The draft recommendations for subject-area competencies and core courses include:

**Humanities**

*Students will demonstrate interpretive ability and cultural literacy.*

*Students will demonstrate competence in reflecting critically upon the human condition.*

ARH X000  Art Appreciation
HUM X020  Introduction to Humanities
LIT X100  Introduction to World Literature
MUS X010  Introduction to Music Literature/Music Appreciation
PHI X010  Introduction to Philosophy

In the discussion forum below, please provide your feedback on the implications of the recommended competencies and core courses. Keep in mind that the state-level recommendations are pertinent only to the state mandated 15 hours of the 30 hour General Education Curriculum, and that we will have the opportunity to develop additional course offerings in this subject area in our General Education program. Also, the most valuable feedback in this stage of the process is that which conveys concerns or questions about program- and/or department-level implications.

**Learning outcomes and class sizes**

Author: [Redacted]  1/22/2013 12:55 AM  
Rating: --  
Flag: --

Regarding the Humanities field, I see the following challenges. The stated learning outcomes call on students to demonstrate cultural literacy, interpretive ability, and critical reflection. These are sound learning outcomes very appropriate to the subject area. However, interpretive ability and critical reflection will only be assessed and developed adequately through writing assignments and/or artistic production/performance. These outcomes will *not* work with the assessment methods we typically use in large enrollment courses, such as scantron tests, factual-comprehensive question types, etc.

The challenge here is that the Humanities area is currently the home of some of our largest Gen Ed courses at FGCU. This is not only the case for HUM 2510, but for numerous other 180, 150, 125 or 90 student courses in the humanities fields. If we are going to assess the stated learning outcomes as given in the Gen Ed document, then we would need to reconfigure the courses on the state list as writing intensive classes. This is already the case in a couple of the FGCU equivalents of these listed courses, but not for the others. We could still run large cap humanities courses on our local list, of course. But the net effect would be to lower the average section size in the Humanities Gen Ed field, and hence lower the average for gen ed in general. The Administration would need to be prepared for the resource implications of this change.

This may be a case where there is a mismatch between the staffing model at the research I campuses and the situation at the regional schools. At UF or FSU, it would be possible to assess these outcomes in a large enrollment course, because those schools have a graduate program in almost every field and can thus supply TAs or graders to handle the writing requirement. FGCU and other regional schools do not have such graduate resources. Hence, we will either have to lower our class sizes in at least the state half of our humanities requirement; or we will go on with our present large caps in humanities, in which case we'll be forced to pretend that we fulfill the learning outcomes when in reality we will not.

One issue that was not addressed in the state Gen ed document is how the Writing Intensive course requirement would map on to the proposed new Gen Ed structure. Part of the issue I mentioned above with the Humanities learning outcomes would be addressed if the state specified that the Humanities list courses have to be writing intensive courses. By doing this, we would make sure that the courses *can* teach and assess the outcomes of interpretive ability and critical reflection, and we would tie up...
Dear Colleagues:

Greetings! I just came from a spirited Gen Ed discussion led by Kris DeWelde, who proves at every turn to be a smart and effective leader. We are lucky to have you in this role, Kris!

As per our discussion, I'm making plain my response to the state's choice of LIT course requirement.

While I understand that the statewide interpretation of "Introduction to World Literature" is broad enough to include children's literature and the Bible, among other subjects, I still believe that LIT 2000: Introduction to Literature would be a more effective course for this slot. LIT 2000 arms a Gen Ed population with the critical terminology necessary to interpret poetry and prose. It seeks to ignite and foster a love of all literature in students. Most of us who have taught LIT 2000 incorporate world literature into the curriculum, but the focus is to ground students' forays into the world of college-level literary studies with the appropriate critical and theoretical context, and to help them build basic literary arguments with texts from various genres. To make Intro to World Lit the required course would be a) to limit the number of faculty who would feel comfortable teaching the subject matter; b) to cause faculty to contort themselves unnecessarily to fit the state's requirement, and c) to limit students' exposure to English and American texts that would resonate with them. LIT 2000 would be a more inclusive course in terms of staffing, subject matter, and student interest. Requiring World Lit as our sole statewide LIT course would be like requiring that all students take a single type of writing course (i.e. Nature Writing) instead of Comp I & Comp II, which generally cover a multitude of types of writing assignments/genres including Nature Writing.

All best,


Among the core courses at the institution level, a minimum of 2 (the best would be 4) semesters of a foreign language should be required. Our students are going to compete for jobs with people from all over the world, people who know and can speak several languages. It is vital that they know more than English, even though we still think in the US that English is sufficient. "The best way to do business is in the language of your clients". We need to make sure we prepare our students.
HUMANITIES

- HUM X020: Introduction to Humanities
  - The Comm/Phil team leaders endorse this course as a statewide core course option.
  - If this course is adopted, the Comm/Phil team leaders would like it to be housed in and coordinated by the Department of Comm/Phil, as are all HUM General Education courses except HUM 2510.
  - FGCU has Introduction to Humanities on the books as a General Education course, but its number (HUM 2930) is different than the proposed HUM X020.

- PHI X010: Introduction to Philosophy
  - The Comm/Phil team leaders endorse this course as a statewide core course option.
  - If this course is adopted, the Comm/Phil team leaders would like it to be housed in and coordinated by the Department of Comm/Phil.
  - To fulfill SACS accreditation standards, if this course is adopted, the Philosophy Program would need resources allocated toward recruiting additional faculty who are qualified to teach Philosophy.

(Statement from the Communication, Philosophy, Interdisciplinary Studies, and Journalism Team Leaders, Department of Communication and Philosophy, 1/15/13)

*****

1. Regarding the Humanities field, I see the following challenges. The stated learning outcomes call on students to demonstrate cultural literacy, interpretive ability, and critical reflection. These are sound learning outcomes very appropriate to the subject area. However, interpretive ability and critical reflection will only be assessed and developed adequately through writing assignments and/or artistic production/performance. These outcomes will not work with the assessment methods we typically use in large enrollment courses, such as scantron tests, factual-comprehensive question types, etc.

The challenge here is that the Humanities area is currently the home of some of our largest cap Gen Ed courses at FGCU. This is not only the case for HUM 2510, but for numerous other 180, 150, 125 or 90 student courses in the humanities fields. If we are going to assess the stated learning outcomes as given in the Gen Ed document, then we would need to reconfigure the courses on the state list as writing intensive classes. This is already the case for Intro Philosophy and some of the Literature Gen Ed classes, but not for the others. We could still run large cap humanities courses on our local list, of course. But the net effect would be to lower the average section size in the Humanities Gen Ed field, and hence lower the average for gen ed in general. The Administration would need to be prepared for the resource implications of this change.

