

**UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA**  
**General Education Council**  
**Minutes of February 18, 2008**

- Present: Kenneth Caswell (CAS), John Ferron (COEDU), Ilene Frank (LIB), C. David Frankel (VPA), Hunt Hawkins (CAS), Ed Kellner (COENG), Gladis Kersaint (COEDU), Kathy Laframboise (COEDU), Philip Levy (CAS), Victor Peppard (CAS), Kay Perrin (COPH), Jeffrey Ryan (CAS), Drew Smith (LIB), Nancy White (CAS)
- Absent: Sue Bartlett (COBA), Scott Campbell (COENG) (excused), Sharon Geiger (Honors), Joan Morris (NURS), Jane Noll (CAS), Paul Reller (VPA) (excused), Cheryl Zambroski (NUR) (excused)
- Guests/  
Ex officio: Frank Biafora (CAS USF St. Petersburg), Cyndie Collins (USF St. Petersburg), Chris D'Elia, (USF St. Petersburg), Charlene Herreid (UGS), Pat Maher (Student Learning), Janet Moore (UGS), Laura Rusnak, Bob Sullins (UGS), Diane Williams (C21TE)

The meeting was called to order at 3:04 p.m.

The minutes were approved as amended.

**USFSP General Education Plan**

Robert Sullins, Dean of Undergraduate Studies; Chris d'Elia, Interim Regional Vice President, USF St. Petersburg; and Frank Biafora, Dean of the College of Arts & Sciences, USF St. Petersburg were present to discuss the General Education Plan for the St. Petersburg Campus. St. Petersburg was required by the State Legislature to become fiscally autonomous and seek separate accreditation from the Tampa Campus. St. Petersburg now grants degrees and issues transcripts and diplomas as part of the USF system. Nevertheless, it is to everyone's benefit that there be easy articulation among the campuses so that students can take advantage of being a part of the USF system. The St. Petersburg Campus has determined that it will follow the Tampa Campus model for General Education. The St. Petersburg Campus has established its own General Education Council that will in general mirror the Tampa Council. Courses approved by the Tampa Campus will be available to both campuses. The St. Petersburg Council may also approve courses and they will also then be available to be taught at both campuses, although they need not be. St. Petersburg may need to create some new courses that will not be offered in Tampa. Even though the courses are not offered at Tampa, St. Petersburg would like for these courses to be reviewed by the Tampa Campus as a courtesy. If the Tampa General Education Council approves these courses, then they may be used to fulfill general education requirements at either campus. It was questioned whether the Tampa General Education Council should have been consulting with the St. Petersburg Council all along. It was noted that St. Petersburg just determined this year that it will mirror the Tampa Campus Council actions.

It was stated that in the future that it would be good for this Council to consult with the St. Petersburg General Education Council and vice versa, and to coordinate actions of the two autonomous bodies. This model can be expanded to other USF campuses as they become separately accredited. Cyndie Collins will serve as a liaison to share information between the Tampa and St. Petersburg councils. Our faculty should consult with St. Petersburg faculty and vice versa about course revisions and new courses. This should be done at the departmental level, as the General Education Council cannot police this.

It was moved, seconded and unanimously approved that "Following approval of a course by the St. Petersburg Campus General Education Council, the course will be submitted to the Tampa General Education Council for approval."

The concern was raised that this would lead to pressure to teach courses at one campus that were rejected by another. In response, it was explained further that General Education requirements can be different at each campus. If a student transfers to another campus and his/her general education requirements were not met, the requirements of the accepting campus would have to be met. If the student has fulfilled the general education requirement at the first campus, then it will be considered met even if the courses that were used to meet the requirement are different from those required by the campus accepting the student.

### **Review Issues:**

The proposer of ANT 4401 supplied more information and it was decided to approve the course as it is. Recertification is an issue. Rather than the five-page capstone paper, the department will be encouraged to create course portfolios to show evidence of outcomes.

AMS 3230 has been approved. The syllabus will be changed to meet the new Gordon rule requirement. The department will also specify how the department will monitor the course. Chair Kersaint will work with the proposer.

Chair Kersaint spoke to the Geography department about concurrence for ENV 2100. Problems were presented with the course relating to the teaching of policy issues and whereas expertise lies for the course. Another issue is that the course was being approved at the 2000 level where most policy courses are taught at the 4000 level. These issues will be presented for further discussion.

### **Course Proposal Review Status:**

#### **Approved Courses**

1. ***Without Funding***

2. ***With Funding Requests (\$\$\$\$)***

- **BSC 1005 – Biology for Life-----Approved.**  
This course is a comprehensive introduction to living systems, including the scientific basis of cell structure and function, genetic mechanisms, human anatomy and physiology, and ecological and evolutionary processes.

**Core Area: Life Sciences**

**Dimensions: CT, I, SP, EP**

- **LIT 3451 – Literature and the Occult-----Approved.**  
This course is an introduction to the occult tradition as a major ingredient in English, Continental, American, and Multicultural literature. The course focuses on values/ethics, race/ethnicity and gender; thinking and writing skills. This course was approved and meets the Gordon Rule Writing Requirement.

**Core Area: Exit Course**

**Dimensions: CT, I, WLS**

### **Courses Pending Reviewer Action**

ARH 3001, ENV 2001 and GLY 2010 will receive return letters. A summary for LIT 3155 was submitted. Proposers asked for clarification about further actions. HUM 2230 is ready for the lead reviewer to turn in a summary. AMH 3571 needs strengthening and there were questions about funding. The course can be approved without funding. Phil Levy will send a summary review. John Ferron is working on AMS 4804, which was mislabeled on the agenda and should be titled "Major Ideas in America." GLY 2030 was reviewed by two reviewers and both recommended approval. More clarity about mechanisms in place for accountability was requested. PET 3252 is missing a dimension and there are several problems with the proposal. Phil Levy will write a summary about it. REL 3475 requires some clarification of problematic issues.

### **Old Business**

### **Committee Reports**

1. Marketing Sub-committee

No new business.

2. Recertification Sub-committee

A discussion of recertification and how it relates to assessment is scheduled for the next GEC meeting.

3. Assessment Sub-committee

A discussion of recertification and how it relates to assessment is scheduled for the next GEC meeting. The Assessment Sub-committee will be meeting for further discussion of assessment of General Education at USF as a whole.

4. Funding Subcommittee

No new business.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 pm.