Agenda for the meeting on Thursday, March 24, 2016, 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 council’s meeting on Feb. 23, 2016

3. Old Business
   a. Letter of support from President Harpster and Provost Lyman, follow up
   b. The Forum’s decision about the GEC’s request to move its April meeting date.
   c. Report from our GEC representative at the UCC (Dr. James Hamblin)
   d. Reports from our ad hoc Committees
      i. First Year Experience (Dr. Allison Predecki)
         1. Attachment B: Minutes from its meeting on Nov. 17, 2015
         2. Attachment C: Minutes from its meeting on Feb. 2, 2016
      ii. Amendment Committee (Dr. James Hamblin)
         1. Attachment E: Current GEC Bylaws (last updated on Nov. 21, 2011)
         2. Attachment F: List of proposed bylaw amendments (Mar. 2, 2016)
   e. Reports from our Standing Committees
      i. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)
         1. Attachment G: Minutes from its meeting on Jan. 29, 2016
         2. Attachment H: Minutes from its meeting on Mar. 16, 2016
         3. Attachment I: GEC Grant Proposal (Cella 2016)
         4. Attachment J: GEC Grant Proposal (Clark 2016)
         5. Attachment K: GEC Grant Proposal (Godshalk 2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entry</th>
<th>Debit</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Recommend to approve</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carry-over from prior year</td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benbow (2015)</td>
<td></td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>11,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godshalk (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,363.00</td>
<td>1,363.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,837.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,499.05</td>
<td>1,499.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,337.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cella (2016)</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>8,337.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)

   1. Attachment L: Minutes from its meeting on Feb. 12, 2016

iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)

   1. Attachment M: Minutes from its meeting on Feb. 2, 2016
4. New Business
   b. Departments and programs with terms that expire in Spring 2016
      
      | APSCUF       | Human Communication Studies |
      | Chemistry    | Modern Languages            |
      | **Computer Science** | Finance and Supply Chain Management |
      | **Geography / Earth Science** | Teacher Education |

5. Announcements

6. Call to adjourn
Minutes for the meeting on Tuesday, February 23, 2016 in ELL 205 at 3:30pm


1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:34pm.

2. Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting
   a. Attachment A: Minutes from the meeting on Jan. 26, 2016

Motion (Bertram) to approve. Correction to change “Agenda” to “Minutes.” Removing a portion of the Program Committee report to say that changes to the proposed draft Gen Ed program are still being made.

3. Old Business
   a. 2015 Open Faculty Forum, follow up
      i. Attachment B: Letter of support from President Harpster and Provost Lyman

This letter outlines the nature and importance of Gen Ed reform, including a promise that retrenchment will not occur as a result of Gen Ed renewal.

Provost Lyman was present at the meeting and spoke briefly about the letter. She asked GEC for suggestions on what other ways the Provost and President can support the reform efforts. Dr. Lyman suggested several ideas, including possible support to investigate reform efforts at other universities, especially relating to the development of First-Year seminars/experiences.

Dr. Shirk asked if the letter was being distributed to all faculty. Dr. Mike suggested that the departmental representatives are responsible for sharing the information with departments, either via email or at department meetings.

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

Dr. Drzyzga reminded everyone that ENG 106 (WIFYS) is now ENG 114. Dr. Cella volunteered to have any questions related to this change be directed to her. Dr. Drzyzga also let the group know that the UCC proposal revising the Gen Ed special topics (“190”) courses was never uploaded to UCC due to a website error. This error has been corrected and the proposal will hopefully be considered at the March UCC meeting.

Dr. Wallace attended the most recent UCC meeting. She stated that there were no proposals related to the Gen Ed categories, but there were some changes related to the Diversity requirement. EEC 411 has been removed from the Diversity requirement. The English department has made significant
changes to their program, and some courses from ENG were also removed from the Diversity requirement.

Dr. Wallace asked that she be replaced as the UCC-GEC representative, since she hasn’t been able to attend UCC meetings.

Dr. Birsch volunteered.

Motion (Shirk) to approve Dr. Birsch as the alternate, who would fill in for Dr. Wallace. Motion approved.

Motion (Clements) to approve Dr. Hamblin as the 2nd alternate, as Dr. Birsch may not be able to attend the remaining UCC meetings this semester. Motion approved.

c. Reports from our Standing Committees

i. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)

A message was sent to department chairs to solicit Gen Ed grant proposals. Discussions are ongoing for how to better market the program to get more proposals to be submitted.

The deadline for proposals is March 14, 2016.

ii. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)

Dr. Girard stated that the AC met in December to discuss the “job” of the committee. The committee also met on February 12, but minutes have not been written up yet. The AC is starting to look at assessment data and hopes to have some details for the next GEC meeting.

iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)

Dr. Bergsten stated that the PC has reorganized their thinking along the lines of “themes,” echoing one of the suggestions made earlier by Dr. Lyman.

Attachments E and F require action by GEC. MAT 117 will be reduced from 4 to 3 credits. MAT 217 is a renumbering of MAT 313 and an increase from 3 to 4 credits. Students would take MAT 217 if they are interested in the Data Science minor. The PC recommends approval of these two proposals.

Dr. Hamblin answered several questions about the proposals.

Motion (Program Committee) to recommend UCC approval of UCC proposal 15-152. Motion passed.

