Meeting convened at 3:38 p.m.

R. Brown asked the Council for additions to the agenda. He asked the Council if they had any corrections to the minutes from March 6th or 27th. B. Brown asked for the following corrections on the March 6th minutes.

**Paragraph 6, add the sentence:** F. Blevens told B. Brown that the course meeting the criteria to be a science course is most important. **Paragraph 10, change the last two sentences to read:** B. Brown asked if we have to have a smorgasbord, a restrictive model or can we have something in between the two? B. Melzer mentioned we already have a smorgasbord. When selecting the members for the subcommittee, R. Brown disqualified B. Brown for reasons of conflicting interest concerning the proposed courses. R. Brown selected the Liberal Arts Chair to be represented on the subcommittee.

B. Brown asked for the following corrections on the March 27th minutes. **Paragraph 4, should read B. Brown asked for some clarification of the previous meetings’ conversation about SCH.**

**Motion:**
R. Brown asked for a motion to approve the minutes from March 6th and 27th pending review. B. Brown so moves. M. Lord seconds the motion.

The Council received the subcommittees’ report. B. Melzer told the Council that the subcommittee had met several times. The subcommittee was charged with gathering information on each course to review and recommend action upon the proposed additions to the SWT’s General Education Core Curriculum (Anthropology 2414, Geography 2310 & 2410 and Physics 1340, 1350, 1140) at the April 10th General Education Council meeting.

**Motion:**
The subcommittee recommends approval of ANTH 2414: Physical Anthropology as an additional Natural Science Perspective course to be included in the SWT General Education Core Curriculum.

**Support Statement:** The department submitted information that provided the subcommittee with sufficient data to verify this course meets both the SWT Natural Science Perspective, as well as the Coordination Board’s Natural Science information. In addition to the information grid, the department representative provided the subcommittee with information to answer the question about the specific laws of nature being discussed in this course.

B. Brown asked why the Council was not considering his original motion (B. Brown moved the adoption of the Geography, Anthropology and Physics courses to the General Education Core Curriculum for the 99 catalog.) to adopt all the proposed courses to the General Education Core Curriculum at the same time? He asked where the original motion was? R. Brown told B. Brown that once a motion is referred to a subcommittee, Roberts Rules order of procedure is taken. B. Brown was still not clear about the original motion on the table. It was explained to the Council that once a motion is taken to a subcommittee, that subcommittee supercedes that motion and can return to the Council with a subcommittee motion or recommendation. The subcommittee brought the motion back, but it was changed. Any Council member has the right to amend or substitute the motion.

**Substitution Motion:**
B. Brown moved the adoption of all three recommended courses. The substitute motion died for lack of a second.

**Motion:**
R. Brown asked the Council if they would allow L. Estaville to express his concerns to the Council, but for only 4 minutes. K. Margerison so moves to allow. E. Nielsen seconds the motion. The Council unanimously agrees to allow L. Estaville to speak.
L. Estaville had questions about the Roberts Rules used by the subcommittee. B. Melzer informed the Council that she investigated the Roberts Rules procedures and the subcommittee proceeded in accordance with those rules. Roberts Rules give the subcommittee the authority to alter the original motion. The original motion was for information gathering. S. Beebe had asked for more information once the subcommittee had met.

There being no further discussion of the motion by the Council.

*R. Brown asked the Council who was in favor of the motion to accept Anthropology 2414 to the natural science perspective.*

*Motion passed 11 for, 2 opposed.*

**Motion:**
The subcommittee recommends approval of PHYS 1340: Astronomy: Solar System, PHYS 1350: Astronomy: Stars and Galaxies, and PHYS 1140: Introductory Lab in Astronomy as additional natural science perspective courses to be included in the SWT General Education Core Curriculum.

Support statement: The department submitted information that provided the subcommittee with sufficient data to verify this course meets both SWT Natural Science Perspective, as well as the Coordinating Board’s Natural Science information. In addition to the information grid, the department representative provided the subcommittee with information to answer the question about the specific laws of nature being discussed in this course.

*R. Brown asked the Council who was in favor of the motion to accept Physics 1320, 1350 and 1140 to the natural science perspective.*

*Motion passed 11 for, 2 opposed.*

**Motion:**
The subcommittee recommends deferring consideration of GEO 2310: Introduction to Environmental Geography and GEO 2410: Introduction to Physical Geography until the first meeting of the 2000-2001 academic year.

Support statement: The subcommittee believed it appropriate to recommend deferring action to allow the department their requested time to provide the subcommittee with the department’s accurate interpretation of the course information versus the subcommittee interpreting the course syllabus in a manner which might not be accurate.

**Discussion:**
B. Brown asked why the subcommittee couldn’t just look through all the material that was provided? B. Brown stated that he was not at these Council meetings for Geography, but for Liberal Arts. He does not want the issue to be held up until next fall.

**Substitute Motion:**
B. Brown moved to substitute the adoption of Geography 2310 and 2410 to the natural science perspective for the subcommittee recommendation. The substitute motion died for lack of a second.

M. Lord asked if the subcommittee was deferring the recommendation in order for Geography to gather the requested material? B. Melzer told the Council that the subcommittee did not want the recommendation to come from their interpretation of the material. The subcommittee felt that was unfair to Geography. The subcommittee also made the present recommendation because they are not able to meet before the next scheduled meeting.