This may be a case where there is a mismatch between the staffing model at the research 1 campuses and the situation at the regional schools. At UF or FSU, it would be possible to assess these outcomes in a large enrollment course, because those schools have a
graduate program in almost every field and can thus supply TAs or graders to handle the writing requirement. FGCU and other regional schools do not have such graduate resources. Hence, we will either have to lower our class sizes in at least the state half of our humanities requirement; or we will go on with our present large caps in humanities, in which case we'll be forced to pretend that we fulfill the learning outcomes when in reality we will not.

1b. One issue that was not addressed in the state Gen ed document is how the Writing Intensive course requirement would map on to the proposed new Gen Ed structure. Part of the issue I mentioned above with the Humanities learning outcomes would be addressed if the state specified that the Humanities list courses have to be writing intensive courses. By doing this, we would make sure that the courses can teach and assess the outcomes of interpretive ability and critical reflection; and we would tie up a loose end in the legislation by addressing where Writing Intensive courses should be taught. Of course, this would not solve the resource issue—we'd still have to find a way to staff and fund the number of sections that would be necessary, which would be a challenge at our campus.

2. It would be nice to have some provision for higher level courses in the humanities and social sciences, similar to the proposed language in math and science.

(1/20/13)

******

All five courses, of course, have merit. And I understand that we still have the opportunity to develop additional course offerings in Humanities in FGCU's GE program. That being said, I feel that I have a responsibility to express to you all where Intro to Theatre stands compared to my hastily researched findings on the 5 proposed courses. Please correct me if I'm wrong, but I don't see an "Art Appreciation" course currently on the books. For prefix ARH XX00 we have ARH 2500 Survey of Non-Western Art and ARH 3200 Medieval Art (currently offered to 25 students in 1 section). Perhaps those courses are being proposed in lieu of "Art Appreciation," or my esteemed Art colleagues are creating this class as I type (which given their talent, may very well be the case!)? Also, it appears that MUL 2110 is currently being taught in three sections of 60 students each by three separate faculty. Intro to Humanities is not being offered this semester, so I don't know how many students this course typically accommodates or how often it is offered. Intro to World Lit is currently being offered to 2 sections of 65 students by 2 faculty. Intro to Philosophy currently has one online offering for 25 students by one faculty, 5 traditional sections of 25 students being taught by 4 different faculty.

While I certainly don't want to engage in a turf battle, I'm only thinking of the current status of these offerings, and while I can't speak to the impacts on other programs, I can share with you how we were positioning ourselves in Theatre to meet GE demand.

We currently have a very successful THE 2020 Introduction to Theatre online course. All 5 of our full-time theatre faculty teach this course and we are planning a
major scale-up and revision to meet what we thought was going to be increased demand from GE students. This is an online course, meeting the demand for distance learning and the potential for student capacity and cost savings to the university that go along with it. Importantly, we are planning to utilize an open-access Intro to Theatre textbook (that I am contributing to) being put out by University Press of Florida this year, therefore placating calls for textbook affordability and meeting state demands for lowering college costs for students. We planned for our scale up to take effect after we have comfortably transitioned to the new LMS system and introduced the open-access textbook. Currently we offer at least one section of Intro to Theatre online with 70 students each semester and two summer sessions each summer. We are looking to scale up the course to offer it to as many as 250+ students per section if we get the institutional support we need to achieve the scale up—which, we thought, due to the state's and the provost's interest in cost savings, distance learning, and open-access texts, might not be a pipe dream.

I suppose I feel compelled to write because I fear that we will lose an audience for this very popular course and all our big plans will come to naught if it is not built into the GE curriculum somehow. We currently have a plan for revision/scaling up, the faculty to offer it, and can build upon the success we've already demonstrated in the course.

I'm not sure if this email amounts to much more than a "what about me?" plea, and indeed that is what it is, however, as Theatre Program Leader, I feel it's my duty to advocate for what has been, and promises to be, a very successful contribution to GE.

We also offer a Survey of Dramatic Literature course as a GE, which is very popular. My hope is that Theatre program will still be able to offer these 2 courses to fulfill GE requirements in some way. Please understand that I am not suggesting, necessarily, that the 5 core courses suggested by the committee be changed, unless you see fit to change them, only that you take this information under advisement as we move forward on the plan for GE Humanities offerings, and as you hear from other program leaders about the impacts your proposal will have on their programs. Perhaps we are better positioned than others to absorb the impact (?), but I trust that you all, again, have more information than I.

(1/16/13)

*****

In the discussion about the History offering, both humanities and social science representatives expressed the strong feeling that this lineup does not have a "Foundations of Western Thought" or a "World Civilizations" -type general course. I think since it falls between the Humanities and Social Science silos, this feeling didn't get incorporated into this document but a lot of people believe that at least one course where intellectual and cultural history would get broad treatment would be extremely desirable. Where else would people learn about texts like the Bible or about classical mythology or Confucius? It is implied in the Social Science comments but no mention is specifically made of this type of general history-of-culture course (which is a bit different than a straight history course would be).

(1/30/13)
The draft recommendations for subject-area competencies and core courses include:

Mathematics*

Students will determine appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving, and demonstrate an understanding of mathematical concepts.

Students will apply appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving.

MAC X105  College Algebra
STA X023  Statistical Methods
MGF X106  Liberal Arts Mathematics I
MGF X107  Liberal Arts Mathematics II

*For the mathematics and natural science core course options, the following policy should apply:

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.

(*Note: this is language the Steering Committee is requesting to be amended to the legislation.)

In the discussion forum below, please provide your feedback on the implications of the recommended competencies and core courses. Keep in mind that the state-level recommendations are pertinent only to the state mandated 15 hours of the 30 hour General Education Curriculum, and that we will have the opportunity to develop additional course offerings in this subject area in our General Education program. Also, the most valuable feedback in this stage of the process is that which conveys concerns or questions about program- and/or department-level implications.
Dear Colleagues,

This subject is way beyond my area of expertise, but it strikes me that your two competencies sound too much alike.

*Students will determine appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving, and demonstrate an understanding of mathematical concepts.*

*Students will apply appropriate mathematical and computational models and methods in problem solving.*

Wouldn't students need to determine those models and methods in order to apply the right ones in problem-solving?

