General Education Council
2015-2016 Academic Year

Agenda for the meeting on Tuesday, October 27, 2015, in ELL 205 at 3:30 P.M.

1. Call to order
2. Greeting and Introductions
3. Approve the Minutes of the two previous meetings
   a. Attachment A: Minutes from the meeting on Sept. 22, 2015
4. Old Business
   a. General Education Special Topic “Great Discoveries in Archeology”
      i. Attachment B: Approval notice
   b. Report from our new GEC representative at the UCC (Dr. Beverley Wallace)
   c. Report about our campus-wide faculty forum:
         SUP2_MSCHE_RevisedStandards2014_FINAL.pdf
      ii. Supplement 2: Why do we need to revise our General Education Program?
         SUP1_GenEd_RevisionJustification_2015-10-02and07.pdf
      iii. Attachment C: Notes about comments made and issues raised
      iv. Attachment D: April 7, 2010 Letter of Support for General Education Renewal from the President and Provost
   d. Reports from our Standing Committees
      i. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)
         1. Balance: $12,000
         2. Attachment E: General Education Grant proposal (Dr. Sam Benbow)
      ii. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)
         1. Activity report
      iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)
         1. Activity report
         2. Attachment F: Minutes from the meeting on Sept. 15, 2015
      iv. First Year Experience (Dr. Allison Predecki)
         1. Activity report
5. New Business
6. Announcements
7. Call to adjourn
General Education Council
2015-2016 Academic Year

Agenda for the meeting on Tuesday, September 22, 2015, in ELL 106 at 3:30 P.M.


1. Call to order

   Meeting was called to order at 3:37pm

2. Greeting and Introductions

3. Approve the Minutes of the two previous meetings
   a. Attachment A: Minutes from the meeting on Mar. 26, 2015

      Motion (Clements) to approve. Passed unanimously.
   b. Attachment B: Minutes from the meeting on Apr. 21, 2015

      Motion (Beck) to approve. Passed unanimously.

4. Old Business
   a. Report from last year’s GEC representative at the UCC (Dr. Kate Shirk)

      From an email from Dr. Shirk dated 9/1/15

      “The UCC met today, but it was mostly organizational. They introduced new members to the online system, etc. They are expecting smart catalog to continue to make modifications/improvements on that system. The registrar’s office would like UCC to consider recommending guidelines on the introduction of new subject codes (they would like to limit code proliferation).

      Dr. Sara Grove reiterated the necessity to carefully look at resource needs for new programs and courses, especially with the current climate of lean resources (and threat of retrenchment).

      No new proposals were considered, however there are about 60 proposals in the pipeline at council level or department and submitter level. There should be a few on the agenda next meeting.”

   b. Call for nominations to serve as GEC representative at the UCC for the 2015-2016 AY

      Beverly Wallace was the only person nominated.

   c. Election of the GEC representative at the UCC for the 2015-2016 AY

      Wallace was approved as the GEC-UCC representative.

   d. Reports from our Standing Committees

      i. Budget (Dr. Scott Drzyzga)
The committee has not met since the last GEC meeting.

1. Initial balance

   According to the Provost’s Office, the current budget is $12,000, which is the roll-over balance from last year.

2. Attachment C: Dr. David Godshalk’s and Dr. Sharon Harrow’s General Education Grant Final Report re: their visits to the Holocaust Museum and Smithsonian Museums in Washington, DC.

ii. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)

   The CLA+ exam was given to 153 freshman, which achieves the target set by the committee. This is the first time the targets for both freshmen and seniors have both been achieved. There has not yet been time to get meaningful results of the testing.

1. Report of summer activities

2. Attachment D: Minutes from the meeting on Apr. 24, 2015

iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)

   PC (Program Committee) moves to approve ANT 190 as a selected-topics Category E course for Spring 2016. The intention is for the course to be offered permanently, but the decision to make this change will be made based on assessment data. A friendly suggestion was made to include specific course/category objectives on the course syllabus. Motion passed unanimously.

   Attachment J was distributed, detailing two UCC proposals (15-031 and 15-032), which are essentially renumbering of ENG 106 to ENG 114 and ENG 110 to ENG 115, so that the numbering of these courses is more logical.

