Agenda for the meeting on Tuesday, November 24, 2015, in ELL 205 at 3:30 P.M.

1. Call to order
2. Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting
   a. Attachment A: Minutes from the meeting on Oct. 27, 2015
3. Summary of recent events [US DOE, MSCHE, PASSHE, SHIP]
   a. Attachment B: Accreditation in the news
4. Old Business
   a. Reconstitute the ad hoc Amendment Committee
      i. Attachment C: GEC By-laws
   b. Report from our new GEC representative at the UCC (Dr. Beverley Wallace)
   c. Reports from our Standing Committees
      i. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)
         1. Attachment D: Minutes from its meeting on Oct., 9, 2015
         2. Attachment E: Minutes from its meeting on Nov., 11, 2015
      ii. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)
         1. Attachment F: Minutes from its meeting on Nov., 11, 2015
      iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)
         1. Attachment G: Minutes from its meeting on Oct., 20, 2015
         2. Attachment H: Minutes from its meeting on Nov., 11, 2015
         3. Attachment I: UCC proposed new Subject Code Policy (#Policy_1_2015)
   d. Reports from our ad hoc Committees
      i. First Year Experience (Dr. Allison Predecki)
         1. Attachment J: Minutes from its meeting on Oct. 17, 2015
5. New Business
6. Announcements
7. Call to adjourn
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

   Meeting was called to order at 3:35pm.

2. Approve the Minutes of the two previous meetings

   a. Attachment A: Minutes from the meeting on Sept. 22, 2015

      Motion to approve (Predecki). Correction to add S. Mortimer-Smith was made to the attendance list. Motion passed unanimously.

Old Business

3. General Education Special Topic “Great Discoveries in Archeology”

   a. Attachment B: Approval notice

      Dr. Drzyzga presented the memo that is being generated and sent to interested parties when Gen Ed special topics courses are approved.

4. Report from our new GEC representative at the UCC (Dr. Beverley Wallace)

   ENG course number changes to WIFYS and related courses are in process. There is an increasing trend of General Education courses or sections that are restricted to majors. There was discussion about the various reasons why departments restrict some sections of Gen Ed courses, and what impact this has on minors or the Honors program. Dr. Drzyzga was asked to look at how many sections are being restricted across Gen Ed.

   More departments and colleges across campus are creating “first year experience” courses for their majors; this should be distinguished from a general first-year experience course for all students. We were encouraged to consider these departmental courses and how they relate to the EYE being looked at by GEC.

5. Report about our campus-wide faculty forum:

      SUP2_MSCHE_RevisedStandards2014_FINAL.pdf

   b. Supplement 2: Why do we need to revise our General Education Program?
      SUP1_GenEd_RevisionJustification_2015-10-02and07.pdf

   c. Attachment C: Notes about comments made and issues raised
d. Attachment D: April 7, 2010 Letter of Support for General Education Renewal from the President and Provost

Two faculty forums were held earlier this month on 10/2/15 and 10/8/15. Thanks to Drs. Shirk and Botteron for taking notes at the sessions.

Motion (Birsch) to approve the notes taken at the faculty forum and distribute to the faculty.

Discussion: Is this “rough draft” the best thing to send out to faculty? Perhaps include a one-page executive summary? The environment was “anxious” and there was skepticism about whether we “really need” a relatively ambitious revision of Gen Ed rather than doing a simpler revision of the existing program. There was discussion about whether there would be consequences with Middle States if no significant changes are made. Such consequences might include additional follow-up visits that would be expensive to the university.

Dr. Drzyzga: Middle States characterized the University’s assessment efforts as “desultory.” Faculty who participated in the most recent Middle States review had a strong sense that it would not be acceptable to “kick the can” on assessment. Simply modifying the current Gen Ed program to assess the missing objectives from Middle States would expand the already-too-large program significantly.

Motion to Amend (Hamblin): Task Program Committee to generate executive summary of the notes in Appendix C that includes the consequences and sanctions related to non-compliance with Middle States. Motion passes (amending the amendment).

Motion to Amend (Mike): Add “ways in which the current Gen Ed program is deficient with respect to the new Middle States standards.” Motion passes (amending the main motion).