You might consider changing the wording of the first competency to clarify the difference between the two. "Students will recognize [or differentiate between] a variety of appropriate..." might get at the spirit of this competency. Then it's clear that Objective Two, "Students will apply...", refers to a totally different skill. This will aid in the assessment process that will surely follow.

All best,

---

**Elementary Calculus in State level or in FGCU list**

Elementary calculus: College Algebra is high school course. We, at LCOB, expect our FGCU students master at least basic calculus. There is a space for it in the list (has only 4 courses listed).

If we cannot get it in the State level, we need to place it in the FGCU list.

---

**Add MAC2233 Elementary Calculus**

Only four mathematics courses are listed...adding MAC-2233 (Elementary Calculus) would round out the GEN ED math core nicely.
The draft recommendations for subject-area competencies and core courses include:

**Natural Sciences**

*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.*

*Students will successfully recognize and comprehend fundamental concepts, principles, and processes about the natural world.*

- BSC X005  General Biology
- CHM X020  Chemistry for Liberal Studies
- PHY X020  Fundamentals of Physics
- ESC X000  Introduction to Earth Science
- EVR X001  Introduction to Environmental Science

*For the mathematics and natural science core course options, the following policy should apply:*

> 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.

(*Note: this is language the Steering Committee is requesting to be amended to the legislation.*)

In the discussion forum below, please provide your feedback on the implications of the recommended competencies and core courses. Keep in mind that the state-level recommendations are pertinent only to the state mandated 15 hours of the 30 hour General Education Curriculum, and that we will have the opportunity to develop additional course offerings in this subject area in our General Education program. Also, the most valuable feedback in this stage of the process is that which conveys concerns or questions about program- and/or department-level implications.

---

**STEM prereq double dipping**

**Author: [Redacted]**

**Score:** --

1/22/2013 | 10:00 AM
Rating: --
Flag: --

I'd like to just observe an irony with this legislation, which is that the programs it intends to help the most are actually helped the least by it. The few undergraduate programs where completion of requirements within the 120 hour rule is a real issue are almost all from the STEM areas. However, the extra 6 hours that this law "gives" to these programs will not actually help students complete their degrees faster, because the new framework eliminates much of the opportunity (which existed in the...
previous Gen Ed structure) to "double dip" Gen Ed and STEM common prereq requirements. STEM students will simply have to take the same math & science prereqs they are currently taking; its just that they will no longer be covering Gen ed requirements with them. So students in those few "stuffed" degrees will take exactly the same time to degree under this new system, if it is designed well. If it is not designed well, they will take longer. But not harming degree completion rates is the best we can hope for-this legislation will not improve them.

The Nature of Science: I would contend that before students can accomplish the first competency, they need to understand the Nature of Science and how science is distinct from other disciplines. To me this is far more important for a General studies program than having students analyze the scientific method (which tends to get memorized). For those unfamiliar with the distinction between the scientific method and the nature of science, key concepts involved in the nature of science include the ideas that:

- science has limits
- science contains inherent uncertainty
- science can be misused and contain biases
- and science is a social process

Reliability in science lies in understanding its nature.

Having a general education outcome based on the nature of science also dovetails nicely with the Next Generation Science Standards for K-12 which can be found at nextgenscience.org.

I am not sure if at this point we can add any more competencies, or revise these. But I'll take a stab at it.

If I were going to revise the first competency, I would state it this way:

"Students will demonstrate an understanding of the nature of science through model construction, data analysis, explanation development, and argumentation via evidence."

Thank you,

---

A purely grammatical offering 1/18/2013 | 5:08 PM
Author: [Name]
Score: --
Rating: --
Flag: --

Dear Colleagues,

Greetings! For clarity's sake, I would recommend the following sentence--which currently stands as a run-on--be altered as follows:

From ---"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 those instances the more advanced, similar course will be considered to have completed the portion of the core in that subject area."

To---"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."

All best,

---

**Meaning of chemistry for liberal studies**

Author: [Name]
Score: --
Rating: --
Flag: --

What would a Chemistry for Liberal Studies course look like? Is this an introductory course? Or is it a course that is geared for a general studies student? The chemistry department is already pushed to the limit with the number of general education courses it teaches, this just adds to an already strapped department. This new course would involve additional faculty, additional scheduling of lab and lecture space and additional resources for labs.

I am asking the committees involved to reconsider this additional course for chemistry and allow general chemistry I to be used for the general education core.

Kind regards,

---

Chemistry and Mathematics

**RE: Meaning of chemistry for liberal studies**

Author: [Name]
Score: --
Rating: --
Flag: --

I would recommend developing a chemistry course for liberal studies. In my mind, such a course would be more broadly based and applicable to the nonmajor, however, students should be able to apply General Chemistry I or II to this general education requirement as per the asterisk.

---
NATURAL SCIENCES

Very few Universities offer Earth Science – FGCU does not have this class on the books. Instead we all offer intro geology, which has a GLY prefix and is required for numerous degree. To my knowledge Earth Science is not required for any degree in the SUS.

To clarify, Earth Science is a combination of geology, astronomy, and metrology. Intro geology is an introduction to geology, and has little to no astronomy and metrology content.

Intro Geology would be a better general education course. It is offered at every SUS school (I checked), and required for all state-wide geology programs and environmental engineering programs. It is also required for some Environmental Studies programs, and is commonly taken by Civil Engineering majors. Again, Earth Science is not required for any degree program (I am confident that it is not required, but I have not checked).

(1/9/13)

*****

I think we should require all the core course to be laboratory based. Science is a process, as much or more than a body of knowledge - particularly for a Gen Ed audience, and the ‘process’ should be discovery-based. Many content-focused science courses use the laboratory to illustrate concepts, not to model the discovery process.

I also believe (though some of my colleagues might not), that there is nothing that precludes a 3-credit lab course. We are stuck in a format of a three credit lecture connected (sometimes poorly connected) to a one credit lab class. It is an artificial requirement tied to ‘that is the way I was taught, so that is the only way to do it’. I, or anyone, can teach a two-credit lecture and one credit lab. There is never enough time to cover everything, you work in the time you have. I’d like to believe that anyone can, and should, be able to teach an integrated 3 credit lab course, but sadly that seems not to true.