Motion (Program Committee) to recommend UCC approval of UCC proposal 15-155, with a note to make sure that there are enough sections of MAT 117. Motion passed.

d. Reports from our ad hoc Committees
i. Amendment Committee (Dr. James Hamblin)

1. Attachment G: Current GEC Bylaws (last updated on Nov. 21, 2011)
2. Attachment H: List of proposed bylaw amendments (Feb. 3, 2016)

Dr. Hamblin presented several amendments and asked the GEC membership to consider them. No action could be taken on the amendments because the APSCUF representative was not present. Feedback should be given to Dr. Hamblin via email and the amendments will hopefully be voted on at the March GEC meeting.

ii. First Year Experience (Dr. Allison Predecki)

Dr. Predecki reported that Dr. Drzyzga recommended that the EYE committee develop a set of goals and actions for further developing an EYE. Dr. Botteron mentioned that some of the department chairs (History, HCS, and English) are also working on the EYE issue, and suggested that Dr. Predecki and Dr. Drzyzga work with them to learn about that work.

Dr. Mike pointed out that there should be a distinction between developing an EYE that can impact immediately with the existing program. However, there is also the potential for a different experience that can fit into a new future program.

4. New Business
   a. Department and program representative terms are three-years long.
   b. To foster information transfer, terms were grouped and staggered so that no more than 1/3 of the council membership turns over in a given year.
   c. Departments and programs with terms that expire in Spring 2016
      - APSCUF
      - Chemistry
      - Computer Science
      - Geography/Earth Science
      - Human Communication Studies
      - Modern Languages
      - Finance and Supply Chain Management
      - Teacher Education

Dr. Drzyzga will be sending out a letter to the chairs of these departments to let them know that they need to elect new representatives.

5. Announcements

Dr. Drzyzga has made a request for the next GEC meeting to be moved so as to not conflict with the Minds@Work student research conference. This request will be considered at the next Forum meeting in March.
The next meeting is Thursday, March 24.

6. Call to adjourn

Meeting was adjourned at 4:56pm.
Minutes
Entry Year Experience Committee of the General Education Council, 11/7/15, 3:30 pm, FSC 110

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

II. Dr. Knight moved to approve the minutes from the 10/17/15 meeting. Dr. Cella seconded the motion. The minutes were unanimously approved.

III. Dr. Drzyzga reported that Dr. James Hamblin will chair the ad-hoc GEC By-Laws Committee with the purpose of a periodic review of the GEC by-laws and also to amend the by-laws to make the EYE committee a standing committee. Volunteers are needed to serve on this committee.

IV. The committee then continued discussion of commonalities among our first year courses at Ship that could be developed into an Entry Year Experience. The committee examined the learning objectives from HIS 105 and 106, ENG 106 and HCS 100. Several common objectives from the courses were identified including research and analyzing sources, formulating arguments and developing a sense of perspective. The committee discussed ways that we could communicate these commonalities to the students. Jerry Fowler and Misty Knight suggested an entry year experience theme, “Navigating the C’s: communication, competence, cultures, communities and confidence”. This theme could be communicated via a website and brochure for first year students with a logo and mission statement. The website and brochure could advertise coordinated speakers or programs across campus and a centralized tutoring location for first year students. Any advertisements for programs associated with the entry year experience could include the logo. Assessments already performed by first year courses would continue with perhaps the addition of a survey of students after completing their first year.

V. The meeting was adjourned at 4:30 pm.

----Minutes submitted by Allison Predecki
Minutes
Entry Year Experience Committee of the General Education Council, 2/12/16, 12:00 pm, FSC 110

I. Meeting was called to order by Allison Predecki, chair of the EYE Committee. The meeting was attended by Allison Predecki, Laurie Cella, Margaret Lucia, Misty Knight, James Hamblin, and Scott Drzyzga.

II. Dr. Cella moved to approve the minutes from the 11/17/15 meeting. Dr. Knight seconded the motion. Dr. Cella suggested an amendment that Dr. Knight’s name be added to Item IV for suggesting the Navigating the C’s theme. The minutes were unanimously approved with this amendment.

III. Dr. Drzyzga indicated that wants EYE committee to do the following things this semester:
1. develop for a public audience a clear statement of purpose;
2. develop for public and internal audiences a short list of clearly stated objectives;
3. develop for an internal audience a short list of possible methods for accomplishing each objective; and
4. develop a series of recommendations to the GEC by March 24, 2016, so that the council body may discuss items 1, 2, and 3.

IV. The committee then set to work on Dr. Drzyzga’s list of tasks. The committee will meet again before the March 24 GEC meeting to finalize recommendations to the GEC.

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

----Minutes submitted by Allison Predecki
Report to the GEC from the ad hoc EYE Committee  3/24/16

During this academic year the GEC ad hoc EYE Committee has held regular meetings to discuss what an EYE program at Shippensburg University should look like. The committee consisted of GEC representatives from English, History, Human Communication Studies and a few other departments. These discussions have centered around the idea that an EYE program at Shippensburg should be a shared culture and to that end the committee has drafted a purpose, objectives, a list of methods for achieving these objectives and recommendations to the GEC to move forward in the development of an EYE program.

Aspirational Purpose

The purpose of the Entry-Year-Experience program is to help our students develop into a thriving community of learners during their first year on campus. We believe it is important to help our students develop a shared sense of comfort, confidence, and curiosity during this important transition period so that they may accomplish their personal educational goals.

General Objectives

To achieve this purpose, the EYE program should be focused on accomplishing three objectives:
1. Provide our students with clear and consistent messages about college-level expectations and opportunities
2. Help our faculty members foster a continuous conversation about students’ first-year experiences
3. Create opportunities for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to collaborate as they develop innovative EYE programming

Specific Methods for Achieving the General Objectives

1) Providing students with clear and consistent messages about college-level expectations and opportunities

The GEC EYE Committee has identified several specific ways to accomplish this goal:
1. Brand the program for better recognition of available services
2. Establish a website for EYE program
3. Provide programming about college level expectations and opportunities
4. Facilitate collaboration between the three primary academic departments (English, History and Human Communication Studies)
2) Helping faculty members foster a continuous conversation about students’ first-year experience

The GEC EYE Committee has identified several specific ways to accomplish this goal:
1. Provide faculty with a flowchart of available resources for first year students
2. Hold a continuous faculty awareness campaign
3. Event planning by the EYE Program Coordinator

3) Create opportunities for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to collaborate as they develop innovative EYE programming.