**Motion:**
R. Brown asked the Council if they would allow L. Estaville to express his concerns to the Council, but for only 4 minutes. K. Margerison so moves to allow. E. Nielsen seconds the motion.

Motion passed 8 for, 3 opposed, and 2 abstentions.

L. Estaville told the Council that he had left the subcommittee meeting with the understanding that the issue of his courses would occur this semester. He was unable to provide the information that the subcommittee requested because he was at a conference. The subcommittee noted on the request for information that it was a quick turn around time limit for the requested information. L. Estaville told the Council that Astronomy was late getting their information in. It seems to him that they gave lots of information about the Geography courses, yet because he was at a conference they are being penalized. He has a committee working on the requested information at this time. He thinks it would be a disservice to everyone to have this hanging over their heads.

B. Melzer told the Council that in the original memo it said, if you have problems with this turn around time contact her as soon as possible. Astronomy did contact B. Melzer to let her know they would not be able to provide the requested information on the date the subcommittee had requested it. It was difficult for the subcommittee to get the requested information back and find a time to meet that suited their schedules.

K. Margerison asked what the agenda is for April 24th?
R. Brown told the Council there is some value to laying this issue to rest. The problem is that several subcommittee members, including Chairs, will be out of town around the time they receive the information from Geography.

T. Mandeville supports K. Margerison’s idea for appointing a proxy to the subcommittee, unless the absent subcommittee member is a Chair representative. If L. Estaville can get the information to the subcommittee sooner, then they could meet.

F. Blevens asked if the changes and pending issues would be in the 2000 addendum? R. Brown told the Council that he would take the Council’s recommendations to the VPAA and CAD and the other necessary meetings, but there is a process for getting these courses accepted as part of the General Education Core Curriculum natural science perspective. F. Blevens told the Council that we have missed the catalog copy deadline for this fall. He thinks we need to slow down here, not speed up.

V. Luizzi suggested that Geography present to the Council on April 24th with the requested information.

B. Brown disagrees with F. Blevens. He thinks the Council should be making the same criteria across the board. The Council needs to do what’s right and fair for all the proposals.

L. Estaville told the Council he could have his information to the subcommittee as early as close of the business day on Wednesday.

**Motion:**
The Council will table this issue and defer action until April 24th. R. Northcutt so moved. K. Margerison seconds the motion.

V. Luizzi hopes to meet by Friday. B. Melzer believes it is possible for the subcommittee to meet if they have the information by Wednesday.

The Council unanimously agrees to defer action until April 24th.

T. Mandeville had some concerns he would have liked to address when this issue was over, but he will be unable to attend the next meeting so he will address them now. He is very concerned with the process for which this issue has been addressed. He told the Council he has received a great deal of paperwork concerning these courses. It concerns him that he has received letters and phone calls of a lobbying nature. He is concerned because the tenor has been confrontational. His concern is that in the future the Council should not operate in the same manner. How can we address this issue? We need to have something that states what can been done in the future to assure us the process
will be more congenial. He has felt “nit-picked” for a while and is not happy about how this process has transpired.

L. Estaville believes the subcommittee was charged with another issue that will address Tom’s concerns. (The subcommittee was charged with developing a recommendation about the appropriate procedures for handling future requests for additions to the General Education Core Curriculum. No date for completion specified)

Assessment:
R. Brown reminded the Council of the two methods of assessment, senior conversations and continuing portfolios of the fall 1999 random sample of new freshman. The continuous portfolios will collect information concerning “writing intensive” courses. Collecting this “writing intensive” information depends on faculty comfort. The continuous portfolios will look at these students over a period of 3 to 4 years.

B. Brown reports more comfort with the assessment tool since ethics has been defined.

K. Margerison asked what the point is for asking the same questions for 25 people about the same class? R. Brown told him that faculty could answer the first one and staple all other students from the same course together.

R. Northcutt thinks the information in the second paragraph concerning “not used” is overkill. G. Rydl asked if this assessment tool is to see what the faculty member is incorporating in their course. R. Wellborn does not like the “used” and “not used” categories. M. Lord has questions about “criteria for evaluation”. K. Margerison thinks many faculty members will be confused. B. Brown asked how important is it to use this particular model? T. Mandeville suggests that the assessment instrument be reversed. He thinks the assessment tool should have the most significant use first and they should be put in sentences rather than phrases. K. Margerison asked if ethics is a skill? V. Luizzi said some says yes. It is a skill because understanding ethical dimensions can be taught. M. Brennan suggested a brief example that clarifies each category. F. Blevens asked what is the significance of the students’ name.

R. Brown expected math to be the next skill hit by accrediting agencies. When such agencies ask if we have these skills in our courses, we can say yes and here is the data to prove it.

A subcommittee was formed with the following people T. Mandeville, K. Margerison and F. Blevens to meet and discuss what is an appropriate assessment tool. T. Mandeville will act as Chair for this subcommittee. The subcommittee will have this information for the next meeting.
University College will send out the inferior assessment tools now to continue to collect data. M. Brennan suggested that in the future the assessment should be sent at the beginning and not the end of the semester.

**Motion:**
R. Brown entertained a motion to adjourn. M. Lord so moved. T. Mandeville seconds the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m.