(1/21/13)

*****

The faculty are concerned about the generated effects of having mandated courses that are significantly different in content from those we currently teach. We worry such shifts will be inconsistent with faculty disciplinary strengths. For example, we have much faculty effort dedicated to teaching Marine Systems; there is no state-mandated course with a comparable subject area. There are numerous examples of this with implications for our department.

2. We offer many sections of Environmental Biology of Southwest Florida (BSC1051C). Introduction to Environmental Science is on the state list, and this something we teach but to a much more limited audience. Our faculty could handle such a change – the same people qualified to teach Environmental
Biology of SW Florida are qualified to teach Intro Environmental Science. However, the former is critical to our students’, both within the program and within the greater campus community, sense of place – environmental scientific principles and methods but focused here in our region. This change, therefore, doesn’t create a staffing hardship, but would cause a disruption in our philosophical approach.

3. Our Physics / Astronomy teaching effort is very demanding of our small faculty in these disciplines. These faculty teach General Physics I & II and College Physics I & II and these serve as general education courses. The constituents in these courses, however, are almost entirely required to take these courses for their STEM majors. We would not have the staffing to teach Fundamentals of Physics as a mandated course. We would be obligated to continue to support of the STEM majors.

4. I believe Jamie MacDonald has communicated this already. Introduction to Earth Science is a course not offered currently in the SUS and not on campus. We teach comprehensive Earth Science in the guise of Marine Systems, Meteorology & Climatology, and Introduction to Physical Geology. These courses serve multiple audiences: STEM majors and non-science students needed general education science. We don’t have the staffing to cover the mandated Earth Science course and would have a difficult time altering our commitments to these other introductory courses. Jamie had suggested replacing Introduction to Earth Science with Introduction to Physical Geology. Our guess is other SUS institutions would feel similarly.

1/25/13)

******

I strongly concur with the comment that the Natural Sciences section of General Education should include a lab. The current General Education program mandates completion of a science course including a lab. The new General Education curriculum should not be a step backwards. The laboratory component of a science course provides students with the opportunity for hands on learning and for the opportunity to better understand the work and process of science. Lab experience is a vital part of science.

1/30/13)
The draft recommendations for subject-area competencies and core courses include:

---

**Social Science**

*Students will demonstrate the ability to examine behavioral, social, and cultural issues from a variety of points of view.*

*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.*

**PSY X012**  Introduction to Psychology  
**SYG X000**  Principles of Sociology  
**WOH X040**  20th Century World History  
**CPO X001**  Comparative Politics  
**ANT X000**  Introduction to Anthropology

---

In the discussion forum below, please provide your feedback on the implications of the recommended competencies and core courses. Keep in mind that the state-level recommendations are pertinent only to the state mandated 15 hours of the 30 hour General Education Curriculum, and that we will have the opportunity to develop additional course offerings in this subject area in our General Education program. Also, the most valuable feedback in this stage of the process is that which conveys concerns or questions about program- and/or department-level implications.

---

**History Program response**  
**Author:** **[Redacted]**  
**Score:** --  
**Rating:** --  
**Flag:** --  

1/22/2013 | 3:23 PM

The History Program believes that the State Faculty Committee's recommendation of 20th Century World History is inappropriate as one of the core Social Science courses. We feel that the course is too narrow and restrictive in its focus on a single century in human history. Each of the other recommended social science courses are broad in scope, and we find it especially ironic that the history course has the least historical perspective and content of all the proposed courses. We would prefer a course that has no chronological restrictions, such as an Introduction to World History course, where a range of time periods and geographical locations can be engaged.
The Social and Behavioral Sciences Department endorses the History Program's response to this issue.

Economics: It is hard to imagine providing a well-rounded liberal arts education to our majors w/o making sure that they have the chance to take economics. The subject matter explains the behavior of a typical American (I can see that clearly being raised in Istanbul, Turkey). So, put one in the State level and the other at the FGCU level.

8 reasons to include economics in the Gen Ed Social Science core:

1) 49 of the top 50 public universities in the US News & World Report ranking allow or require one or more courses in Economics to satisfy general education requirements. By excluding Economics from the core course options of the General Education Program, Florida would deviate from best practices that are nearly universal at America's top public universities.

2) Historically, the discipline of economics has been and continues to be very important in the understanding of human behavior in society, and as such is an integral part of social sciences. Individuals make decisions on a daily basis involving some aspect of economics. An understanding of the basic principles of economics will produce students who are better equipped to make good decisions.

3) Any government policy has direct and/or indirect economic effects on the lives of individuals. An understanding of those effects will lead to more intelligent civic engagement and better policy choices. Excluding Economics from the core course options works against the goal of preparing students for reasoned civic engagement.

4) Economics emphasizes high-level academic skills, critical thinking, logical problem-solving, and quantitative reasoning.

5) Economics is a demanding subject that increases the rigor of the general education curriculum. Excluding it from the core course options weakens the General Education Program by robbing the Social Science area of some of that needed rigor.

6) Economics is the social science that best connects with STEM disciplines. Excluding it from the core course options works against the state goal of promoting STEM fields.

7) The American Council of Trustees and Alumni recommends Economics as one of only seven subject areas that are essential for a general education curriculum (along with Composition, Literature, Mathematics, Science, US Government or History, and Foreign Language). Note that economics is the only social science discipline on that list that is not included in the current draft of the GenEd core.

8) Dropping economics from the GenEd curriculum would have a disproportionately adverse effect on students choosing to major in one particular college (the COB) as they would lose their ability to count the two required economics courses toward their GenEd requirements.
As evidence of reason #5 ("5) Economics is a demanding subject that increases the rigor of the general education curriculum. Excluding it from the core course options weakens the General Education Program by robbing the Social Science area of some of that needed rigor.") note that ECO 203 is always one of the classes targeted by the Center for Academic Achievement for Supplemental Instruction and/or Walk-in-Lab tutoring sessions. ECO 203 is also on the schedule this spring. The only other social science on the schedule this semester is psychology.

Our students want Economics as part of their general education. At the town hall meetings held in November, we learned student responses on campus surveys overwhelmingly requested more financial literacy, not less. Economics courses help them understand how public policy decisions affect them (financially or otherwise). They need this basic understanding to make personal financial decisions, whether they are business majors or not. They will be (or already are) helping to create public policy by voting for local, state, and federal representatives. They need to be able to understand how a candidate’s policies will affect them, and economics courses help to create civically engaged individuals who can make well-informed decisions. They need to be able to answer these questions:

What does it mean that there is a fiscal deficit? What are the consequences of a restrictive measure in the money market imposed by the Federal Reserve? What is the Federal Reserve System? How does a change in mortgage rates today affect the decision to purchase a home? What is the role of taxes and subsidies in the economy? What are entitlements? What is the cost of health care? What is inflation? What is purchasing power? (Arguea, 2012)

One suggestion being talked about is a blended micro/macro course that is already on our books. I think it’s a great suggestion, and FGCU students want it (according to their responses on campus surveys).