The GEC EYE Committee has identified that the best way to accomplish this goal would be to hold regular GEC EYE committee meetings.

Recommendations from the committee

To be successful the EYE program needs:

1. Staffing including a Program Coordinator, an Intern and a Student Worker.
2. Budget for EYE programming
3. A standing GEC EYE Committee comprised of members of the GEC, representatives from English, History, and Human Communication Studies and ex-officio members from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs including but not limited to the First Alert Coordinator and representatives from Residence Life and the Career Development and Community Engagement Center
**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.
Amendment 16-1
Revise Section I.E.2 as follows:

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

New Text
Alternate members may be members of GEC committees, but the primary member and alternate from the same academic department may not both be members of the same GEC committee.

Rationale
Clarification.
Amendment 16-2
Revise Section II.F as follows:

Original Text
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.

New Text
Notice of meetings and an agenda shall be distributed at least four (4) business 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.

Rationale
Originally GEC meetings were on Thursdays. This meant that, as a practical matter, the agenda would typically get sent out on Friday and the GEC membership would have most of the following week to look over it. Now that meetings are held typically on Tuesdays, having the agenda sent out over the weekend doesn’t always give the members enough time to look over everything carefully. Four business days allows for GEC committees to meet on a Tuesday and submit agenda items to the co-chairs in time for a GEC meeting on the following Tuesday.
Amendment 16-3
Revise Section III.F.1 as follows:

Original Text
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)

New Text
The GEC Assessment Committee will organize the assessment of general education courses in terms of: time frames (i.e., which objective to assess, and when) and department rotations (i.e., coordinating the responsibilities of various departments involved in General Education)

Rationale
Correcting grammatical errors. The parenthetical statements were made more general so that the Assessment Committee is not locked into any particular mode of assessment.
Amendment 16-4
Revise Section VI.B.4 (describing the membership of the Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee) as follows.

Original Text
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.

New Text
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 Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee.

Rationale
Fixing a typo.
Amendment 16-5

Modify III.G.1 (which describes the charge of the Program Committee) to add the following text.

Original Text

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

New Text

G. Program.

1. The GEC Program Committee will consider all curriculum matters related to General Education, 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.

vii. Evaluate UCC proposals related to General Education and make recommendations to GEC.

Rationale
This has become the standard operating procedure for GEC, but was not specifically codified as part of the Program Committee’s charge. The phrase “related to General Education” was added to G.1 for clarification.
Amendment 16-6A
Revise Section III.B as follows.

Original Text
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.

New Text
The membership of each committee will be organized at the first GEC meeting of each academic year. Committee members from the prior academic year are considered to still be members of that committee until this organization occurs. See Sections III.E.2, III.F.6, and III.G.4 below for the selection procedures.

Rationale
Changing “determined” to “organized” takes into account that volunteers will be solicited at this meeting, but the final determination may require additional efforts by the co-chairs.

Over the summer and during the early part of the academic year, it is important that the committees continue to have members for work that comes up.
Amendment 16-6B
Revise Section III.B as follows.

Original Text
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.

New Text
The membership of each committee for the next academic year will be organized at the last GEC meeting of each academic year. See Sections III.E.2, III.F.6, and III.G.4 below for the selection procedures.

Rationale
Changing “determined” to “organized” takes into account that volunteers will be solicited at this meeting, but the final determination may require additional efforts by the co-chairs.

Organizing committees at the end of the academic year for the next year matches the procedures of other governance bodies on campus.
Amendment 16-7

Modification #1: Add a subsection to Section III (Committees) adding the Entry-Year Experience Committee as a standing committee. This subsection will appear between the existing Sections III.G and III.H.

Original Text
n/a

New Text

H. Entry-Year Experience

1. The GEC Entry-Year Experience Committee will investigate the possible creation of an entry-year experience for Shippensburg University and report its findings to the GEC.

2. If/when such an experience is created, the Entry-Year Experience Committee will work with the Assessment and Program Committees to monitor and manage the experience to ensure that it meets the goals set by the General Education program. The Entry-Year Experience Committee is encouraged to work closely with any programs and departments related to the Entry-Year Experience at Shippensburg University.

3. Membership.

   i. Any member of GEC is eligible to volunteer to be a member of the Entry-Year Experience Committee.

   ii. The Entry-Year Experience 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 Entry-Year Experience 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 Entry-Year Experience Committee.

Rationale

GEC voted to approve making the existing Ad-Hoc Entry-Year Experience Committee into a standing committee. This change accomplishes that task. The charge of the committee, in subsections H.1 and H.2, is kept general enough to allow for flexibility depending on how the experience is eventually designed.

Modification #2: Revise Sections III.A and III.B as follows.

Original Text

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.

New Text
A. The GEC has four standing committees: Budget Committee, Assessment Committee, Program Committee, and Entry-Year Experience 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, III.G.4, and III.H.3 below for the selection procedures.

Rationale
These sections change to reflect the inclusion of a fourth standing committee.
Minutes
Budget Committee of the General Education Council
January 29, 2016 at 2:00pm in Century Café

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

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

III. The committee discussed the GEC Grant Project Grant proposal that was submitted by Dr. David Godshalk and Dr. Sharon Harrow. The proposal outlined a trip to the United States National Holocaust Museum and other museums and monuments on the National Mall. Students in Honors World History II and Honors Intro to Literature will participate in the field trip. Dr. Godshalk and Dr. Harrow requested $1363.00 in their budget for the project. The Budget Committee highly recommended funding the proposed event and moved its positive recommendation to the GEC.