   PC moves to recommend approval of 15-031 to UCC. Motion passed unanimously.

   PC moves to recommend approval of 15-032 to UCC. Motion passed unanimously.

   Attachment K was distributed, detailing a UCC proposal to revise UCC #07-78-01, which created the General Education selected topics “190” courses. Several issues, including proposal submission timing, and the number of times a 190 course could be offered, are addressed.

   PC moves to approve Attachment K for submission to UCC. The September 1 deadline is “aggressive,” but this has been deemed necessary so that, if approved, the course can be available for students to sign up for in October. Motion passed unanimously.

   PC has discussed modifying the Gen Ed program revision timeline to allow for “open forums” to discuss reasons for reforming the program. The forums would be Friday, October 2 (12:30-2pm) and Thursday, October 8 (3:30-5pm), both in Grove Forum.

   Rebecca Elbel (student representative) suggested allowing students to attend the open forum, and also having a GEC representative attend the Student Senate open forum on October 7 in CUB MPR (7pm).
PC moved to approve holding these open forums. There was discussion about whether students should be invited to the forum or whether it should be faculty-only. The format of the forums was also discussed: Should it be mostly a presentation of information, or just a discussion of ideas?

Dr. Birsch made a motion to amend the motion to make the forums be faculty-only. Discussion emphasized that there should be future forums that include more of the campus community. Motion to amend passed unanimously.

Amended motion passed unanimously.

1. Report of summer activities
2. Attachment E: Minutes from the meeting on Apr. 7, 2015
3. Attachment F: Minutes from the meeting on May 4, 2015
4. Attachment G: Minutes from the meeting on Aug. 20, 2015
5. Attachment H: Minutes from the meeting on Sept. 1, 2015
6. Attachment I: A General Education Special Topics Course Proposal: ANT190
7. Updated “190-type” General Education Special Topics course proposal

iv. First Year Experience (Dr. Scott Drzyzga)
   1. No report

5. New Business
   a. Committee assignments for AY 2014-2015

      Dr. Drzyzga announced the committee assignments that he and Dr. Mike made.

6. Announcements

      Committee assignments and Attachments J and K are included as additional attachments to these minutes.

7. Call to adjourn

      Meeting was adjourned at 4:49pm.
MEMO

DATE: September 23, 2015

TO: Cathy Sprenger; Barbara Denison; Curt Zaleski; and James Mike

FROM: Scott Drzyzga, faculty co-chair, General Education Council

SUBJECT: ANT190: Special Topic "Great Discoveries in Archeology" approved for Category E

On Tuesday, September 22, 2015, the General Education Council reviewed and approved the special topic proposal submitted by the Department of Sociology and Anthropology (via Dr. Karl Lorenz). The GEC found the topic "Great Discoveries in Archeology" to be appropriate for a 190-type course in Category E (and very interesting). The GEC also found the submitted proposal and syllabus made clear and explicit connections between the general learning objectives of the Category E curriculum and the specific learning objectives of the course.

In accordance with university policy, the special topic “Great Discoveries in Archeology” may be offered up to and no more than 4 times. If the Department of Sociology and Anthropology wishes to offer the course more than 4 times, then it must submit a new general education course proposal to the UCC and receive its approval before doing so.

This instance of ANT190 may now be activated by the Registrar’s Office and made available to students for Spring 2016.

All the best,
Scott

faculty co-chair of the GEC

Scott A. Drzyzga, PhD, GISP
PASSHE GIS Consortium & Affiliates, Past President
Department of Geography & Earth Science
Shippensburg University
1871 Old Main Drive
Shippensburg, PA 17257
October 2nd Open Faculty Meeting
Grove Forum

Issues Discussed

The main driver for reform is the new Middle States standards, which requires assessment of student learning for each and every standard.

Another driver for reform is the inability to assess our current program.

FM - Challenge from HCS that the method used to count the number of learning objectives was misguided. It was up to faculty teaching the course how to tease out the objectives in a way appropriate to the course material and discipline. The question was asked whether doing this on a competency-base made assessment more straightforward.

The question then came up several times – is this really an assessment problem or a program problem and shouldn't we first figure out what is going on programmatically and fix that before upending the entire thing? In essence, come up with better assessment of our current program rather than changing our program to assess it.