The exclusion of economics from the general education social science learning core is ill-advised owing to several reasons:

It is an established best practice followed by almost all tier 1 universities. We shall put Florida students at a relative disadvantage by excluding economics.

Without an understanding of the basic principles of economics, a large segment of Florida students run the risk of being ill-equipped in making decisions on a daily basis that most of the times involve some aspect of economics.

Most public policy has direct and/or indirect economic effects on the lives of individuals. An understanding of those effects will lead to more intelligent civic engagement and better policy choices. By excluding economics from the core course options, Florida students will not be prepared well for reasoned civic engagement.
Economics is the social science that best connects with STEM disciplines. Excluding economics from the core course options weakens the General Education Program by robbing the Social Science area of needed rigor.

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni recommends Economics as one of only seven subject areas that are essential for a general education curriculum (along with Composition, Literature, Mathematics, Science, US Government or History, and Foreign Language). Note that economics is the only social science discipline on that list that is not included in the current draft of the GenEd core.

Dropping economics from the GenEd curriculum would have a disproportionately adverse effect on students choosing to major in one particular college (the COB) as they would lose their ability to count the two required economics courses toward their GenEd requirements.

---

**Replace CPOX001 with ECO 2023 Microeconomics**

1/17/2013 | 2:48 PM

Author: [Redacted]
Score: --
Rating: --
Flag: --

Without being able to add another GEN ED course in the social sciences then CPOX001 should be replaced with ECO 2023 Microeconomics. See the other post titled "What about Economics" for support.

---

**Where's the Economics?**

1/11/2013 | 2:02 AM

Author: [Redacted]
Score: --
Rating: --
Flag: --

I can't believe that Economics was excluded from social sciences. This should at least be a choice for students who want to understand the modern world.

---

**RE: Where's the Economics?**

1/17/2013 | 2:48 PM

Author: [Redacted]
Score: --
Rating: --
Flag: --

I agree. Students should have an opportunity to learn the economic world and how human behaviors are influenced and decisions are made from the economic perspective.

---

**RE: Where's the Economics?**

1/15/2013 | 8:01 AM

Author: [Redacted]
Score: --
Rating: --
Flag: --

And this will cause difficulty for business majors - which of course could be addressed with the "extra" six hours of free electives - I understand that this is not in our college, and this could serve to broaden the perspective of business majors as they would need an additional social science, but it does seem narrow to exclude econ from the list.

maz

---

**RE: RE: Where's the Economics?**

1/17/2013 | 9:48 AM

Author: [Redacted]
Score: --
Rating: --
Flag: --

No geography, either. The way the system is set up, with five courses and seven social science disciplines, two will have to be left out. There's no good way to determine which two are shut out, as far as I can tell.

---

**Concerns with WOH X040 -- 20th Century World History**

1/10/2013 | 3:42 PM

Author: [Redacted]
Score: --
There are grave concerns with the Social Science state mandated course WOH X040 -- 20th Century World History. History is the only in neither the Social Sciences or the Humanities to have a course listing that presents only a partial window into the discipline; I refer you to the proposed courses "Introduction to Anthropology", "Comparative Politics," "Principles of Sociology", "Introduction to Psychology", "Introduction to World Literature", "Introduction of Philosophy," and "Introduction to Music Literature/Music Appreciation". The state mandated course for English (LIT X100 Introduction to World Literature) appears to be a new course. It essentially (so far as I can tell at least) is a combination of LIT 2110 (Intro to World Lit & Culture [Survey of World Literature from Ancient and Classical times through the Renaissance. Centers on both canonical and marginal texts in their cultural and historical contexts]) and LIT 2120 (Intro to World Lit & Culture II [Survey of World Literature from the seventeenth century to the present. Centers on both canonical and marginal texts in their cultural and historical contexts]). Essentially these two courses currently in Guifine equate to World Civ. I and World Civ. II. If the state is permitting a new course to be created for English which is open-ended and accommodates all areas and time-periods (as this appears to at face value), then History should be afforded the same equity. As nothing in the Steering Committee's report indicates that the LIT X100 would be limited in scope, why should History be so limited? Being limited to 20th century world is equivalent to English being forced to focus on 20th century literature, or the Psychology being pigeon-holed into "Abnormal Psychology".

For the sake of continuity with the other courses on the Social Science list and the Humanities list, the state mandated general education course should be entitled "Introduction to World History".

Thank you Kris, Rick, et al. for listening,

Concerns about proposed history course

1/10/2013 | 3:32 PM
Author: [Redacted] Score: -- Rating: -- Flag: --

I am very concerned that the proposed history course covers only the 20th century. This is very restrictive and means that vast swathes of human history are excluded from the state gen ed provision. It also means that students will be gaining an incredibly restrictive view of how the modern world works. It is impossible to understand the historical processes of the 20th century without understanding issues such as the rise of free-market capitalism, the industrial revolution, European colonialism and imperialism all of which pre-date the 20th century. Students cannot understand key 20th century events such as the Holocaust, World War One and Two, decolonization, the Cold War, civil rights, and feminism without understanding the deeper historical roots on which these movements were predicated. It is concerning that the state does not think there is a need for students to know about the ancient past, the medieval world, or the age of discovery and exploration, or the renaissance and reformation, to list just a few critical historical topics which will be missing if only the 20th century is covered by historians. There is no other place in any of the subject lists where the pre-20th century world is discussed at all, and this will sadly restrict the ability of students to understand the range and breadth of human experiences - surely one of the key goals of social science learning competencies. Some historians would even question whether the immediate post-contemporary world (the post-1960 era in particular) can even be properly explained by historical methods, which depend on distance in time and access to a full range of primary sources. How can students learn about historical causality or change over time when such a small period of time is the only topic of consideration, and there is no space for the long duree that has been so central to historical methodologies and insights.