IV. The committee has $9837 remaining in the budget after approving the $1363 request by Dr. Godshalk and Dr. Harrow.

V. The committee discussed ways to market the GEC Project Grant Program to faculty and programs. Kirk Moll volunteered to draft a message to send to department chairs.

VI. The committee discussed timetables for upcoming proposal submissions. For faculty seeking approval of their proposal by the GEC at its February 23 meeting, the proposal needs to be submitted by February 15. For faculty seeking approval of their proposal by the GEC at its March 24 meeting, the proposal needs to be submitted by March 14. The deadlines will give the Budget Committee sufficient time to review proposals and forward its recommendations to the GEC.

VII. The next meeting will be held at 2:00pm on February 19 in Century Café.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30pm.

--Minutes submitted by Ben Meyer
Minutes
Budget Committee of the General Education Council
March 16, 2016 at 2:00pm in Century Café

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

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

III. The committee discussed two GEC Grant Project Grant proposals.

One proposal was submitted by Dr. Robert Clark. This project will feature Gunnard Lindgren, an expert in flintknapping (making stone tools), who will give lectures to ANT 111, ANT 121, and ANT 350. The expert will also offer two workshops that are open to the campus community. The Budget Committee highly recommended funding the proposed event for $1499.05 and moved its positive recommendation to the GEC. Funding the Clark project would leave $8337.95 in the GEC Project Grant budget.

Another proposal was submitted by Drs. Laurie Cella, Carla Kungl, Nicole Santalucia, and Ray Janifer. The Cella proposal outlined a guest speaker for all ENG 114 WIFYS students. Students in WIFYS will listen to Sherman Alexie discuss issues of Native American culture, identity, poverty, addiction, and the American experience. Dr. Cella’s group requested $10,000.00 in their budget for the guest speaker. The Budget Committee highly recommended funding the proposed event for $8337.95 and moved its positive recommendation to the GEC. Funding the Cella project would leave $0.00 in the GEC Project Grant budget.

IV. The committee has $0.00 remaining in the budget after approving $1499.05 for the Clark project and $8337.95 for the Cella project.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:40pm.

--Minutes submitted by Ben Meyer
Name: **First Year Writing Committee**: Dr. Laurie Cella, Dr. Carla Kungl, Dr. Nicole Santalucia, Dr. Ray Janifer

Department: English

Email: Dr. Laurie Cella(Chair): ljcella@ship.edu

Phone: 717-477-1204

Date of Proposed Project/Event/Excursion:

Thursday, October 6, 2016

If project/event is specific to your general education course sections, please provide Course # and Section number(s): ____ This event, the First Year Writing Speaker, would be required for all students taking Writing Intensive First Year Writing. General Education Category: This event would fit under the **Skills, Category B, and the Diversity Requirement**.

Brief Description of General Education Project (50 words maximum):

Sherman Alexie’s lecture will discuss issues of Native American culture, identity, poverty, addiction, and the American experience. All WIFYS instructors will build writing assignments from one (or more) of the issues he presents in his literature. Students will be asked to respond critically to his texts and his presentation.
Summary of Grant Proposal for Sherman Alexie as First Year Writing Featured Speaker

As a member of the First Year Experience committee (GEC) and the Director of First-Year Writing, I am committed to developing programming that will help brand the (emerging) FYE program here at Shippensburg. As part of that effort to create a cohesive FYE program, I plan to invite Sherman Alexie to give the inaugural First Year Writing lecture, a lecture open to all students, but particularly geared toward students taking WIFYS.

As Director of First Year Writing, I will require ALL WIFYS professors to incorporate Sherman Alexie into their course in some way. This will provide a common discourse for all WIFYS instructors, and provide a means to collaborate on a variety of compelling assignments. Inviting this speaker will create a common pedagogy across classes, and this will be the first step toward creating a cohesive First Year Experience for new students here at Ship.

Currently, we have 29 ENG 114 courses on the books for Fall 2016. With the course capped at 25, there will be 725 students required to attend this lecture.

Sherman Alexie’s lecture will discuss issues of Native American culture, identity, poverty, addiction, and the American experience. All WIFYS instructors will build writing assignments from one (or more) of the issues he presents in his literature. Students will be asked to respond critically to his texts and his presentation.

Sherman Alexie’s lecture will also draw local high school and middle school teachers. His presentation would also function as a way to attract high school students and provide relevant programming that would have an impact on the community and the surrounding area.

The Welcome Week committee has developed a theme of “Sustainability” for the upcoming year, and Alexie’s work speak to these issues of environmental, cultural and political sustainability.

Sherman Alexie’s presentation would be co-funded by a Human Understanding grant, and so his lecture would serve as both the keynote for the Day of Human Understanding, as well as the inaugural First Year Writing speaker. Combining these two into one lecture achieves an important purpose on campus; we are introducing First Year student to important issues of diversity, while we are simultaneously encouraging a large-scale conversation about these issues in all our WIFYS classes.

This lecture would address a wide variety of Learning Outcomes, and those are:

Writing Skills and Competencies, Learning Objectives

- Engage in a college-level discussion: Featuring Sherman Alexie as the First Year Writing Speaker will provide a common ground for all WIFYS instructors to approach challenging and engaging topics through their classroom discussion. By reading the same texts and preparing for Alexie’s talk, students will become familiar with a variety of similar topics and themes that will provide a common language as they share ideas and reactions through classroom discussion.
• **Discover and develop a thesis or main idea that is supported by examples and/or evidence:** All WIFYs instructors will assign one text of their choosing written by Alexie and they will practice developing an argument, selecting evidence from the text to strengthen that argument, and clarifying that argument through the drafting process.