Main (amended) motion is now:

Approve the notes taken at the faculty forum and distribute to the faculty, and task Program Committee to generate executive summary of the notes that includes the consequences and sanctions related to non-compliance with Middle States and ways in which the current Gen Ed program is deficient with respect to the new Middle States standards.

Motion passes.

Reports from our Standing Committees

6. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)
   a. Balance: $12,000
   b. Attachment E: General Education Grant proposal (Dr. Sam Benbow)

Met 10/9, elected new chair (Benbow) and secretary (Moilanen).
Motion from the committee to recommend approval by the Provost of the grant application (Attachment E).

7. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)
   a. Activity report
   Met 10/15. Looked over assessment material that Math has provided, talked about getting data from ENG, HCS, and HIS. Looking at Middle States assessment objectives and how the existing Gen Ed objectives match up (or fail to do so).

8. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)
   a. Activity report
   b. Attachment F: Minutes from the meeting on Sept. 15, 2015
   Met on 10/20. Elected chair (Bergsten) and secretary (Lorenz). PC is looking at feedback from faculty forums.

9. First Year Experience (Dr. Allison Predecki)
   a. Activity report
   Met on 10/7. Elected chair (Predecki) and secretary (Hamblin). Received charge of how EYE can exist within existing program without adding an additional course. Working with the core Gen Ed courses (WIFYS, HIS 105/106, HCS 100, and possibly math). Looking at learning objectives of these courses and how we can be explicit about these objectives with students.
   Motion (Moll). EYE committee to be added as a standing committee.

   Point of order (Hamblin): This would require a change to the bylaws.
   Motion to Postpone (Drzyzga): Postpone discussion of this issue until the next meeting. Motion passed.
   Motion (Hamblin): Create ad-hoc bylaws committee to make recommendations on changes to the bylaws to add the EYE committee as a standing committee. Motion passed.

New Business

10. Announcements

11. Call to adjourn

Meeting adjourned at 4:55pm.
Accreditation in the News


GEC Bylaws
These bylaws supplement the University Governance Document and describe the policies and procedures of the General Education Council (GEC).

Update History: Sections I and II accepted by GEC on 10/6/11. Sections III through IV accepted by GEC on 11/3/11.

I. Membership.

A. The membership of GEC is described in the University Governance Document. For undergraduate academic departments, the Governance Document stipulates “One representative and one alternate of each undergraduate academic department, elected by the department.”

B. The representative from APSCUF to GEC serves a one-year renewable term.

C. A “primary member” of GEC is any member other than an alternate.

D. Attendance.

1. Attendance by primary members at all GEC meetings is expected. It is the responsibility of primary members to notify the co-chairs of the committee of absence in advance, when possible. More than two (2) unexcused absences from GEC meetings per semester shall lead to automatic dismissal from GEC. The executive committee of the University Forum shall determine what constitutes an unexcused absence.

2. If the primary representative from an academic department is unable to regularly attend GEC meetings, the alternate may take over as primary representative. The department should then choose a new alternate.

E. Role of Alternates.

1. Alternate members may attend GEC meetings, but may not vote if the primary member is present.

2. Alternate members may be members of GEC committees, but the primary member and alternate may not both be members of the same GEC committee.

3. Only primary members (or alternates serving in lieu of the primary member) may make or second motions.
4. All GEC members (including alternates) may attend and participate in GEC and GEC committee meetings, but voting in these meetings is restricted as noted above.

II. Meetings.

A. The GEC will meet monthly during the fall and spring academic semesters.

B. The final meeting of the spring semester will include organization for the following academic year. The Faculty Co-Chair, the Secretary, and the Non-voting Representative to the University Curriculum Committee will be elected to one-year terms at this meeting.

C. A quorum shall consist of 2/3 of the body. In determining a quorum, alternates shall be considered only if the department’s primary representative is not present. Votes may only take place when a quorum of voting members is present.

D. A motion shall be deemed passed if a majority of the members present vote “aye.” In this determination, alternates who are not eligible to vote shall not be counted.

