Motions Passed Summary
2002-2007

11.12.07
Motion: R. Brown asks for a motion to approve the minutes from October 22, 2007. T. Hindson so moves. B. Stone seconds the motion. The October 22, 2007 minutes are approved as prepared.

Motion: The Philosophy Review Subcommittee recommends the following:
When the submission recommendations are addressed (see below), we recommend that this course be approved by the General Education Council.

Recommendations before submission:

1. Make sure the documentation matches the areas found on Texas State University-San Marcos Core Curriculum (Appendix C).
2. Clarify the writing intensive nature of the course in the syllabus.
3. Add the Texas State requirements to the syllabus (i.e. Honor code, disability).

Discussion: Dr. Luizzi addressed the recommendations from the subcommittee and assured the Council he would make the necessary changes to comply with the recommendations.

Who would teach the course? Anyone can teach it with the option of some teaching ½ 1320 and ½ 1305 and some teaching 1320 exclusively.

Motion passed unanimously.

10.22.07
Motion: R. Brown asks for a motion to approve the minutes from September 24th. M. Blanda so moves. R. Mooney seconds the motion. The September 24th minutes are approved as prepared.

Motion: Return to agenda the subcommittee recommendation for Philosophy 1320 when Vince Luizzi is present to answer questions from the council. M. Blanda seconds the motion.

All agreed to revisit this recommendation at the meeting on the 2nd Monday of November.

9.24.07

Motion: R. Brown asks for a motion to authorize Cathy Fleuriet and Ron Brown to meet with departments regarding SACS assessment and general education core courses. C. McCall so moves. S. Ogletree seconds the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

9.25.06
S. Ogletree made a motion that when we send the recommendation forward we do so as a first preference, second preference format. The first preference would be the GEC would like to have no cuts to the GECC. The second preference is the approved recommendation to cut 2-hours from the 090 Institutional Option category with the student option of choosing to take 1-hour of US 1100 or 1-hour of PFW.

A. Krejci seconds the motion.

For: 11 Opposed: 5 Motion passed.
B. Stone made the motion to cut 2-hours from the 090 Institutional Option category with the
student option of choosing to take 1-hour of US 1100 or 1-hour of PFW.

K. Morris seconds the motion.

For: 9  Opposed: 7  Motion passed.

B. Stone makes a motion for his original proposal. He recommended a cut of 1-hour lab and 1-
hour of PFW.

S. Ogletree seconds the motion.

For: 8  Opposed: 8  Motion did not pass.

L. Lloyd makes a motion for #1 on the Brown Proposal which is to collapse the current 041
Humanities subcategory into 040, which would include 3 hours from Philosophy 1305 and the
Sophomore Literature series, making the English 23XX courses Writing Intensive. This would
continue the ability of students who start here or complete most of their core here to fulfill 9 hours
of Writing Intensive courses within the Core. Since Provost Moore has assured us to hold all
departments harmless from losing teaching positions and graduate assistants caused by Core
modifications, this would also allow the six Literature courses and Philosophy course to be taught
in smaller sections to more effectively fulfill the Writing Intensive requirement, thus improving the
quality of the undergraduate experience.

C. McCall seconds the motion.

S. Beebe made a motion to table the motion made by L. Lloyd for #1 on the Brown Proposal
which is to collapse the current 041 Humanities subcategory into 040, which would include 3
hours from Philosophy 1305 and the Sophomore Literature series, making the English 23XX
courses Writing Intensive. This would continue the ability of students who start here or complete
most of their core here to fulfill 9 hours of Writing Intensive courses within the Core. Since
Provost Moore has assured us to hold all departments harmless from losing teaching positions
and graduate assistants caused by Core modifications, this would also allow the six Literature
courses and Philosophy course to be taught in smaller sections to more effectively fulfill the
Writing Intensive requirement, thus improving the quality of the undergraduate experience.
The motion included repealing the amended B. Stone motion from last week that was approved.
B. Stone recommended a cut of 1-hour lab and 1-hour of PFW. The Council suggested an
amendment to that proposal. The new recommendation is for 2 hours to be reduced from the
General Education Core Curriculum and those hours come from the four one-hour courses in the
current core--2 PFW’s, 1 Science lab, 1 US 1100 as well as each academic department being
empowered to make its own choices of the 2 1-hour courses that would be required.

B. Stone seconds the motion.

For: 9  Opposed: 4  Motion passed.

09.18.06
Amended Motion:
B. Stone recommended a cut of 1-hour lab and 1-hour of PFW. The Council suggested an
amendment to that proposal. The new recommendation is for 2 hours to be reduced from the
General Education Core Curriculum and those hours come from the four one-hour courses in the
current core--2 PFW’s, 1 Science lab, 1 US 1100 as well as each academic department being
empowered to make its own choices of the 2 1-hour courses that would be required.