• **Comprehend and analyze college-level readings:** All WIFYs instructors will assign one text written by Alexie, and the students will practice reading, thinking about, and responding to his work. Reading this text will provide a useful framework for understanding and reflecting on Alexie’s lecture.

• **Demonstrate analytical and critical thinking skills:** Alexie’s texts and presentation will raise challenging questions regarding culture, identity, race, and addiction. His work asks students to re-imagine and re-think the American identity. They will engage in discussion of these issues in their WIFYs classes before and after his presentation.

**Diversity Learning Objectives:**

• **Engaging in Alexie’s work in classes and through his presentation will help advance Learning Objective #1:** An understanding of the United States as a pluralistic society (understanding the United States today in terms of its diverse historical and cultural roots and that the United States continues to emerge and be shaped by the interaction of people with different views, i.e. multiple origins, experiences, and world views).

• **In addition, through discussion of his work, and hearing his story, students will meet Learning Objective #2:** An understanding that one’s own attitudes, perspectives, and beliefs are shaped by cultural, ethnic, and racial heritage, by gender, by age, by social class, by sexual orientation, and by abilities;

1. **Foregrounding these issues of culture and identity as a common experience for ALL WIFYS students will lead to Learning Objective #3:** The ability to respond in a constructive manner to information, ideas, emotions, and situations associated with issues of diversity, including culture, ethnicity, race, gender, religion, age, social class, sexual orientation, and abilities;

**Category B - Linguistic, Literary, Artistic, and Cultural Traditions:**

• **Identify styles, genres, and techniques in literature:** A critical analysis of Sherman Alexie’s approach to poetry, short stories, novels, and films will ask students to identify different styles, genres, and techniques.

• **Recognize literary movements or other cultural contexts in which literature or works from the visual or performing arts were produced:** Sherman Alexie’s literature and films expose the Native American experience to Anglo audiences and his works offer insight on major issues such as poverty, despair, and subcultures in America. His work fuses Tribal and Western Cultures.
GENERAL EDUCATION PROJECT GRANT

BUDGET SHEET

(WRITTEN ESTIMATES FROM VENDORS MUST BE ATTACHED TO HARD COPY)

NAME: DR. LAURIE CELLA
DEPARTMENT: ENGLISH

EMAIL: ljcella@ship.edu
PHONE: 477-1204

MONTH AND YEAR OF PROPOSED EVENT:

ITEMIZED BUDGET (PROPOSED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ITEM AMOUNT (WRITTEN ESTIMATE ATTACHED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sherman Alexie, author of <em>Lone Ranger and Tonto Fistfight in Heaven</em></td>
<td>Speaker Fee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL REQUESTED: $10,000

WE WILL SUPPLEMENT THIS FEE FROM A VARIETY OF OTHER GRANTS ON CAMPUS, SPECIFICALLY THE DAY OF HUMAN UNDERSTANDING SPEAKER AND THE REFLECTOR.

FACULTY MEMBERS

DR. LAURIE CELLA
DR. NICOLE SANTALUCIA
DR. CARLA KUNGL
DR. RAY JANIFER

DATE

3/3/2016

ENGLISH DEPARTMENT FIRST YEAR WRITING COMMITTEE
Yes, Sherman Alexie is available for events in the fall.

Here are his current fees:

$20,000. (college/regional not-for-profits)

Also, I tell groups it usually takes a month, sometimes longer, for an answer to offers, so they are prepared going in.
GENERAL EDUCATION PROJECT GRANT
2015-16 ACADEMIC YEAR

PURPOSE:
This grant funds projects and events that advance the objectives of the General Education program. Two types of projects are funded by this grant program. The first supports projects and excursions directly related to a faculty member’s general education sections (i.e., trips to Washington, D.C., etc.). The second are those projects, programs, and/or events which benefit the general education program or students within a discipline and/or the community at large (i.e., performances that General Education students in a Department are required to attend, events where the work of General Education students are featured, and so forth.) This grant can now support projects that have been funded previously. The deadline is a rolling date until funds are exhausted.

GRANT APPLICATION

PROPOSALS MUST CONTAIN THE FOLLOWING:

- Title Page
- Summary: The Summary must provide a clear description of the project. It must then explain how the project advances the learning objectives of the appropriate General Education Category (Attached). For projects/programs/excursions specific to a faculty member’s General Education Sections, it is suggested that an ‘assignment’ of some type be required (i.e., reaction paper, exam question, etc.)
- Budget Page: The Budget Page must be completed. In addition, for each budget item you MUST include a written estimate produced by the vendor. The grant will NOT be evaluated without written estimates attached.
- Written Estimates or Receipts (The grant WILL NOT be evaluated by the Committee without these.)

AWARD CRITERIA

- Summary statement that clearly and concisely explains how the project will meet established objectives of BOTH the General Education program and appropriate Category Objectives.
- Budget feasibility and reasonableness.
- Quality of overall proposal (well organized and presented, proofread, etc.)

GRANT POLICIES

Receipts must be retained and submitted for reimbursement.

General Education Project Grants can be submitted once a semester and for General Education course sections taught by a faculty member.

Grant Awards are limited to:

- $1,500 per General Education class section (For example, 2 sections of a Gen Ed class going to Washington D.C. is limited to a $3,000 grant.)
- $2,000 per ‘Project’ that falls outside the direct purview of a faculty member’s course sections.

If your project is funded, you must complete a final report at the end of the semester assessing your program/project. Guidelines for this will be given out with award letters.