E. Items may be placed on the agenda by either Chairperson, by any standing or ad-hoc committee, or by petition by any five members.

F. Notice of meetings and an agenda shall be distributed at least five (5) days before each meeting to members, alternates, and other university constituencies. The mailing list will be developed by the Council, and reviewed annually at the spring organizational meeting.

G. If an item is discussed which was not included on the agenda, any member has the right to have the vote postponed until the next meeting.

H. Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures set down in the revised Robert’s Rules of Order except as otherwise provided in these bylaws.

I. Agendas and minutes from each meeting will be posted on a publically available website.

III. Committees

A. The GEC has three standing committees: Budget Committee, Assessment Committee, and Program Committee. The purpose of each committee is to make recommendations to the GEC.

B. The membership of each committee will be determined at the first GEC meeting of each academic year. See Sections III.E.2, III.F.6, and III.G.4 below for the selection procedures.
C. Each standing committee will elect a chairperson and a secretary at its first meeting of each academic year.

D. Each committee will deliver a report on its activities at the monthly GEC meeting.

E. Budget Committee.

1. The GEC Budget Committee will serve as a resource to recommend to the GEC the allocation and distribution of any funds available to the GEC. The committee may:
   i. Develop recommended guidelines for distribution of any available funds in the form of grants.
      a. The committee may serve, as needed, as a review body for grants, either as a whole or as a subcommittee.
      b. The committee may recommend to the GEC that ad-hoc grants committees be formed, as necessary.
   ii. Develop and recommend strategic requests for funding, tying such requests to the mission and goals of the GEC.
   iii. Coordinate and assist with the seeking of external grant funding, especially when related to the mission and goals of the GEC.

2. Membership.
   i. Any member of GEC is eligible to volunteer to be a member of the Budget Committee.
   ii. The Budget Committee shall have at least 5 but not more than 8 members.
   iii. The co-chairs may jointly appoint any member of GEC (as defined in Section I.A.) to the Budget Committee if there are fewer than 5 volunteers.
   iv. If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Budget Committee.

F. Assessment.

1. The GEC Assessment Committee will organize the assessment of general education courses: In terms of time frames (i.e., each department every 3 or 4
years), department rotations (i.e., coordinating staggered introduction of assessment)

2. The Assessment Committee will assist departments in devising and carrying out assessments according to best practices.

3. The Assessment Committee will review assessment plans with departments to facilitate best practices for both general education and department goals and aim.

4. The Assessment Committee will review assessment outcomes with departments and assist departments in improving outcomes if problems have been identified.

5. In addition to the course-level assessment described above, the Assessment Committee will develop and carry out program-level assessment using appropriate strategies. These strategies may include, but are not limited to:
   i. National standardized tests
   ii. Surveys
   iii. Public forums
   iv. Ongoing analysis of connections between course goals and program goals
   v. General education curricula at other universities
   vi. Published best practices

   i. Any member of GEC is eligible to volunteer to be a member of the Assessment Committee.
   ii. The Assessment Committee shall have at least 5 but not more than 8 members.
   iii. The co-chairs may jointly appoint any member of GEC (as defined in Section I.A.) to the Assessment Committee if there are fewer than 5 volunteers.
   iv. If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Assessment Committee.

G. Program.
1. The GEC Program Committee will consider all curriculum matters, with a particular emphasis on long-term planning. This charge includes, but is not limited to:
   
i. Developing guidelines according to which curriculum proposals related to general education are drafted and evaluated
   
ii. Crafting statements regarding program vision, mission, and goals
   
iii. Crafting curriculum consistent with the vision, mission, and goals
   
iv. Documenting the vision, mission, goals, and curriculum, and the connections among them
   
v. Continually evaluating the vision, mission, and goals with the intention of proposing revisions whenever it is deemed appropriate
   
vi. Continually evaluating the curriculum with the intention of proposing revisions whenever it is deemed appropriate; the evaluation should include the delivery of the curriculum, as well as the content and its connection to the vision, mission, and goals
   
2. In evaluating the vision, mission, goals, and curriculum, the Program Committee will use any and all resources available to it, including but not limited to the data and information generated by the activities of the Assessment Committee.
   