S. Ogletree seconds the motion.

For: 11  Opposed: 3 (L. Lloyd could not vote because 2 regular council representatives for
Education were present)  Abstained: 1  (V. Luizzi)
08.21.06
T. Hindson made a motion to keep the core the same and not make any cuts for the 120-Hour Degree request. M. Johnson seconds the motion.

Amended Motion:
K. Morris makes an amended motion with suggestions from V. Luizzi. We place a high value on the core curriculum as it stands at 46 hours and would like to continue the deliberation before we make a recommendation to keep the core as it is or suggest changes. We would also like to review the data sent to the Provost from the Chairs and Directors before deciding on a course of action.

J. Charles seconds the motion to table the issue.
The amended motion is unanimously approved.

08.14.06
Approve revised PPS 1.12. S. Ogletree so moved. B. Stone seconds the motion.

Corrections:
   6. Change--16 to all
   9. Change—college to department

Motion passed unanimously.

08.07.06
A recommendation was made to have R. Brown meet with the Provost and discuss the Council suggestions and invite the Provost to attend the meeting on August 14th. C. McCall so moved. S. Beebe seconds the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

03.27.06
A recommendation was made to limit Dr. Jeff Gordon to 15 minutes to share the information he wishes to share with the council.
B. Stone so moved. R. Northcutt seconded the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

02.27.06
Have the ASG students come visit the GEC because this is the place that originates curriculum and all departments are presented here.
T. Hindson so moves. B. Stone seconds the motion.

Motion passed unanimously.

4.12.04
M. Hennessy asked the council to approve the DAN/PFW cross-listed courses listed below for core curriculum institutional option credit.
-DAN 1150/PFW 1180L
-DAN 1160/PFW 1180A
-DAN 1161/PFW 1180B
-DAN 1162/PFW 1180C
-DAN 1170/PFW 1180J
-DAN 1180/PFW 1180D
-DAN 1181/PFW 1180E
-DAN 1182/PFW 1180F
-DAN 1190/PFW 1180G
-DAN 1191/PFW 1180H
-DAN 1192/PFW 1180I
B. Stone seconds the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

3.8.04
R. Brown asked for a motion to send the THECB Report forward to the next channels after the latest corrections are made. S. Ogletree so moved. D. Wiley seconds the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

11.17.03
Adopt the method of short narrative and long table for the Coordinating Board Report. D. Glassman so moved. D. Flaherty seconds the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

4.28.03
Accept the revised version of the Institutionally Designed Option.
The revised version reads as follows:

Institutionally Designated Option Component

Texas Coordinating Board Communication Component

Assumptions
1. Every institution of higher education will adopt a core curriculum.
2. . . . a core curriculum should contain courses that establish multiple perspectives on the individual and the world in which he or she lives.

An institution may wish to include in its core curriculum courses that address exemplary educational objectives not covered in the preceding broad discipline categories. Such courses may include computer literacy, kinesiology, health/wellness, interdisciplinary or linked courses, or other courses that address a specific institutional role and mission.

Southwest Texas State University Institutionally Designated Component

Definitions
The SWT designated component has two requirements within the component: an integrative perspective and a physical fitness perspective:

Integrative Perspective
University Seminar exposes learners to university life, in addition to the skills necessary for success in life after college. Through active discussions, hands-on projects and opportunities for outside learning, students will explore the multiple tasks and responsibilities of a college student, as well as gain a better appreciation for the benefits of a university education.

Physical Fitness Perspective
The mission of the physical fitness perspective is to offer to SWT students a variety of activities promoting wellness with emphasis on physical fitness and/or lifetime sports. The courses provide an opportunity for an individual to explore and appreciate the recreational and physical benefits of activities intended to promote a healthy lifestyle while gaining knowledge and skills in various available activities.

Requirements—Courses Meeting the SWT Component:
All students will complete three hours within this component, designated as follows:

Integrative Course
US 1100—University Seminar

Physical Fitness Courses
Choose two courses from:
PFW 1101-1139, 1150-1164, 1166-1225:
OR
Take one course from the above and one from:
PFW 1140, 1149, 1165, Music 1111C, 2111C, 3111C, 4111C (Marching Band)
Defining Characteristics

**Integrative Perspective**
- small class size
- individual interaction and participation in group discussions
- application of learning skills related to success in college and life
- inclusion of issues relevant across discipline
- evaluative exploration of self and/or issues related to society
- develop an appreciation of higher education and its potential to transform a life

**Physical Fitness Perspective**
- application of fitness and/or physical skills to being a healthy college student
- application of fitness and/or physical skills to the promotion of lifelong health and wellness

Objectives

**Integrative Perspective**
Primary objectives of University Seminar are:
- to facilitate students' adjustment to the challenges of life and learning at SWT.
- to expand students’ understanding of the nature and purposes of a university.
- to identify practical learning skills and concepts that will promote students’ academic success.
- to encourage students to explore the connection between university study and life enrichment, life-long learning and civic responsibility.
- to promote respect for diversity issues and concepts.