QUESTIONS AND SUBMISSION INSTRUCTIONS

Questions can be directed to Ben Meyer at BWMeyster@ship.edu. Please submit the grant application as an attachment to me. The electronic submission does not need signatures or vendor estimates. However, you must send a single hard copy of the entire proposal that includes original signatures and vendor estimates to Henderson Gym 107D.
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: Robert L. Clark
Department: Sociology and Anthropology

Email: rlclark@ship.edu
Phone: 203-530-9331

Date of Proposed Project/Event/Excursion: April 15-17, 2016

If project/event is specific to your general education course sections, please provide Course # and Section number(s): ANT 111-01, ANT 121-03/04, ANT 350-01, _______________________, _______________________, _______________________

General Education Category: (Skills and competencies, A-E, Diversity requirement) E

Brief Description of General Education Project (50 words maximum):

The project features an expert in flintknapping (making stone tools) who will demonstrate to students their importance in understanding the development of human cognitive abilities and technologies. The expert will (a) give short lectures both in-class and open to the campus community; (b) during these talks, demonstrate the making of stone tools from various traditions (Oldowan, Acheulean, Mousterian, etc.); and (c) offer two workshops on stone tool making that will be open to the campus community.

Total Amount Requested: $1499.05

Faculty Member: Robert L. Clark
Date: 2-4-2016
**GENERAL EDUCATION PROJECT GRANT**

**BUDGET SHEET**

(*WRITTEN ESTIMATES FROM VENDORS MUST BE ATTACHED TO HARD COPY*)

**NAME:** ROBERT L. CLARK  
**DEPARTMENT:** SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY

**EMAIL:** rlclark@ship.edu  
**PHONE:** 203-530-9331

**MONTH AND YEAR OF PROPOSED EVENT:** APRIL 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ITEM AMOUNT (WRITTEN ESTIMATE ATTACHED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 4 nights hotel in Shippensburg</td>
<td>$309 ($77.25 x 4, per Jill Heberlig)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Per Diem (2014)</td>
<td>$184 ($46 x 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Transportation from Hartford, CT</td>
<td>$376.05 (327 mi. x .575c / mi, x 2, auto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Honorarium</td>
<td>$450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Materials (raw flint, quartz, protective, etc)</td>
<td>$180.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REQUESTED:** $1499.05

**FACULTY MEMBER:** ROBERT L. CLARK  
**DATE:** 3-4-2016
Project Description

Flintknapping, i.e. the manufacture of stone tools by hand, has been a fundamental technology of humanity for at least 3.5 million years. From the simplest percussion style of Australopithecines in the Central Rift Valley of Africa, through the advanced spear points of the super-predator Homo neandertalensis, to fully modern Homo sapiens sapiens, the creation of stone tools enabled early humans to stalk, kill, and efficiently process game; scrape hides, catch fish, girdle trees, and even plant seeds.

As anthropology is the study of humanity in all its breadth and depth, and culture is a broadly construed concept describing the cultural norms and technologies that define us as human, in Cultural Anthropology we cover the stone tool technology of early humans in detail. This project will once again bring an expert flintknapper of 30+ years experience to Cultural Anthropology class at Shippensburg this semester. The expert will accomplish three goals:

1) Give a short lecture and demonstration (30 min.) to each of my classes: Cultural, Physical, and Medical Anthropology on the manufacture, uses, and varieties of stone tool technologies, and a lecture in an open forum geared toward the campus. Additional lectures will also be made available to my colleagues in the anthropology program, who may utilize them for either Cultural Anthropology or other courses, such as Archaeology or Physical Anthropology.

2) Hold an interactive demonstration on the manufacture and use of stone tools during the above talks.

3) Host open-enrollment workshops, open to the campus community, on practical flintknapping outside of class time. Two to three workshops will be held, in which students will be invited to make stone tools themselves, using a choice of materials and techniques. Participants will be able to retain the stone tools they create. Since it will be outside of class time, this workshop will be for extra credit, and obtaining credit will involve writing a response paper relating the experience to the importance of stone tool manufacture to human cultural development. A comparable paper opportunity will also be made available to students who see only the in-class presentation. Colleagues in anthropology and other fields may also employ the lecture and workshops in an extra credit capacity.

4) Weather and time permitting, an add-on trip may also be organized by the Sociology/Anthropology club to nearby Carbaugh Run, an Archaic-era rhyolite quarry in the Michaux State Forest, where the professor and the expert will explain the significance of the site to prehistoric, regional Native American trade networks.

This project meets the goals of the General Education program in the following ways:

1) Demonstrate effective reading, writing, oral communications, and critical thinking:

   Students participating in the workshop (and even those who simply hear the lecture and demonstration) will be asked to write an extra-credit paper connecting stone tool manufacture with the development of culture. In order to do so they will need to connect relevant research with their own experiences making stone tools in the workshop. They will also be offered the option of giving an oral presentation of their findings.

2) Develop an understanding of ideas, events, persons, and creative expressions from history:

   With a 3.5 million year history, flintknapping has long been considered a definitive industry of humanity, as we are some of the only animals that habitually make complex tools from the environment. Flintknapping was a trailhead that facilitated the development of the modern human mind—a mind now capable of devising artifacts that allow humans to explore outer space and walk on the bottom of the ocean. Students will be exposed to these concepts and explore their own inherent ability to knap stone tools.

3) Find and use information using abstract logical thinking, inductive reasoning, and critical thinking:

   Students will use these skills to write a paper about the workshop experience, as well as to experiment with flintknapping itself. Despite popular misconceptions, flintknapping requires an understanding of the workable properties of stone, as well as applied geometry; it also requires the ability to learn from experience.

5) Demonstrate an understanding of the social sciences and their significance in contemporary society.

   Within Category E of the Gen Ed Curriculum (Social Sciences), the following learning objectives are relevant:

   2) Students will be able to identify patterns and processes of human activity within and across cultures.

   Flintknapping was, until approximately 10,000 years BP (before present) a universal human activity. It is the ancestor of nearly all later technological forms and so holds a global, cross-cultural significance.

   3) Students will be able to identify causes of human action.