3. All decisions made by the Program Committee are recommendations, with approval authority resting with the entire Council.
   
4. Membership.
   
i. Any member of GEC is eligible to volunteer to be a member of the Program Committee.
   
ii. The Program Committee shall have at least 5 but not more than 8 members, and must include one member from each of the three Arts and Sciences divisions (Arts and Humanities, Behavioral and Social Sciences, Math and Natural Sciences), one member from the College of Business, and one member from the College of Education and Human Services.
   
iii. The co-chairs may jointly appoint any member of GEC to the Program Committee if there are fewer than 5 volunteers. The co-chairs will also appoint a member of GEC from an appropriate college/division (see III.G.4.ii) if no such member volunteers.
iv. If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Program Committee.

H. The GEC will create ad-hoc committees as necessary to perform its duties as described in the governance document.

I. The co-chairs of GEC will serve as ex-officio members of each of the standing committees.

IV. Curriculum Proposals.

A. In accordance with the Governance Document, the University Curriculum Committee will refer all proposals that relate to general education to the GEC.

B. A standard part of each GEC meeting’s agenda will be consideration of proposals which have been received prior to distribution of the agenda.

C. Once the GEC has made a decision, it will forward its recommendations on to the University Curriculum Committee.

V. Interdisciplinary Programs.

A. Interdisciplinary major and minor programs have an impact on General Education, therefore the GEC invites a representative from each program to participate as a non-voting member at each monthly meeting.

B. Each program is encouraged to select a representative who is not already a member of GEC and who is interested in participating for at least one year.

VI. Amendments

A. By a motion from the floor or a joint recommendation from the co-chairs, the GEC may form an Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee to review and make recommendations to the GEC for amendments to these bylaws.

B. Membership of Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee.

1. Any member of GEC is eligible to volunteer to be a member of the Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee.

2. The Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee shall have at least 5 but not more than 8 members.

3. The co-chairs may jointly appoint any member of GEC (as defined in Section I.A.) to the Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee if there are fewer than 5 volunteers.
4. If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Assessment Committee.

C. Proposed amendments must be presented in writing to the Council at least ten (10) days before the Council meeting at which they will be considered.

D. An affirmative secret vote of 2/3 of the voting membership is required for enactment. The APSCUF representative will be charged with administering this vote. Votes will be counted jointly by the APSCUF and the GEC co-chairs.

E. The bylaws should be reviewed at least every five years.
I. Meeting was called to order by Dr. Scott Drzyzga, chair of the GEC. The meeting was attended by Scott Drzyzga, Ben Meyer, Mark Moilanen, Kirk Moll, and Marcela Pineda-Volk.

II. The committee made a call for nominations for committee chair and secretary.

III. Dr. Ben Meyer was elected as committee chair and Dr. Mark Moilanen was elected as committee secretary.

IV. The committee indicated the need to update the contact data on the GEC Grant application form according to the election results. The old form is located at:

https://www.ship.edu/WorkArea/linkit.aspx?LinkIdentifier=id&ItemID=213747&libID=213758

V. The Budget Committee of the General Education Council (GEC) reviewed a General Education Grant proposal that was submitted by Dr. Sam Benbow (Social Work & Gerontology). Dr. Benbow would like to take students in his SWK 265 course (Understanding Diversity for Social Work Practice) to volunteer with the homeless of Dauphin County. He requested $800.00 in his budget for the project. The Budget Committee scored highly (4.6/5.0) the proposed event (class trip to the Project Homeless Connect Program in Harrisburg, PA) and moved its positive recommendation to the GEC.

VI. The committee has a $12,000 budget for the 2015-2016 academic year.

VII. The next meeting will be scheduled for November 11, 2015.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45pm.

--Minutes submitted by Ben Meyer
Minutes
Budget Committee of the General Education Council
November 11, 2015 at 3:30pm in Century Café

I. Meeting was called to order by Dr. Ben Meyer, chair of the GEC Budget Committee. The meeting was attended by Kirk Moll and Marcela Pineda-Volk.