GEC – The new Middle States Standards require assessment of competencies that our current program does not address. So, at a minimum, the current program needs to be updated to reflect these additional competencies. Without restructuring the program at all, more learning objectives need to be added to an already cumbersome set. Restructuring the program is the best option because doing so would allow us to re-focus on student learning and streamline the program by including the missing learning objectives and reconsidering/purging extant learning objectives that are cumbersome or nearly impossible to assess.

FM - If it is a question of program assessment vs. student learning assessment? (i.e., that we cannot assess student learning given the way our objectives are currently written?)

GEC – The current program was assessed in 2009. What we learned then is: a) the current structure of our GenEd program places an extraordinary burden on faculty to assess completely (owing to the extremely large numbers of stated and embedded learning objectives); and b) many of our learning objectives are nearly impossible to assess consistently across the program (owing to the post-hoc way that learning objectives were created – after the program was created and not necessarily aligned with student learning, but aligned with departmental turf).

FM - If a new program goes through, it was emphasized that the GEC Assessment and Program Committee had to provide guidance on how to assess, including instruments, time frames, etc.

GEC – Of course. It is a best practice to assess one or very few learning objectives each semester, program-wide. This practice allows the campus community to collaboratively seek clarification and guidance (and the GEC to provide both), and to normalize expectations about baseline, above average, average, and below average competency levels across the curriculum. Ideally, time frames would be linked with our normal 5-year and 1-year program review cycles.
Discussions about assessment in general.

FM - When first year experience is implemented, that would be the beginning point of assessment for the Gen Ed program – old or new?

GEC – This is an open question.

One point was made about identifying specific classes that were not [helping students to achieve the desired learning objectives] and whether or not the Gen Ed Committee could go back to that class specifically. I was unclear about the answer – GEC does the assessment in other programs and individual courses are not targeted.

Institutions that are doing well in terms of assessment, are they using standardized instruments? Discussed the Values Rubrics written by the AACU. It was noted that the effort by the Program Committee in devising rubrics was frustrating and forcing all competencies into a 3x3 matrix was arbitrary, misinformed about pedagogy, and did not pay heed to the learning objectives. It was noted, when HCS said they used their professional organization’s rubric, that it was inappropriate for GEC to force something else.

GEC – The Program Committee does not have any authority “to force” anything; only to make recommendations to the GEC, which department representatives on the GEC vote to ‘approve’ or ‘not approve.’ Last year, the Program Committee solicited advice from multiple departments regarding how they currently assess student learning. Some gave their advice. Any miscommunication about “forcing” was unintentional.

This moved to a discussion about the difference between having a rubric that measured whether a competency had been learned vs. whether the competency had been well used. The example was the English department rubric. It is not appropriate for a non-English department to have a rubric that measures if the student ‘learned’ how to write, but that it would be very useful to have a rubric to evaluate how well a student wrote (practiced).

The distinction it seems: 

I – Competency Introduced
P – Competency Practiced
A – Competency Assessed  *** Just my thought.

Another driver for reform was a general trend away from content-based programs to competency-based, with the explicit aim of encouraging cross-disciplinary courses.

FM - First question was whether competencies were being generated internally or externally.

FM - Second, if different disciplines are receiving the same tag, how is assessment possible?

Discussion ensued about departments receiving a tag getting together to standardize assessment of the competencies.
The question then came up about incentives to change over to this system. The Middle States transition from 3-legged stool to the full ‘4-legged chair’ was discussed. [A faculty member] expressed the concern that when learning is assessed cross-disciplinarily that there was potential threat to discipline standards and integrity.

Concern expressed that there was a general movement emphasizing national outcomes and objectives, national instrumentation for assessment that ignored discipline standards. The Core Curriculum moves up to university.

[Remember, our CBA is built on the 3-legged stool so the Middle States 4-legged-chair comes into direct contradiction with our contract.]

The Elephant in the Room (Digging a Big Trench then Digging it again… Retrenching!)

After presenting the ‘Retrenchment’ vs. ‘Gen Ed Reform’ slide, many challenges arose on that point. There was a need for you to update the chart as several schools did in fact have retrenchment letters on the table post-gen ed reform.