   Artifacts manufactured through knapping show intent and specificity, meaning that each one was constructed with a specific goal in mind, whether that be to kill a mastodon, chop wood, or scrape a hide. Therefore, from examining stone tools and making them ourselves we can gain important insights into the mental processes of early humans.
To: Shippensburg University  
From: Gunnard Lindgren owner RCM-CT  
Re: Stone tool making material expenses  

Materials:  
- 35 lbs Fort Payne chert quarry spalls (flakes) / $2.00 per lb $70.00  
- 30 lbs hammer stone cobbles/ $2.00 per lb $50.00  
- 30 lbs net weight cobble blanks/ $2.00 per lb $60.00  

Each class participant will be provided hammer stones, blank net weight cobbles, and Fort Payne chert flakes suitable for tool making.  
I recommend that all participants provide safety glasses and light weight garden gloves.  

Total material expenses: $180  

Thank you for your business
Name: David F. Godshalk and Sharon Harrow
Department: History/English

Email: dfgod@ship.edu
Phone: (717) 360-4877

Date of Proposed Project/Event/Excursion: April 24, 2016

If project/event is specific to your general education course sections, please provide Course # and Section number(s): Students from Honors 123—World History II: Thinking Historically in a Global Age, Sections 1 and 2, and from Honors 249: Honors Intro to Literature, Section I. In addition, a small number of students currently enrolled in HIS 106: Thinking Historically in a Global Age may also participate in this experience if any extra seats are available.

General Education Categories: Skills and Competencies: History 106 (Honors 123); Category B, Literature: English 250 (Honors 249).

Brief Description of General Education Project (50 words maximum):

Students will visit the United States National Holocaust Memorial Museum and other museums and monuments on the National Mall. Essays and class discussions on this experience, linked to course learning objectives, will be integrated into the classes’ assignments.

Total Amount Requested: $1363.00

David F. Godshalk/Sharon Harrow
January 19, 2016
PROPOSAL SUMMARY:

On April 24, 2016, students enrolled in our Honors World History II: Thinking Historically in a Global Age and Honors Intro to Literature sections will travel to the National Mall in Washington, D.C. via Wolf’s Bus Lines. Students will be chaperoned by Professors Sharon Harrow and David Godshalk. The bus will leave campus for Washington, D.C. at 8:00 A.M. and return at approximately 8:00 P.M.

During the field trip, all students will visit the United States Holocaust Memorial Museum. The Holocaust Memorial Museum’s permanent collection contains approximately one thousand historical relics from the Holocaust as well as video footage and eyewitness testimonies of the Nazis’ rise to power, their racist Aryan ideology, their attempts to exterminate European Jews and other minorities, and the efforts of Europeans to resist their atrocious acts. In addition, students will tour two other temporary exhibits: “Some Were Neighbors: Collaboration and Complicity in the Holocaust,” and “From Memory to Action: Meeting the Challenge of Genocide.” Students will also be required to visit at least one additional museum devoted to global cultures and/or a collection of monuments on the National Mall devoted to global leaders or events. During their field experience on the Mall, students will gain an awareness of the central role of genocide in recent world history and art, and they will gain an enhanced knowledge of major global events, leaders, and cultures that have shaped our past and continue to influence our future. This experience will clearly advance the three learning objectives of Honors World History II: “a foundational understanding of world history since 1500,” “an ability to write clearly and think critically about world history since 1500,” and “an ability to analyze historical events and trends effectively.” The experience will also address a central learning objective of Honors Intro to Literature and other Category B courses—that is to “Recognize literary movements or other cultural contexts in which literature or works from the visual or performing arts were produced.” Note: the Holocaust Museum is waiving the traditional service charge for timed tickets for our group; the other National Mall museums and monuments are free.

This field experience will also play a crucial role in enhancing students’ understandings of three themes that are being developed in Honors 123: the role of World Wars I and II in contemporary political and social struggles, the historical experiences of laborers and enslaved workers in areas across the globe, and the worldwide impact of genocidal acts. This field trip will also address a number of themes specific to the literature studied in Honors 249: race, ethnicity, and the power of language as found in Colson Whitehead’s *Apex Hides the Hurt*, the cultural dislocations experienced by an Iranian immigrant in Europe as recounted in *Persepolis*, and the struggles of colonial and postcolonial people across the globe.

To assess the success of the field experience in promoting these learning objectives and outcomes for our final report, all students will be required to write an essay explaining how the field experience enriched their understandings of the material covered in our classes. In Honors 123, students will have the option of writing their final paper on an aspect of the Holocaust. In addition, an essay on their final exam will require students to analyze the relationship between acts of resistance to the Holocaust and acts of resistance undertaken during other global human rights campaigns. The essays of those participating in the field trip will be compared to those of the students who do not participate in the field trip. Anonymous summaries of the students’ essays will be included in our final report.

To ensure that all available seats on the bus are occupied, the professors will compile a waiting list of History 106 students to fill any seats not used by students enrolled in our Honors courses.
GENERAL EDUCATION PROJECT GRANT
BUDGET SHEET
(WRITTEN ESTIMATES FROM VENDORS MUST BE ATTACHED TO HARD COPY)

NAME: DAVID F. GODSHALK
DEPARTMENT: HISTORY-PHILOSOPHY

EMAIL: DFGODS@SHIP.EDU
PHONE: (717) 360-4877

MONTH AND YEAR OF PROPOSED EVENT: APRIL 24, 2016

ITEMIZED BUDGET (PROPOSED)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ITEM AMOUNT (WRITTEN ESTIMATE ATTACHED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Wolf’s Bus Transportation for 52 students and 2 faculty members</td>
<td>$1363.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL REQUESTED: $1363.00

FACULTY MEMBERS:

DAVID GODSHALK
JANUARY 19, 2016

SHARON HARROW
JANUARY 19, 2016
Hi David,
Thank you for requesting a quote from Wolf’s Bus Lines for your April 24, 2016 trip to Washington DC. I do have a 54 passenger motor coach available and the price would be $1363.00. The price is based on departing from Shippensburg, traveling to Washington DC and using the bus from 8:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m.