II. The committee approved the minutes from the October meeting.

III. The committee discussed the GEC Grant Project Grant program. A recommendation was made to make personalized contacts with the Department Chairs in each General Education area in order to promote the program. Budget Committee members will be assigned to make contact with the Department Chairs.

IV. The Budget Committee recommended using the Project Proposal that was submitted by Dr. Sam Benbow as a template / exemplar proposal on the GEC website. Dr. Kirk Moll will contact Dr. Benbow for his approval.

V. The committee has $11,200 remaining in the budget after approving the $800 request by Dr. Samuel Benbow.

VI. The next meeting will be scheduled for the spring semester.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:45pm.

--Minutes submitted by Ben Meyer
GEC Assessment Committee Meeting Summary  
November 10, 2015

Present: Jim Mike, Corrine Bertram, Han Liu, Dudley Gerard, and Beverly Wallace

Beverly gave an overview of documents submitted to the Assessment Committee, which set up first round of comparing Gen Ed learning objectives with Middle States Standards, as per the 2015 document, Standard III.

The following hard copies were distributed to the group:
- Middle States Standards III and V copied from the 2015 web document
- A chart mapping existing draft learning objectives for the General Education Skill Learning and Categories matched to the Middle States expectations for General Education found under #5 of Standard III.
- A chart mapping the overall Skill Learning and Categories with Middle States expectations.

Criterion for matches was a strict reading of the learning objective alone, without consideration of what was taught or assessed in the course.

A discussion was conducted about how to move forward. Several issues were raised:

What about AAC&U value rubrics to assess learning objectives? GEC Program Committee is using these as a starting guide for standard three of the new program, but we should perhaps use them for the old program as well. English uses value rubric for WIFYS, so this skill learning section may be a model for assessment for other skill and categorical groups.

One Middle States expectation not covered by any existing learning objectives in our gen ed according to the chart is Technological Competency. Even though the existing learning objectives indicate that it is not covered, this competency is probably covered by more than one course in the existing General Education Program. This indicates a need for revision of learning objectives.

One other item that the charts indicate is that according to this assessment, the case cannot be made for a change in gen ed based on meeting Middle States Standards because the current gen ed does address the majority of expectations, at least according to the chart of matches between learning objectives and Middle States expectations.

Now, the existing goals should be revised to become learning objectives and mapped to match learning objectives by courses.

Dudley will continue to find out what we already have that can be assessed, using the charts to address Middle States expectations matched to learning objectives. His goal is to grab two objectives per year to assess.

The goal going forward is to assess what we have while working on revisions to goals to come up with about 6 General Education Program Learning Objectives.
The committee discussed the fact that it is our job to define learning objectives in working draft form to take to the GEC, either whole committee or Program Committee and then to whole.

Jim Mike brought up that while course-level learning objectives are developed in departments, the GEC sets the standards to determine its program-level learning objectives. Then departments can decide whether or not a particular course fits into the General Education Program according to the Gen Ed Program learning objectives. The question becomes: “If you want to be part of program how does what you do in course “x” fit these learning objectives?”

Jim Mike reiterated that the GEC should go back to setting learning objectives and departments abide or get out of gen Ed. This is a 48 hour program that all students must take.

The goal going forward: Don't make learning objectives fit existing courses but ask how existing and new courses fit the learning objectives.

Responsibility doesn't lie with GEC assessment but with courses within categories to see how a course does or does not fit.

**Plan of Action to be completed by Next Meeting:**

- Beverly will meet with Jim Delle to turn the existing Gen Ed goals into broad program-level learning objectives. Then, if the existing goals do not cover the Middle States expectations, one or two additional program-level learning objectives will be developed. Any new objectives developed will be done by working with the program committee. This resulting document will be a working document for assessment. Jim Delle has gone through this process at Kutztown, and Beverly has gone through this process in developing the new gen ed program at Mansfield.

- Corrine and Han will take the charts to make their assessment of matches among the various learning objectives and Middle States expectations to establish interrater reliability at the next meeting.

- Dudley is going to continue finding existing assessments matched to learning objectives, concentrating first on those that are matched to Middle States expectations.

This procedure allows assessment to drive decisions.

Next meeting last week of semester.