GEC – During the Oct. 2 session, some of the dates on the slide in question reflected the issuance of “general” retrenchment letters while other dates reflected the issuance of retrenchment letters to “individual” faculty members. The data on the slide were corrected before the Oct. 8 session to reflect only “individual” letters (using data sent by Mary Rita DuVall @ State APSCUF).

FM - One suggestion on this point was to seek a letter from the President/Provost that NO faculty jobs would be lost as a result of Gen Ed reform.

Suggestions

FM - To achieve the goal of reducing the program size, consider eliminating one science requirement and re-think the diversity requirement.

FM - Another suggestion was made to bring Middle States here and ask them for guidance in terms of whether we are going in the right direction or not. [I talked to Sara about this today and she said Middle States will no do it without an enormous cost outlay to the school.]

GEC – This was an idea that surfaced at both sessions. We consulted with Dr. Sara Grove and she reported that Middle States will not visit campus or provide such guidance without enormous cost to the university. Nor will they “pre-approve” anything before their review.

Other Topics

A great deal of frustration was expressed in that everyone keeps hearing that something was coming but no program draft ever emerges. Difficult to have an actual discussion when there is nothing on the table. People would like to see alternative programs.

GEC – The GEC has been frustrated by the release of new accreditation standards and the “general” retrenchment letter, both of which required rethinking and, hence, slowed the process.
GEC – Take a look at the NIU-Plus program @ Northern Illinois University (NIU), which is a new general education program that’s been designed around a clear set of 8 student learning objectives.

FM - There is an incompatibility between PASSHE and Middle States in terms of what they want from their Gen Ed curriculum: Middle States, competencies; PASSHE, content oriented. The question was whether AAAT or GEC Assessment could work with departments to blend the two requirement sets together.

FM - If/when new program comes out, the Tags/objectives must be very very clearly laid out and each and every step about grandfathering in courses, assessment rotations, etc. must be very explicit.

Meeting ended.

These are the notes to the best of my ability to write fast and to remember!

Cynthia B.

FM - Idea expressed by a faculty member

GEC - Idea expressed by the General Education Council

Italicized text indicates a summary of a discussion or ideas expressed by the note-taker.
Meeting opened at 3:35 pm with presentation and handout

**Comments during presentation:**

FM - If Middle States is now adding assessment as a separate item from teaching, scholarship and service, will tenure and promotion processes on campus now include this as well?

GEC - That is an open question for the Tenure & Promotion committee to consider.

FM - HCS 100 addresses the (Middle States) list of objectives, but this may or may not be revealed in assessment.

FM - There are too many objectives to assess in the current program.

FM - Has Kutztown (w/ 3 GE programs) had a Middle States review recently?

*GEC – The answer to this question was not known at the time, but subsequent research found their next self-study review will occur during the 2017-2018 AY. So, it’s coming.*

**Comments after presentation:**

FM - There was a guarantee of no retrenchments being caused by GE program revision in the past. Can we get another letter of guarantee from the provost/administration that reorganization of GE program will not lead to faculty retrenchment?

GEC – This has not been pursued yet, but the Program Committee of the GEC can be tasked by a motion of the GEC.

FM - I believe that such a letter would help the process along.

GEC – What if the provost says “no”?

FM - That is information that the faculty needs to know to make an informed decision.

FM - We should be drawing on assessment data to inform changes.

FM – Data is appreciated, but the current program is not assessable.

FM – Two faculty members of my department were retrenched and relocated from other PASSHE campuses due in part to GE redesign. Less GE may be good for
GEC open forum for faculty
8 October 2015

GEC open forum for faculty
8 October 2015
Notes taken by KBShirk

sciences, but not good for social sciences where we introduce students to depth and breadth of subject material. Many of our majors find their way to us through the GE program.

**GEC –** We have a pressing need to assess 1/3 of the credits (dollars) that students are taking (spending) to fulfill their liberal arts degree requirements. These credits (costs) are in the GE program. Our program needs to be assessable and competitive among our sister institutions.