This price does not include the driver gratuity. Your group would also be responsible for any parking or entrance fees.

If you would like to book, we would require a $150.00 deposit per bus, per day and then the balance would be due 1 month prior to the departure date. Our cancellation policy: If you cancel prior to 1 month before departure date, you would get a full refund. Cancellations received thirty days to seven days before the trip are charged 50% of the contracted amount. Cancellations received less then 7 days prior will be charged 75% of the contracted amount.

When you charter any of our deluxe Wolf’s motorcoaches, you are backed by over 65 years of service and over 30 professionally trained drivers all striving to make your travel safe, comfortable and reliable. You are paying for the best, and you deserve the finest – that’s why you should call the “friendly Wolfs.”

Please let me know if you would like to book this.
Thank you and I look forward to working with you.

Howls from the Wolf Pack!

Melissa Miller
1-800-692-7804
melissa@wolfsbus.com
GEC Assessment Committee meeting minutes  
February 12th, 2016, MCT 156

Present: Corrine Bertram, Scott Drzyzga, Dudley Girard, Han Liu, James Mike
Secretary for the Meeting: Corrine Bertram

The committee reviewed the assessment results of the CLA+. One hundred fifty first year students and 150 seniors were assessed in spring and fall 2015. Seniors scored 1000 to 1300 (average of roughly 1150, 1100-1200 is considered “proficient.”). First year students scored 900 to 1150 (average of roughly 1000). A formal comparison of the results is presently being done by CLA. Until we get repeated assessments, we won’t know exactly what these results mean. We do know that the exam is being taken seriously in that only three students finished the assessment in less than ten minutes.

The committee reviewed the WIFYS research rubric for ENG 106 (soon to be 114) from October 2015. English has developed the rubric relying on national standards and are implementing an assessment of their old program while creating a new program. Although English has created new measurable goals, they need to dialogue with the GEC about the continuing development of outcomes. The GEC Assessment Committee would like to ask the Program Committee to put forward the new outcomes from English, Human Communication Studies, and History, so that the GEC as a whole can approve these outcomes for the old program. This would demonstrate progress in our assessment for Middle States. English needs to petition to change their educational outcomes to both the GEC Assessment and Program Committees. Both those committees could recommend the changes be approved, so that the entire GEC body could consider the revisions. This might also be an effective way to introduce assessment changes to the larger GEC.

Drzyzga reminded the committee that the 2010 GECC program review recommended that we pick individual learning objectives to assess rather than assessing them all. If we provide a rationale for which objectives we choose to assess, Middle States should not have an issue with our assessment of only some of the objectives. There was a short discussion of which learning objectives were feasible to assess and which needed revision for assessment to be possible.

The committee’s discussion moved to the assessment of MAT 211. Girard remarked that most people don’t realize how many courses the Math department needs to assess in the General Education curriculum. They are currently assessing nine courses each semester which may be of concern. They use five random choice questions to assess MAT 211 which are given to all students in the course. Liu suggested that this may not be specific enough and lead to problems with validity and reliability. The single educational outcome they have is really four outcomes that need to be disaggregated. We need to meet with the Math assessment committee, commending them on their assessment so far, and gathering the following information:

- What do they do with the results of their assessments?
- What are the targets that they want to reach in these courses and their assessment of them? What is the goal?
After meeting with and documenting the conversation with the Math assessment committee, we will want to make a recommendation to the Program Committee about resolving the issues with their educational outcomes.

The **goals for our next meeting** include the following:

1. Write up the English and History
2. Follow-up with ACS
3. Meet with the Math assessment committee – Girard will report back to the GEC about this meeting.
4. Move forward with Category A assessment

Next meeting date: TBD
Minutes
Program Committee of the General Education Council, 2/2/16, 3:40 pm, FSC 248

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, James Delle, Scott Drzyzga, Brian Wentz, Karl Lorenz, Cynthia Botteron, Kathryn Shirk, Jennifer Clements, Paris Peet, Mike Greenberg and Doug Birsch.

II. Drs. Shirk/Birsch motioned to approve the minutes from the 1/19/16 meeting, which were approved unanimously.

III. The committee then discussed the merits of the Math proposals (15-152, 15-155) to revise the existing MAT 117 Applied Statistics course (15-152) and to add a new statistics course, MAT 217 Statistics I (15-155), for more advanced students, as an alternative to Math 117. Drs. Shirk/Clements motioned to recommend approval of the two proposals with one concern to bring to the GEC council regarding how the addition of MAT 217 will impact the number of sections of MAT 117 to be offered each semester. Of the nine voting members of the committee, eight voted to approve the proposal with this one concern and one voted to abstain.

IV. The committee had a lengthy discussion of how to revise and simplify the wording of the learning objective tags associated with the four program themes of: 1) Culture, Reflection and Responsibility, 2) Interconnections, 3) Natural Science and Technology, and 4) Creativity/Expression. We also discussed options for the articulation of introductory modern language courses into the new General Education model.

V. Before our next meeting committee members will make efforts to finalize revisions of Core Program Goal descriptions and update any revisions on the S drive. We will also attempt to populate each core program goal and its associated tags with courses currently taught as part of the General Education curriculum to determine if the proposed reorganization is balanced across the goals and tags.

VI. The next Program Committee meeting will be on Tuesday, 2/16/16 in FSC 248 at 3:40 pm.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:15 pm.

Minutes submitted by Karl Lorenz