Beverly will send copies of handouts to Shelley Morrisette, Scott Drzyzga, Sherry Bergsten, and Lance Bryant.

Respectfully,
Beverly Wallace
Secretary, GEC Assessment Committee
Minutes
Program Committee of the General Education Council, 10/20/15, 3:45 pm, FSC 248

I. Dr. Sherri Bergsten was nominated to serve as the GEC Program Committee Chair for one more year by a motion from Dr. Douglas Birsch and seconded by Dr. Cynthia Botteron. The motion was approved unanimously, a vote was held and she was elected unanimously as Program Committee Chair. A motion was then made by Dr. Shirk and seconded by Dr. Botteron to nominate Dr. Lorenz as the committee recording secretary. The motion was approved unanimously, a vote was held and he was elected unanimously as the committee recording secretary. The meeting was then called to order by Dr. Sherri Bergsten, chair of the GEC Program Committee. The meeting was attended by Sherri Bergsten, Scott Drzyzga, Karl Lorenz, Cynthia Botteron, Alice James, Douglas Birsch, and Kathryn Shirk.

II. Dr. Botteron motioned to approve the minutes from the 9/15/15 meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Birsch. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. The committee discussed the comments and reactions of faculty who attended the two open forum discussions for explaining the justification for the needed General Education Program revision. A detailed three-page handout outlining four principal arguments was distributed to all faculty who attended the open forum as justification for the needed revisions. Moreover, detailed notes were taken by GEC Program Committee volunteers at each of the open forum meetings held on October 2 and October 8, 2015 in Grove Hall Forum. The committee discussed the general tone of the faculty who attended as well as the two common themes reflected in the detailed notes from each forum discussion. These two themes centered around issues of assessment. First, in light of the possibilities of retrenchment, many faculty questioned the need for a complete program revision when the problem with the current program lies in its difficulties to meaningfully assess. The committee discussed this concern, but concluded that changed expectations from Middle States for a quality general education program that includes competency measures rather than knowledge content related measures, necessitates a more extensive program revision. Second, some faculty expressed concern that a solid assessment plan needs to accompany the proposed program change. The committee is working on the finalization of a complete proposal of program revisions taking into consideration concerns expressed at open forums and will distribute it to the General Education Council in the upcoming months. A survey is planned to get feedback regarding which learning objective tag existing general education courses would carry in the proposed program. This would help faculty to understand how the proposed revision would be similar and different compared to the current program and might reduce faculty concerns. Dr. Drzyzga volunteered to write up a summary of faculty comments for each open forum discussion to be distributed for discussion to all GEC members at the upcoming council meeting on Tuesday, October 27 at 3:30pm in ELL 205.

V. The next Program Committee meeting will be on 11/3/15 starting at 3:45 pm.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 5:30 pm.

Minutes submitted by Karl Lorenz
I. The meeting was then called to order by Dr. Sherri Bergsten, chair of the GEC Program Committee. The meeting was attended by Sherri Bergsten, Scott Drzyzga, Karl Lorenz, Cynthia Botteron, Douglas Birsch, Kathryn Shirk, Paris Peet, and James Delle.

II. Dr. Botteron motioned to approve the minutes from the 10/20/15 meeting. The motion was seconded by Dr. Shirk. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. To maximize transparency of the process to reform the General Education Program, the committee discussed how the comments and reactions of the small gathering of faculty who attended the two open forum discussions for explaining the justification for the needed General Education reform could be expanded to include the larger body of faculty across the campus. The committee decided that the best way to incorporate more faculty comments would be to construct a digital open forum that would be e-mailed to all Shippensburg University faculty in the next week. The e-mail would include the three page document that was distributed at the open forum discussions outlining four principal arguments as justification for the needed revisions as well as a very brief set of four yes or no questions, and a fifth question soliciting open ended comments to be answered and submitted as an online survey. The five questions that the committee agreed would be asked include:

1. Did you attend one of the face-to-face (on campus) Open Forums?
2. Did you read through the previous content regarding General Education reform?
3. Are you familiar with the content of the current (December 2014) Middle States standards for accreditation?
4. After reviewing the justification for General Education reform at Shippensburg University, do you believe that there is a need for reform?
5. After reviewing this material, what are your comments, thoughts, or suggestions regarding the need for General Education Reform at Shippensburg University?