The choice is especially concerning because history is the ONLY discipline in either the humanities or social science core list to have a course listing that presents only a partial window into the discipline. All the others in both humanities and social sciences have a course like "Intro to Anthropology", "Intro to World Lit" or "Gen Psychology". Offering only 20th century world history is like the English course being 20th century literature, or the psychology course being "Social Psychology" - it provides only a fragmentary window into our discipline, and suggests to students that only some kinds of history are important. The course for history that would be equivalent to that given to the other disciplines would be "World History" with no time period limit on it. I would like to see a course of that nature replace the 20th century world course currently proposed. This would be a more inclusive approach that fully represents the discipline of history, and that treats history in an equal manner to the other disciplines in the social science and humanities competencies.

RE: Concerns about proposed history course

1/21/2013 | 5:59 PM
Author: [Redacted] Score: -- Rating: -- Flag: --
I believe that having a 20th Century World History class as the General Education requirement is narrow and restrictive. History is too rich and dynamic to focus on just the 20th century (and I am a US 20th century historian). An Introduction to History class would be an excellent way to provide a gateway General Education course.

RE: Concerns about proposed history course
Author: 
Score: --
1/11/2013 11:10 AM
Rating: --
Flag: --

I agree with the other postings objecting to the proposed twentieth-century world history course for the state-wide list. I would like to add the suggestion that "Introduction to History" would be an appropriate type of course. It could present the basics of historiography, historical methodologies, and writing history papers, and the historical content of the course could center on the time period and geographical expertise of the instructor teaching a given section.

RE: Concerns about proposed history course
Author: 
Score: --
1/11/2013 11:10 AM
Rating: --
Flag: --

I agree completely with the comments of my history colleagues. It seems especially ill-conceived that the only social science course that is restricted to the recent time period is the history course.

RE: RE: Concerns about proposed history course
Author: 
Score: --
1/22/2013 2:30 PM
Rating: --
Flag: --

I second the comments made by my colleagues, particularly in relation to the lack of historical grounding a 20th century history course would provide. I would also add that this extremely limited course (especially when compared to the other, broader courses offered) would not allow students to understand concepts "past and present." Our past is not limited to the U.S., and did not start in the 20th century.
SOCIAL SCIENCES

I want to add my voice on this subject as chair of the department Economics and Finance. I think the recommendations from the state level and the FGCU committee are unfortunate and do not consider the best interest of our students. One of the arguments made against including economics as a social science option for FGCU students was that it is taught more as a business course than a social science. This is at best an unformed opinion. Economics is taught as a social science. While many of the concepts are demonstrated in the interactions that we observe in markets the business world, they are often more readily observable in day-to-day decisions of individuals which have nothing to do with business. As a result, it is hard for me to imagine a social science that can offer greater value to our students and society as a whole than economics. It was also noted that business would not lose enrollment as a result of this decision. This claim may be a bit difficult to defend. Business majors are not the only students who populate economics classes. However, that may be the case if the current recommendation is not changed. It is my opinion that economics classes composed of a more homogenous subset of students (all business) would likely suffer as a result. Having economics available as an option for students to fulfill their social science requirement provides an opportunity for students outside of business to be exposed to the subject. Some of these students may decide to pursue economics as a minor. To the extent that this occurs, the learning environment in our economics offerings will benefit from the influx of diverse views brought by these students who otherwise might not be part of our program.

1/18/13

*****

As Program Leader for Economics, I am writing to express my concern about the lack of an economics course in the draft Gen Ed Social Science core. Here are eight reasons to include an economics course.*

1) 49 of the top 50 public universities in the US News & World Report ranking allow or require one or more courses in Economics to satisfy general education requirements. By excluding Economics from the core course options of the General Education Program, Florida would deviate from best practices that are nearly universal at America’s top public universities.

2) Historically, the discipline of economics has been and continues to be very important in the understanding of human behavior in society, and as such is an integral part of social sciences. Individuals make decisions on a daily basis involving some aspect of economics. An understanding of the basic principles of economics will produce students who are better equipped to make good decisions.

3) Any government policy has direct and/or indirect economic effects on the lives of individuals. An understanding of those effects will lead to more intelligent civic engagement and better policy choices. Excluding Economics from the core course options works against the goal of preparing students for reasoned civic engagement.
4) Economics emphasizes high-level academic skills, critical thinking, logical problem-solving, and quantitative reasoning.

5) Economics is a demanding subject that increases the rigor of the general education curriculum. Excluding it from the core course options weakens the General Education Program by robbing the Social Science area of some of that needed rigor. (As evidence, note that ECO 2023 is always one of the classes targeted by the Center for Academic Achievement for Supplemental Instruction and/or Walk-in-Lab tutoring sessions. ECO 2013 is also on the schedule this spring. The only other social science on the schedule this semester is psychology.)

6) Economics is the social science that best connects with STEM disciplines. Excluding it from the core course options works against the state goal of promoting STEM fields.

7) The American Council of Trustees and Alumni recommends Economics as one of only seven subject areas that are essential for a general education curriculum (along with Composition, Literature, Mathematics, Science, US Government or History, and Foreign Language). Note that economics is the only social science discipline on that list that is not included in the current draft of the GenEd core.

8) Dropping economics from the GenEd curriculum would have a disproportionately adverse effect on students choosing to major in one particular college (the COB) as they would lose their ability to count the two required economics courses toward their GenEd requirements.

Here are some specific recommendations, listed by order of preference:

1) Include ECO 1000, Survey of Economics, in the core. (This is a one semester course that covers the basics of both microeconomics and macroeconomics. We have not yet taught it, but it is in the catalog, and we are planning to start offering it in the near future.) Include both ECO 2023, Principles of Microeconomics and ECO 2013, Principles of Macroeconomics, in the electives.

2) Include ECO 2023 (micro), in the core. Include both ECO 1000 and ECO 2013 (macro) in the electives. (The reason for choosing micro over macro is that everything you do in macroeconomics has underlying foundations in microeconomics, which is why we have our students take micro first. Some other schools do it in the opposite order or let students pick which one to take first.)

3) Include ECO 2013 (macro), in the core. Include both ECO 1000 and ECO 2023 (micro) in the electives.

Please note that including both 2023 and 2013 in the core is essential to addressing the concern in reason #8 above. Keeping ECO 1000 in the Gen Ed curriculum (via the electives if necessary) will also be helpful to non-COB students who want to learn some economics, but who may be scared away by the high DFW rate in ECO 2023. (In fact,
we have been asked a number of times by leadership in another college, whose students are currently required to take 2023, to start teaching this course. It provides a survey of micro and macro in one semester, with less math and graphing.)