**FM -** Is there any data that parents or prospective students actually compare and contrast GE programs?

**GEC –** That is an open question.

**FM –** I think this would be positive for transfer students. It would give students choice in what they want.

**FM –** That the new program is needed to align with Middle States is the strongest argument. Could we just pare down objectives in subcommittee to make assessment feasible?

**GEC –** That was among the first things that the Program Committee considered, but much of our current program does not align with competencies. Our program reflects 20th century thinking of compartmentalized GE. We are being prompted to move forward to 21st century cross-disciplinary GE.

**FM –** Assessment and Program subcommittees did look at skills section of current program. It is challenging to write learning objectives and rubrics that capture all courses in current program.

**FM –** Our “pass” from Middle States was lucky with the assessment that we had of current GE program. We need to be more creative and flexible. We should consider that colleges other than A&S may be able to fulfill GE requirements with their courses.

**FM –** It’s a marketing issue to allow other colleges to offer GE and attract students.

**FM –** We each have a specialized body of knowledge. For example, many courses have writing, but WIFYS is still very much needed. Everybody cannot teach all things.

**GEC –** This is not a conversation about specialized turf. This is a campus-wide conversation about cross-disciplinary learning objectives.

**FM –** Who designates “tags”?
GEC – The General Education program is a university-wide program and the faculty is having a conversation about its structure. Past practice suggests that departments would seek to participate in the new program by applying to position their courses as they see fit.

FM – We’re talking about why we’re moving forward. The major driver is assessment, so the new program should first have clear assessment goals and procedures.

GEC – The first thing is to develop a skeleton/framework based on learning objectives, then create the process for periodic assessment of student learning associated with those objectives, then populate the program with courses where they belong to help students learn what we expect them to learn.

FM – Look at Middle States recommendation: Critical analysis could be applied to arts. It would be easy to build that rubric for assessment.

FM – The arts all share that they “analyze”, “describe”, etc. That would be true for all.

FM – Can the assessment be designed to be better with the current program? If this is assessment driven, we should start with assessment and see if we need to change.

FM – The assessment subcommittee doesn’t write the learning objectives.

GEC – Program change should help us meet Middle States requirements, but we should also protect what is good about our current program.

FM – We don’t have a clear idea on what Middle States actually wants.

FM – Middle States will not come to campus and give a preview. They have told us that assessment matters, and that faculty involvement in the assessment matters.

FM – The new program then has to have a clear idea on how assessment will occur.

GEC – Six people went to Middle States conference and collaborated on what they heard. This document (hand out and presentation) reflects that group interpretation on what Middle States wants.

FM – Could we include 300 and 400 level courses in GE?

GEC – That’s a great idea and one that the Program Committee considered for a long time, but the new PASSHE BOG policy (2012-13) effectively prevents this from happening.

FM – [question about middle states that I didn't catch]
FM – Middle States’ goal is that educational programs should be intentional and thoughtful about student learning objectives and outcomes. If we are put on warning, that is not cost effective. We would have a loss of federal funding for our students, it would damage our reputation, we would have the additional costs of more intermediate reviews.

FM – Can we streamline objectives for the current program?

GEC – We are missing some of Middle States’ new objectives, so these need to be added.

FM – Sociology does assess technology competency.

FM – We may need to move courses from one category to another after doing that.

GEC – Yes, a program designed intentionally around student learning objectives (instead of department-based clusters) might prompt some departments to move their courses into new or other areas.

Meeting ended.

FM - Idea expressed by a faculty member

GEC - Idea expressed by the General Education Council

*Italicized* text indicates a summary of a discussion or ideas expressed by the note-taker.
Letter of Support for General Education Renewal from the President and Provost

We write this letter to support ongoing faculty led efforts to explore avenues for renewal of General Education at Shippensburg University. We were commended by Middle States for the hard work performed by the General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC), giving special recognition to the assessment work done by the committee. The GECC has developed a comprehensive assessment plan for General Education, with components including, but not limited to, course assessment and program assessment. Course assessment has included reviewing category objectives, rubrics, and the framework for administering assessment of current general education courses. Program assessment has included faculty survey and forums, study of General Education at comparable universities, and study of national General Education best practices. In addition, the Provost’s Office and Arts and Sciences Dean’s Office sent a team to the Institute on General Education, sponsored by the Association of American Colleges & Universities.