**Physical Fitness Perspective**
Primary objectives of physical fitness courses are:
- to instill in students a knowledge of health, physical fitness and wellness.
- to encourage positive lifestyle behaviors regarding personal health, physical fitness and wellness.
- to educate students about the physiological benefits derived from a physically active lifestyle.
- to encourage students to achieve and/or maintain physical fitness
- to provide students the opportunity to participate in lifetime activities.
- to encourage social interaction among students through participation in physical fitness activities.
- to educate students about the stress reducing benefits of physical activity.
- to educate students in regard to the prevention and care of activity related injuries.
- to provide opportunities for students to improve their skill level and confidence in physical activities.
- to provide physical activities and instruction for students who are physically challenged.
- to provide students the ability to design and carry out personal fitness and wellness programs.

Assessment

**Integrative Perspective**
To evaluate the successfulness of the course in helping students meet the stated objectives, the following measures will be used:
- student evaluations that probe for the students’ own view of the impact of the course;
- group meetings of faculty teaching the course, providing the occasion for continual self-assessment of their effectiveness in delivering the objectives of the course;
- annual sessions held by the program director with the orientation assistants (O.A.’s) to discuss the impact of their experience in the Freshman Seminar class.
- other periodic and longitudinal studies have been conducted at several points in time to help determine the effectiveness of the course in meeting stated objectives. For more information regarding these methods, please contact the Director of Freshman Seminar.

**Physical Fitness Perspective**
To evaluate students’ success in meeting the objectives of the physical fitness perspective, faculty will rely on a variety of assessment methods that would include at least one of the following:
- objective and/or essay exams
- skills tests examining the competency of skill level students have achieved.
- manuals, logs, or journals indicating students’ daily/weekly physical fitness activities and/or activity participation.
- class participation in the form of tournaments and competition which gives the instructor opportunities to observe students skill abilities and social interaction.
-compiling manuals or journals containing cognitive information obtained outside of class from sources such as the library, newspaper or internet including information about physical fitness perspective topics.
-end of course faculty evaluations by students, peer review of syllabi, tests and examinations, and mid-course assessment of cognitive and skill knowledge.
-surveys of former students examining the students’ actual use of the skills and information after leaving class.

B. Stone so moved. D. Glassman seconds the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**4.14.03**
Adopt the timeline as tentative for the Coordinating Board Report as presented. D. Glassman so moved. D. Wiley seconds the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**11.25.02**
B. Stone asked for a motion to accept Math 1329 to the General Education Core Curriculum under the Math Component.

B. Melzer seconds the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

**9.23.02**
The Council would like the President to come to any meeting of her choice to discuss assessment of general education issues and learning outcomes. T. Hindson so moves. J. Crawford seconds the motion.

The motion was approved unanimously.

**4.29.02**
B. Stone asked for a motion to accept the subcommittees’ original decision and not reexamine the Physical Geography proposal. B. Melzer seconds the motion.
A motion is made that Physical Geography be rejected as a natural science, which is affirming the Councils other decision.

For: 11 Opposed: 2 Abstained: 1 (M. Hennessy)

**4.8.02**
The Council members that were present do not support the contentions of any irregularities in the appointment in the original course review subcommittee.
F. Blevens seconds the motion.

6 in favor, 1 opposed and 6 did not vote because they were not present at the meeting referenced in the motion

**3.25.02**
--A motion was made by B. Stone and **seconded** by B. Melzer that the sub-committee recommend that the General Education Council disapprove the request from the Department of Geography to include Physical Geography 2410 as a Natural Science component course.
(VOTE: 5 yes, 1 no)

**Rationale for vote:**
The proposed course does not meet the General Education Council’s approved definition as a Natural Science Component course; instead of providing fundamental information that provides “the knowledge base for a number of applied disciplines…” the information presented in this course appears to be **applied** and, thus, does not meet the definition of **providing** the knowledge base on which the other disciplines can make application.

Motion passes 10 for and 3 opposed.
--B. Stone recommends reviewing the syllabi for natural science, mathematics and fine arts from each department. We will give them a statement of the definition and the natural science table-format to fill out. The Council will review each to see if they still meet the definition.

R. Northcutt seconds the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

3.4.02
B. Stone: The General Education Council holds each Chair, each semester responsible for reviewing and approving the general education syllabi and then signing a statement saying the syllabi meets the general education guidelines for the general education courses.

Amended Motion:
Department Chairs or their designees are responsible for reviewing and approving General Education course syllabi each semester. The Chair will review the syllabi for compliance with the General Education Councils’ minimum expectations and evaluate it as compliant or non-compliant. Once the syllabi has been reviewed the Chair will sign a statement indicating the syllabus is compliant if it is compliant or non-compliant and recommend a remediation plan if it is non-compliant.

Motion passed unanimously.