

General Education Council
10.9.00

Council Members Present:

L. Thomas-Health Professions
B. Melzer-Health Professions
B. Brown-Liberal Arts
M. Hennessy-Liberal Arts
T. Hindson-Liberal Arts
W. Stone-Applied Arts
V. Sriraman-Science
R. Northcutt-Science
M. Lord-Education
C. McCall-Education

F. Blevens-Fine Arts and Communications
S. Beebe-Chair Representative

Council Members Absent:

J. Crawford-Chair Representative
A. Angirasa-Applied Arts
J. Ross-Business
J. Oliver-Business
T. Mottet-Fine Arts and Communication
A. Lopez-Student Representative
M. Benavides-Student Representative

Meeting convened at 3:34 p.m.

Agenda review for future meetings:

10.23.00

- The subcommittee of R. Northcutt (chair), C. McCall and F. Blevens will have a recommendation for the council on the issue of student voting
- Revisit the student interview issue
- R. Brown has spoken with T. Mottet about facilitating a workshop concerning role playing for the Senior Interviews

11.13.00

- The council will review the revised proposal for GEO 2410

11.27.00

- Discuss Senior Interview Process (5-7 trial interviews for incite into SWT students) to take about 2.5-3 hours one night in Nov.

The subcommittee recommendation revisited:

The subcommittee recommends that the procedure for the General Education Council (GEC) to determine applicability of proposed courses to meet the SWT general education requirements be discussed by the GEC at the second meeting of the 2000-2001 academic year.

Support Statement: The subcommittee has developed an initial procedure for determining the applicability of proposed courses as new general education courses. However, the GEC will not have sufficient time to discuss the process or provide input to the subcommittee prior to the completion of the regular meetings scheduled for the 1999-2000 academic year. Although, the subcommittee has been able to spend nearly 4 hours of discussion about the courses being proposed for additional SWT general education courses it has not had sufficient time to articulate all possibilities to present to the GEC.

Currently the subcommittee's suggested process for approval of new general education courses includes:

1. when a proposal has been received, the GEC appoint a subcommittee to review the proposal
 - a. the process for subcommittee appointment will be determined by the GEC
 - b. the subcommittee chair will be appointed by the Dean
 - c. a GEC member who is a member of the department proposing the additional general education course will not be appointed to the subcommittee to prevent any perception of a conflict of interest
2. the subcommittee will develop a form for assessing the course
 - a. the form will utilize both the CB criterion and the SWT “perspective” criterion for which the course is being suggested
 - b. it is the responsibility of the department to provide the supporting information in the format developed by the subcommittee

although parliamentary authority states that committee meetings be completed in executive session, it be the subcommittee’s option to invite representatives of the department to present additional information during the subcommittee meeting

B. Melzer told the council that they needed to map out a form to give out as a standard that all submitted proposals need to follow. She suggested that the PPS indicate what the council decides concerning the proposal process; otherwise, it is left to the interpretation of each individual subcommittee reviewing a proposal.

C. McCall told the council that last spring they discussed having a format that compared apples to apples. The council needs a standard format that everyone must follow.

Process:

1. Appointment of subcommittee
2. Criteria driven
3. How subcommittee operates

R. Brown asked the council if they wanted to create the procedure for submitting a proposal now or if they wanted to wait for a proposal to come along? The criteria must incorporate the coordinating board statements, but do we want to carry forward the exemplary objectives?

W. Stone told the council that the criteria must meet the coordinating board statements.

S. Beebe told the council to do all areas now with the coordinating board statements and the exemplary objectives.

R. Brown told the council that it would be beneficial to let the departments know ahead of time what the criteria is for getting a course accepted under the General Education Core Curriculum. He also told the council that at this time the subcommittee would affirm the natural science perspective and a subcommittee or committee would be appointed to reform or revise all perspectives.

B. Melzer said they were told that the proposals only had to meet the coordinating board statements and not the perspectives.

V. Sriraman said the council needed to make clear what the description of the natural science requirement is.

R. Brown told the council that public schools send courses coded from their core curriculum and we have to accept those courses.