Though praise was received by Middle States, it is also clear that the accrediting body expects program assessment to be used to renew our current 26-year-old General Education program. As a reflective and professional community, we will consistently evaluate ourselves so that we provide the best experience for our students, faculty, and staff. Our Academic Master Plan will be an important blueprint for this work, and an important component of that master plan will be the continuing work of the GECC, leading the campus in the process of assessing and renewing General Education. It is important to note that any changes to the General Education program will be accomplished in a thoughtful, planned manner consistent with current and future faculty complement. There will be no faculty retrenchment as a result of this effort.

With all of the above in mind, we therefore encourage the GECC to include in its charge the following goals, using all the assessment instruments and other information at your disposal: 1) Use appropriate means to keep faculty and other constituencies informed of the progress of your work; 2) Identify and obtain appropriate additional input from faculty and other appropriate internal and external constituencies; 3) Develop a comprehensive plan for the renewal of the general education program, including the following components: appropriate revision of the vision, mission, goals, and objectives of General Education, a curriculum proposal or series of proposals designed to meet those goals and informed by course and program assessment, and a plan for the implementation of proposal(s); 4) Present your proposal to UCC at the beginning of the Fall 2011 semester.

Best wishes for continued success in this vital renewal effort to enhance the quality and relevance of undergraduate education at Shippensburg University.

Cordially yours,

William N. Ruud, Ph.D.
President

Barbara G. Lyman, Ph.D.
Provost
Please note: The summary narrative with a clear description of the project, including how the learning objectives of the appropriate General Education category are met, should be attached to this form.

Name: Samuel R. Benbow  
Department: Social Work and Gerontology Department

Email: Srbenb@ship.edu  
Phone: 717-477-1781

Date of Proposed Project/Event/Excursion: November 20, 2015

If project/event is specific to your general education course sections, please provide Course # and Section number(s): SWK 265: Section 01 & Section 02

General Education Category: (Skills and competencies, A-E, Diversity requirement) 
Brief Description of General Education Project (50 words maximum):

The excursion is to take two sections of SWK 265 (Understanding Diversity for Social Work Practice) to volunteer with the homeless of Dauphin County as part of the Project Homeless Connect Program. The will be ambassadors helping to connect homeless individuals to much needed services in the community.

Total Amount Requested: $800.00

Faculty Member: Samuel R. Benbow  
Date: September 21, 2015
Summary Narrative

Dr. Samuel R. Benbow, Social Work & Gerontology Department
2015 Project Homeless Connect Experiential Learning Opportunity

Summary Narrative of the Project:
The proposed project is a bus excursion to the 2015 Project Homeless Connect Program in Harrisburg, PA on the morning of November 20, 2015. This excursion is designed to directly support the course objectives, which are to assist students to develop tools for increased understanding of and sensitivity to human diversity and cultural experiences different from their own. This “human behavior in the social environment lens” approach calls for students to examine their own values, beliefs, attitudes and approaches to human diversities. Students will be serving in the role of volunteers called Ambassadors who will assist homeless individuals called Guests to access a wide variety of services offered throughout the county that are converged into the Farm Show Complex for the day. Services include, but are not limited to dental exams, eye exams, permanent housing assistance, temporary housing assistance, emergency housing assistance, office of vital records (for birth certificates), social security office, physical exams, flu shots, pet care, bicycle maintenance, mental health supportive services, meals and food distributions, drug and alcohol referrals, veteran resource, child care (to provide support for parents while they are accessing the various services), hair care support and so forth (website: http://www.cachpa.org/).

Participating in the Project Homeless Connect program will assist students to extend their knowledge-base of assigned readings, class discussions and course assignments in a way that would bridge the gap between classroom knowledge and what is actually going on in our communities. Students will also be asked to self-investigate and identify areas where differing customs or values could have an impact on how they engage future clients with their intervention, identify their own biases, and be willing to develop "a reversible mind set."