Thanks for taking the time to consider my input and for your hard work on this important task. Please do not hesitate to follow up if you need further information or clarification.

(1/18/13)

*While I wholeheartedly endorse all eight of these, I cannot take full credit for the writing. Most of these were pulled directly from (or paraphrased from) letters written by the Economics Dept. Chairs at UCF and UWF.

*****
In considering the constitution of the General Education program, I believe that FGCU must be mindful of the society in which our students will function. Based on over 3 decades of executive experience, I would not recommend the hiring of any college graduate who did not have some understanding of the economic underpinnings of business and our society in general.

While I am in favor of exposure to the “humanities” generally, courses like Economics that are related to success in our society support the concept of the “pursuit of happiness” far more effectively.

(1/28/13)

*****
It seems to me social problems would fit the state recommendations better. Perhaps it is just because of the way I teach the course, but social problems covers more specific issues that would allow these competencies to be demonstrated throughout the semester. Some of the stuff I cover in intro would not lend itself to the historical aspects or local issues, for example, since it focuses more on grasping the principles in the abstract than applying them to specific behaviors or occurrences. It’s not that these would not or could not get addressed in my intro class, but problems, as I teach it, would allow me to better tend to these on a consistent basis so that students could cultivate them.

(1/15/13)

Addendum: Many more students take this course as per every place I’ve taught and I think it offers a wider spectrum across the field and addresses the applications of sociology a bit more.

(1/17/13)

Addendum: In general intro covers the basic principles while Social problems has an applied focus. The added advantage of social problems is that it makes it possible to draw on the theoretical perspectives and principles in covering relevant topical issues. This could also be done in an intro class but one would be able to cover a only small part of the syllabus if one adopted that approach.

(1/17/13)
Addendum: The structure of Social Problems (for example, textbook design and content) would more easily align with the recommended competencies. While Intro, as I currently teach it, incorporates both the theoretical and the application of theory to a variety of social issues (local, regional, national, and global), the topical structure of Social Problems would lend itself much more easily to assessing the recommended competencies.  

(Unanimity in the Sociology faculty response on this issue)

******
I would like to provide input to the changes in the Gen Ed course lists. We in Lutgert College of Business have concerns that both the State and FGCU consider other courses than those that are currently listed. I have provided two documents [statements from UCF and UWF] provided by the Finance and Economics department that support my recommendation for inclusion of Economics.

For the Gen Ed list of courses provided by the state:

- Add MAC x001, Elementary Calculus as a fifth choice in the area of mathematics;
- Remove CPO x001, Comparative Politics and replace it with ECO x001, Micro-Economics.

Addendum: The State Requirements for Mathematics should include MAC-2233 (Elementary Calculus) in the GEN ED (this class is currently being offered at FGCU)...there are only four courses in this area so adding a fifth choice should be acceptable. In the Social Sciences I believe a well rounded college education should include at least one course in economics. Microeconomics should be included at the state level in the GEN ED courses (currently it is offered as ECO-2023). In order to have enough room for this course I suggest dropping CPO-X001 Comparative Politics from the state GEN ED list.

Addendum: Elementary calculus: College Algebra is high school course. We, at LCOB, expect our FGCU students master at least basic calculus. There is a space for it in the list (has only 4 courses listed).

Economics: It is hard to imagine providing a well rounded liberal arts education to our majors w/o making sure that they have the chance to take economics. The subject matter explains the behavior of a typical American (I can see that clearly being raised in Istanbul, Turkey). So, put one in the State level and the other at the FGCU level.

******
Although we believe that an understanding of how different political systems around the world function should be an important aspect of our general education program, the
choice of comparative politics as a state mandated general education course will impact our department (Public Affairs) significantly. Our faculty is adapted to delivering lots of sections (6-8 per year) of American National Government and now this particular expertise has been rendered less valuable by the selection of comparative politics. This is a problem of academic creative destruction. We have to create or recruit new comparative politics expertise while shedding American National Government teaching capacities. We would probably do this by means of recruiting new adjuncts and discontinuing other adjunct assignments. We will also have to redistribute teaching assignments among our core faculty, with our comparativists now having to bear far more of the general education teaching load. Even with these adjustments, however, we would almost certainly lack the faculty resources to meet the demand that would result from making comparative politics one of five social science general education courses. The administration would need to make more faculty resources available to our department in order for us to be able to meet the new teaching obligations that would arise from this change. The difficulty of the proposals now under consideration arises from having a short list of required general education courses, which is going to create an onerous teaching commitment for any department that offers one of these courses. Indeed, we would face faculty resource constraints even if our social science general education course was changed from Comparative Politics to American National Government. Ultimately, a satisfactory resolution to revising general education requirements must lie with increasing the number of courses that can satisfy a particular area (e.g., social science) requirement. We believe that the focus of social science general education should be comparative and global, but this can be done through numerous courses that distribute teaching responsibilities across a broad range of departments and faculty members. This involves revising the extant legislation. We urge this approach.
OPEN QUESTIONS:

Has the legislature or BOG made any mention of the impact the changes to the Gen Ed curriculum might have on the communication and computation skills requirements of all baccalaureate degrees? More specifically for my colleagues, the 12 semester hours of writing intensive courses, and for other colleges (perhaps) the 6 semester hours of mathematics? Obviously, many of the courses in the state's pot of 15 semester hours do not satisfy the writing requirement.

(1/17/13)

*****

Again, assessment? If we do this, we should be assessing it. If not, we run the risk of harming rather than helping student learning. Since we will share outcomes and courses across institutions, will we be sharing assessment instruments or approaches? Who will develop them or decide on them?

(1/21/13)

OPEN COMMENTS:

The skill-based competencies will require assessment beyond simple MC instruments and probably preclude large enrollment Gen Ed courses. These changes require pedagogy and assessment that will be more expensive, assuming we are actually committed to do this right.

I do not see a compelling need to get the other 6 credits back into General Education particularly if they go into the State pile where we have less control over them. Why not keep them at the institution level? It adds some flexibility for programs that are now stressed by losing prereqs that used to be in Gen Ed, thereby extending the time needed to graduate in those programs (#10 below).

Folks at the state level need to consider how we handle articulations with other states, else we will limit the ability, and therefore the number, of students transferring from out-of-state, losing out on that out-of-state tuition.

By cutting foundational courses, e.g. in the sciences Bio I,II, Chem I, II, out of Gen Ed, some programs (e.g. Engineering, Health Professionals) will not be able to fulfill their current degree requirements in 4 years, or in 120 credit hours.