M. Hennessy told the council that the exemplary objectives are very broad statements. The proposal also has to meet the specific perspective requirement. The problem arises when you try to meld the exemplary objectives and the perspectives because they are very different. The

council has the right to have specific criteria for its courses. The coordinating board has global criteria and SWT has specific criteria. M. Hennessy told the council that rewriting the exemplary objectives and melding the two would not do.

B. Melzer told the council that the objective has to meet the coordinating board requirements and then whatever the council deems appropriate. B. Melzer asked the council if they needed to add requirements to fit the coordinating board requirements or take out conflicts that already exist?

R. Brown asked the council if they wanted to create the New Core Components of Education where they refined the component and the perspective goes away?

W. Stone warned the council to be careful that the criteria are not too restrictive and tight.

F. Blevens told the council to draw up straight guidelines of the components and draw from the perspectives. He told the council to create a form that they give to the departments that tells the department how the proposal will be evaluated and what guidelines they have to work with.

Motion:

S. Beebe moved that the council empower R. Brown appoint a committee to structure the components so they are aligned with coordinating board guidelines for the departments seeking these proposals. B. Melzer seconds the motion. The motion passes unanimously.

Motion:

S. Beebe moved the procedure for new proposals follow a specific path. First, the proposal is submitted to Dean Brown who then appoints a committee to review the proposal (nobody from the department submitting the proposal may serve on the committee or subcommittee). After the committee reviews the proposal they respond in writing about how the proposal met or did not meet the components. Individuals are invited to attend, but the subcommittee meeting will be considered an executive session. Last, they come to the council.

Discussion:

R. Brown asked the council if the department representatives could come to the entire council for the proposal?

F. Blevens told the council they should have the option to invite representatives.

S. Beebe told the council that the Curriculum Committee allows the representatives to address the council then the subcommittee.

B. Melzer told the council that the subcommittee did not want lobbying.

S. Beebe told the council that the subcommittee would do the work and they control seeking out information. Next they vote on the proposal. Finally, the petitioning department may be available to respond.

W. Stone told the council that he had an amendment for the motion, that in the event a proposal is voted down by the council it should be two years before the council will look at it again.

R. Northcutt told the council that the department should be supplied with a copy of the report from the subcommittee that will be presented to the council. The representative may attend the meeting to answer questions, but lobbying is not allowed. They have one shot to present to the subcommittee so it needs to be their best shot.

Amended Motion:

S. Beebe moved that the procedure for submitting a proposal to the council work in the follow manner. First, the Dean will appoint a subcommittee. The subcommittee will supply the

department with the criteria (form) they expect the department to provide. Once the subcommittee has the written criteria the department may have a representative available to answer any questions the subcommittee may have. The chair of the council will preside and manage the minutes. Finally, the results of the subcommittee recommendation will be given to the department and the council at the same time. If the proposal is defeated by the council it can not be brought back before the council for two years.

The amended motion passed unanimously.

R. Brown asked the council if they wanted to redefine the exemplary objective statements and the perspectives into one common form?

W. Stone told the council they needed one common form for consistency.

R. Brown told the council that they needed the natural science criteria in time for Dr. Estaville's proposal. Volunteers?

Committee consists of:

B. Melzer-Co-chair

C. McCall-Co-chair

V. Sriraman

W. Stone

The committee is charged with reporting back to the council with the natural science criteria as soon as it is completed (before the next meeting), then the others as soon as they are completed.

R. Brown told the council he has been charged by presidential degree to monitor the quality of the General Education courses. He will do this by obtaining course syllabi and conferring with the departments about their course evaluations. He will send a model syllabus from Liberal Arts to the council members along with an e-mail address for David Grise's website. Please send college or department syllabi to R. Brown.

Next Meeting:

1. Student voting
2. Model syllabi
3. Natural science perspective

Motion:

R. Brown makes a motion to adjourn. S. Beebe seconds the motion. Meeting is adjourned at 4:42 p.m.