Second, the committee decided that at the next General Education Council meeting on November 24, executive summaries will be presented of: the faculty open forum comments, the results of the digital open forum and the consequences of non-compliance with the December 2014 Middle States standards for accreditation. The committee also discussed the need for a timeline of the delivery of the complete proposal of General Education program revision sometime during the spring 2016 semester.

V. The next Program Committee meeting will be on 11/17/15 starting at 3:45 pm.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 pm.

Minutes submitted by Karl Lorenz
DEPARTMENT: Chemistry       COLLEGE: Arts and Sciences

SPONSOR: Curtis Zaleski    PHONE/E-MAIL: cmzaleski@ship.edu; x1522

DATE: September 17, 2015

POLICY TITLE/DESCRIPTION: Subject Code Management

Is this a NEW policy or a REVISION of a current policy? _X_ NEW        _____ REVISION

Proposed Policy: For any University Curriculum Committee (UCC) course proposal, the subject code of the proposed course should be that of the current subject code assigned to the department or program. Alternate subject codes should only be proposed after consultation the UCC chair and the Registrar’s Office. A final decision regarding a proposed new subject code (as part of a course proposal) will be made through the normal UCC process and with input from the Registrar’s Office.

Justification: Altering or adding new subject codes has many complex consequences which may be unrealized by proposal sponsors. In order to minimize potential conflicts and to maintain a manageable subject codes list, the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and Registrar’s Office feel the need to use the shared governance process to define guidelines and criteria for the consideration of the addition of new subject codes. The UCC recommends that new subject codes only be created upon approval of the UCC and the Registrar’s Office. Historically, the Registrar’s Office has sometimes questioned the need for new subject codes when requested. The UCC and the Registrar’s Office strongly feel that new subject codes should only be added if the course cannot fit under an existing department or program, if a program runs out of potential course numbers, or if there are other extenuating circumstances. If subject codes were created for every sub-discipline course in a program, it would adversely impact the ability to locate information in the catalog and generate reports for subject specific information. It also creates a more time-consuming and labor intensive search process when students try to search for and register for courses during scheduling. Finally, it makes it more difficult for transcript recipients to interpret student academic transcripts, and since transcript paper is ordered years in advance, the transcript legend will not contain the new subject codes. Under the current curriculum process, if UCC and other bodies on campus approve the addition of a subject code, the Registrar’s Office does not have the authority to provide input.

PROPOSED IMPLEMENTATION DATE: Spring 2016
Minutes
Entry Year Experience Committee of the General Education Council, 10/7/15,
12:00 pm, FSC 110

I. Meeting was called to order by Scott Drzyzga, chair of the GEC. The meeting was
attended by Allison Predecki, Mark Spicka, Laurie Cella, Margaret Lucia, Misty
Knight and Rebekah Elbel.

II. Dr. Drzyzga began the meeting by telling the committee about the work of the
EYE committee over the past few years. He also explained how other PASSHE
schools have implemented dedicated courses to entry year experiences. At this time
a dedicated EYE course is not feasible at Ship due to budgetary constraints. Dr.
Drzyzga charged the committee with examining the courses that Ship students take
during their first year (WIFYS, HCS 100, HIS 105 and 106 and possibly math) and
identifying commonalities among the courses that could be developed into a
conspicuous first year experience for our students. He asked the committee to
develop a list of four things we can do to accomplish this goal.

III. Allison Predecki agreed to serve as chair of the committee and was unanimously
approved by the committee. James Hamblin was nominated to serve as secretary
and was unanimously approved by the committee.

IV. The committee then began to discuss Dr. Drzyzga’s charge. Several ideas were
mentioned including coordinating speakers on campus, devising a common theme
for the first year experience, a centralized tutoring location for first year courses,
and providing students with materials such as a brochure to help identify the
elements of the first year experience. In preparation for the next meeting, the
members of the committee who teach the first year courses will share by email
learning objectives of these courses.

V. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm.

----Minutes submitted by Allison Predecki