We need to clarify how the current Gordon Rule fits into this.

(1/21/13)

*****

1. By BOG Regulation 8.014, each baccalaureate degree program must be 120 hours unless granted an exception by the BOG. This 120 hours includes common prerequisite (Regulation 8.010), general education, and specified computation and
mathematics requirements (Regulation 6.017, formerly Gordon Rule). Currently, foreign language is not included the 120 hours, but I believe it will be in the future.

2. Some programs, especially those that are mathematics and science based, have very few or no unspecified electives. This means that we must double count courses to ensure that all state and university requirements are met within the 120 hours. The common prerequisites are determined by faculty committees and the Articulation Coordinating Committee (see Common Prerequisite Manual at www.flvc.org). The Common Prerequisite Manual includes approved substitutions for some courses, which allows institutions and students to be flexible yet ensure that the content is covered.

3. In SCNS terms, a course is identified by a particular prefix and number. Both SCNS and degree-audit mechanics (CAPP, DegreeWorks) look for a particular prefix/number match. Consequently, WOH X040 20th Century World History will not be satisfied by WOH 1023 World Civilizations 1500-1815, which is what FGCU currently offers. There are also issues related to equivalency and field reviews.

4. There will need to be considerable time allocated for revising our degree audit and advising processes to accommodate such a drastic revision in General Education requirements. Our basic distribution structure has not changed since opening, so this is new territory.

The current articulation guidelines, based on Florida Statute 1007.23, essentially divide the 120 hour program into 60 hours and 60 hours. For any baccalaureate degree program, the first 60 hours consist of general education, common prerequisites, and unspecified electives. The last 60 hours consist of university requirements (for example, IDS 3920 Colloquium), required courses and electives for the major/concentration, and unspecified electives if necessary to get to 120 hours. FGCU cannot require any hours beyond 60 in order to accommodate articulation. This is true for both transfer and native students. In reality, students may take these courses at various times in their academic program, not necessarily during the first or last 60 hours.

You will see that every major in the catalog http://www.fgcu.edu/Catalog/ulist.asp requires no more than 60 hours of coursework (not including general education and common prerequisites), unless an exception has been made for the 120 hour cap. Consequently, the extra 6 hours that will be "gained" by moving from 36 to 30 hours in general education will be unspecified electives under the current rules and regulations. FGCU will not be able to require students to take 6 hours of other coursework.

(Office of Curriculum and Instruction, 1/28/13)

*****

High Schools are going to try the best that they can to teach the courses on the state list,
encourage students to take it via dual enrollment, and/or substitute AP courses for it. The
trend is for top students to earn as much credit as possible using these mechanisms. I
would strongly oppose selecting a course that can easily be transferred from AP unless all
of the list can be. If we don’t, top students will start to lose their ability to choose Gen Ed
if only one or two courses in the Statewide curriculum can be substituted via AP.

One of the strengths of the Humanities list is that I don’t believe that there is an AP
equivalent to any of them. Even then, high-school teachers with an Masters in Music Ed
might be able to teach that course at the high school through the dual enrollment
programs that some schools have (Collier, for example).

A list of AP courses is here:
http://apcentral.collegeboard.com/apc/public/courses/descriptions/index.html. History,
English, and Economics should almost be happy that their courses are so narrowly
defined (World Lit; 20th Cent Hist) or absent (Micro/Macro) in that it makes sure that
students who take the course will not be taking it in H.S.
(1/28/13)

******

I am highlighting the issues below because they deal with specific situations that advisors
deal with on a regular basis.
- It is foreseeable that the State change to General Education will spur our faculty to
make changes to their major curriculums. Should the Glitch amendment not pass,
programs at FGCU will be in an extremely tight spot regarding internal curriculum
changes.
- It seems one of the impetus at the State-level to change General Education is to
free up credits for students in programs which have a great deal of requirements
(Biology, Biotechnology, Marine Science, etc.) to spend a bit more time focusing on their
degree requirements. However, the manner in which the State is enacting this mandate
may do the exact opposite. Currently, these students have a decent amount of overlap
between General Education and their Common Pre-requisites and major
requirements. The structure of the new General Education curriculum will reduce the
amount of overlap, actually causing these students to take extra courses.
- Currently, the majority of FGCU students (who complete General Education and
Communication/Computation Skills here) overlap their Communication and Computation
Skills with General Education (ENC 1101, ENC 1102, a Gen Ed Humanities or Social
Science that is also GRWR, and IDS 3920). It seems the new General Education
program will limit students’ ability to continue to “double dipping” with Gen Ed Hum/SS
(based upon the State mandated courses for each discipline and a limiting of the total
number of Gen Ed Hum/SS that will now be required of students.
- The Steering Committee’s proposal to add wording to the Mathematics and
Natural Sciences categories is imperative to prevent significant harm to STEM
students. In addition, there are students in particular Humanities programs that may also
be forced to take extra credits and, potentially, deal with the Excess Hours fee – Music
majors as well as, potentially Art majors.
(1/30/13)
I support the wording in the Mathematics and Natural Sciences sections that permits students to take more advanced courses within Mathematics or Natural Sciences to fulfill the General Education requirements. This is vital to majors within Biology if they are to complete their degrees within the allotted 120 hours. It would also make no sense for a Biology major to take both BSC 1005 and the state common prerequisites for a degree in Biology. I strongly urge that the wording of these statements be carefully reviewed to make certain that there is no possibility for misinterpreting the intent of these statements.

I am supportive of returning the six credits removed from General Education back to General Education or failing in that request having them returned to the major. This request is not to enrich the major but replace courses lost from the major as a result of changes to General Education. I am currently unsure as to whether the state has a plan for how these credits will be integrated into the curriculum or if this decision will occur at the institutional level.

I would suggest that while institutions should be required to accept all the courses on the state list, they should not have to offer all of them. This could be problematic for some small departments or institutions.

Care should be given in using the word “equivalent” when referring to courses with the same prefix and number. Although the courses can be considered equivalent in terms of content, there are circumstances under which courses transferred from one institution to another would not fulfill Florida Board of Governors Regulation 6.017 Communication and Computation Skills (formerly known as Gordon-rule writing and math.) For example, individual institutions designate which native courses are approved to fulfill the communication skills requirement. The same course, transferred from another institution, may or may not have been structured and taught as writing intensive at the other Florida university or state college. Technically, the two courses are not equivalent in all aspects.