Course Assignment and Connection to General Education Program Diversity Objectives:
There are three assignments which directly connect to this experiential activity, and they are as follows:
1. News Article: Write an article to a print media source of their choice sharing their overall experience and it's alignment to our Social Work Core Competencies and Practice Behaviors. Please see attached document for a more specific descriptor of the assignment. 2. Project Homeless Connect Reflection: Assignment in which student are required to synthesize their experience and draw connections to the course curriculum. Please see the attached documents for a more specific description of the assignment. 3. Cultural Diversity Awareness Paper: Assignment that has been divided into two parts in which students are required to first conduct, then analyze an Ethnographic-based interview with an individual who is ethnically and racial different from themselves. The second assignment requires students to reflect on their entire educational experience in the course with regards to what they have learned about themselves, family, community regarding multiculturalism, and diversity awareness, and then create a plan of what they intend to do as a means for further development of their professional as well as personal growth. Students will include aspects from Project Homeless Connect as part of this assignment.

Additionally, all assignments require students to explore historical aspects of diversity and oppression as a means to develop ways to effectively impact change in their professional lives as social workers as well as in their personal lives. These assignments are in direct alignment to the goals and objectives of the course as well as the General Education Program and the Diversity requirement. More specifically, the diversity objectives in a synthesized manner, states that the activity/excursion should assist students to understand their own attitudes, beliefs and values and take the knowledge to learn how to effectively interact with diverse individuals and communities to enhance social justice and equality. SWK 265: Understanding Diversity for Social Work Practice is a course that has been approved for a number of years to be included as one of several courses approved under the General Education Program Diversity requirement options. The course objectives called Core Competencies and Practice Behaviors have been developed to meet our national accrediting body (Council on Social Work Education/CSWE) standards and are in direct alignment with the Course Learning Objectives established by the General Education Committee. One example of a Core Competency and associated Practice Behaviors for this course is as follows:

Core Competency 2.1.5. Advance human rights and social and economic justice
SWK 265: Understanding Diversity for Social Work Practice

*Project Homeless Connect Cultural Event Assignment*

This experience is a very unique application of social work principles in a real life setting that very few students have the opportunity to at this stage in your course work. To this end, it is essential that you take your professional experiences, course preparation, course readings and personal values to process your thoughts and feelings: 1) leading up to the event 2) throughout the morning and 3) after the event.

**Part I**

You are a news reporter and will be writing an article for submission into one of the following newsletter/newspapers. The SLATE, ASP Newsletter, The Daily Slice of Life (Social Work Newsletter), The Shippensburg Chronicle, The Chambersburg Public Opinion, Hagerstown Record Herald, or your local hometown newspaper

Your article should include the following points but not necessarily in the order provided:  Introduction and identification of self, brief history of Project Homeless Connect, your experience, connection to CSWE Core Competencies and Practice Behaviors, full name of course, what you learned about yourself and a clear picture.  NOTE: Dr. Benbow will be submitting your article so you must also include on a separate sheet of paper that is attached to the rear of your article the mailing address and who the article should be mailed to at the newspaper or newsletter you select.  Be creative and have some fun with it!

**Part II: Synthesis of Event**

- **Facts:** Title, date, location, project name, numbers in attendance, in paragraph form.
- **Description:** Describe the setting and what you did in narrative form. You are expected to synthesize the experience and not simply provide a step by step breakdown of what was done.
- **Connection:** Demonstrate the ability to draw clear connections between course concepts and the event. Provide examples of event activities, class activities/discussion and assigned readings that connect with each other.
- **Reflection:** Describe what you thought before the event (before the training, after the training, on the bus and after the event). What did you learn about yourself through this experience? Would you recommend this experience to a friend? Why or why not? *NOTE: The reflection must go beyond simplistic phrases such as “I liked it” or I didn’t like it”.
- **Core Competencies and Practice Behaviors:** Demonstrate the ability to connect at least two (2) Core Competencies and two (2) Practice Behaviors that best fit your overall experience with the cultural event.
- Show a commitment to excellence in preparation of your paper, including professional appearance and a command of Standard English. Students are highly encouraged to seek assistance from the Learning Center for writing support.
- **Reference page with a minimum of 4 references (course texts can be used as two).**

*NOTE: Length of pages for each assignment is determined by your meeting the assignment requirements.*
**GENERAL EDUCATION PROJECT GRANT**  
**BUDGET SHEET**  
(WRITTEN ESTIMATES FROM VENDORS MUST BE ATTACHED TO HARD COPY)

**NAME:** Samuel R. Benbow  
**DEPARTMENT:** Social Work and Gerontology

**EMAIL:** SRBENB@SHIP.EDU  
**PHONE:** 717-477-1781

**MONTH AND YEAR OF PROPOSED EVENT:** November, 2015

**ITEMIZED BUDGET (PROPOSED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ITEM AMOUNT (WRITTEN ESTIMATE ATTACHED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ry-An Meyers LLC (2 school buses)</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REQUESTED:** $800.00  
**FACULTY MEMBER:** Samuel R. Benbow  
**DATE:** September 21, 2015
It looks like the trip will be 2 hours shorter than originally quoted. So new quote would be $400 for 1 bus or $800 for 2 buses

Sent from my iPhone

On Sep 22, 2015, at 6:00 AM, Sam Benbow <Srbenb@ship.edu> wrote:

Good morning Ryan,
I have changed our plans for the day and ask if you could provide me with an updated pricing to reflect the following: We are leaving at 7 a.m. but will no longer go to the restaurant. We will be loading the buses at the Farm show to return at 12:15 p.m. The pickup and drop off changes as well as a price change for two buses if there is one. Thank you, Sam Benbow.

Samuel R. Benbow, D.Ed
Associate Professor
329 Shippen Hall
Department of Social Work & Gerontology
Shippensburg University
(717) 477-1781

Ry-An Meyers LLC school bus company will do trip on November 20, 2015 leaving Shippensburg University at 7 AM, going to Farm Show Complex. Leaving Farm Show Complex around noon and going to a restaurant on Front Street, then back to Shippensburg University at 3 PM. The total cost for this trip for 1 bus and driver would be $430. The total cost for this trip for 2 buses and drivers would be $860. Thanks Ryan D. Meyers, owner, Ry-An Meyers LLC.
Minutes
Program Committee of the General Education Council, 9/15/15, 3:45 pm, FSC 248
Approved: Oct. 20, 2015

I. Meeting was called to order by Dr. Sherri Bergsten, chair of the GEC Program Committee. The meeting was attended by Allison Predecki, Sherri Bergsten, Brian Wentz, Scott Drzyzga, Doug Birsch, Karl Lorenz, Alice James, Cynthia Botteron and Paris Peet.

II. Dr. Lorenz motioned to approve the minutes from the 5/4/15 meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Botteron. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. Dr. Hirsch motioned to approve the minutes from the 8/20/15 meeting with the amendment that Dr. James and Dr. Peet were not in attendance. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wentz. The minutes were approved unanimously.

IV. Dr. Peet motioned to approve the minutes from the 9/1/15 meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Wentz. The minutes were approved unanimously.

V. The committee reviewed UCC proposals 15-31 and 15-32 which seek a course number change for WIFYS and Advanced Placement Writing respectively so that there will be three consecutively numbered writing courses offered by the English Department covering the range from the developmental writing. Dr. Peet motioned to recommend to the GEC that proposals IS-31 be approved. Dr. Botteron seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved. Dr. Peet also motioned to recommend to the GEC that proposals IS-32 be approved. Dr. Botteron seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

VI. The committee discussed the revision to the Gen Ed 190 course proposal. The revision seeks to change the dates when proposals for new Gen Ed 190 courses should be submitted to the GEC for approval. The revision also proposes that the department where the Gen Ed 190 course will be taught should indicate to the GEC to which general education category the course belongs. Finally the revision proposes that Gen Ed 190 courses should be assessed each time the course is taught. Dr. Lorenz motioned that the GEC approve this proposal for submission to UCC. Dr. Wentz seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved.

VII. The committee set the dates and times for open forums addressing general education reform. The first session will be on Friday, October 2 from 12:30-2:00 pm and the second session will be on Thursday, October 8 from 3:30-5:00 pm. Dr. Drzyzga and Dr. Bergsten presented a draft of the Justification for General Education Reform document that will be discussed at the open forums. The committee had several suggestions for revision of the document. Dr. Drzyzga will make these revisions and solicit further comments by email.

VII. The next meeting will be on Tuesday, October 20th at 3:45 pm.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

---Minutes submitted by Allison Predecki