General Education Council
2015-2016 Academic Year – Final meeting of the year

Agenda for the meeting on Thursday, April 21, 2016, in ROWLAND HALL 200 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 Mar. 24, 2016
3. Old Business
   a. Attachment B: Letter to the Registrar RE: ENG190
   b. Attachment C: Letter to the UCC RE: PSY101
   c. Attachment D: GEC Grant Recommendation to the Provost
   d. Attachment E: GEC Grant Recommendation to the Provost
   e. Attachment F: GEC Grant Recommendation to the Provost
   f. 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
   g. Report from our GEC representative at the UCC (Dr. James Hamblin)
   h. Reports from our ad hoc Committee
      i. Amendment Committee (Dr. James Hamblin)
   i. Reports from our Standing Committees
      i. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)
      ii. First Year Experience (Dr. Allison Predecki)
         1. Attachment G: Proposed letter to the Provost requesting summer support
      iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)
         1. Attachment H: Minutes from its meeting on Mar. 1, 2016
         2. Attachment I: Minutes from its meeting on Mar. 22, 2016
      iv. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)
         1. Attachment K: Minutes from its meeting on Mar. 18, 2016
         2. Attachment L: Assessment of student learning in MAT211
         3. Attachment M: Evaluation of Assessment of Student Learning in MAT211
4. New Business
   b. Elections for GEC faculty co-chair and GEC secretary, AY 2016-2017
   c. Volunteer sign-up sheets for the standing committees
5. Announcements
6. Call to adjourn
General Education Council
2015-2016 Academic Year

Minutes for the meeting on Thursday, March 24, 2016 in ELL 205 at 3:30pm


1. Call to order

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

Motion (Shirk) to amend agenda to add two proposals (ENG190 and UCC 15-177). Motion passed.

2. Approve the minutes of the previous meeting

Motion (Predecki) to approve minutes from 2/23/16. Motion passed.

3. Old Business

a. Letter of support from President Harpster and Provost Lyman, follow-up

Dr. Drzyzga asked if anyone from GEC had discussed the letter with their departments. Several members said that they had.

b. The Forum’s decision about the GEC’s request to move its April meeting date

The April GEC meeting will now be on Thursday, April 21 to avoid conflicting with the Minds@Work conference.

c. Report from the GEC representative to UCC

Dr. Hamblin gave his report from the 3/1/16 meeting of UCC.

Proposals 15-177, 15-224, 15-254, 15-253 were expedited proposals to allow Gen Ed courses to be taught online. These proposals were not considered by GEC or GEC.PC. There was discussion about whether GEC or GEC.PC should give input on these types of proposals to UCC.

The MAT proposals (15-152 for MAT 117 and 15-155 for MAT 217) were approved and will be effective as of Fall 2016.

Proposal 15-177 for PSY 101 had not been considered by GEC, the proposal was tabled so that it could be considered by GEC at its March meeting.

d. Reports from ad-hoc committees

i. Entry-Year Experience Committee (Dr. Allison Predecki)

Dr. Predecki reported that the EYE Committee met with representatives from the English, History, and Human Communication Studies departments and found that the efforts of the EYE Committee aligned well with efforts from those departments to develop an EYE. Dr. Predecki presented a summary of what the EYE has been working on so far, including recommendations for a “program coordinator,” a
budget for EYE programming, and establishment of the EYE Committee as a standing committee of GEC.

   ii. Amendment Committee (Dr. James Hamblin)

Dr. Hamblin reported that the Amendment Committee made some revisions to the amendments that were put forward at the February GEC meeting.

Motion (Hamblin) to vote on amendments as presented.

Motion (Wallace) to amend the motion to fix a grammatical error in Amendment 16-5 (change “evaluate” to “evaluating” and “make” to “making”).

Motion (Lucia) to amend the motion to strike 16-6B and only vote on 16-6A. Motion passed.

All amendments passed. The votes for 16-1 through 16-5 were unanimous. There were two nay votes for 16-6A and three nay votes for 16-7.

   e. Reports from standing committees

   i. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)

Motion from the committee to approve the Gen Ed grant proposal from Drs. Godshalk and Harrow (Attachment K). Motion passed.

Motion from the committee to approve the Gen Ed grant proposal from Robert Clark (Attachment J). Motion passed.

Motion from the committee to fund the Gen Ed grant proposal from Laurie Cella in the amount of $8,337.95 (reducing the remaining grants budget to $0). Dr. Drzyzga asked for the minutes to reflect that the proposal covers 29 sections of WIFYS for a total of 725 students impacted. Motion passed.

   ii. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)

Due to time constraints, Dr. Girard’s report was postponed until the April GEC meeting.

   iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)

UCC 15-177 is a change to PSY 101 to remove “not open to psychology majors,” which matches with current practice. Concern was raised that those psychology majors would now need to take one fewer Category E course. Due especially to the large number of psychology majors, this may have a big impact on other departments with courses in Category E.

Motion by the committee to recommend approval of UCC 15-177. Motion passed.

Dr. Spicka noted that there is nothing in the program change proposal form that asks about impacts on Gen Ed. Dr. Hamblin volunteered to bring up this issue at the next UCC meeting.

Motion by the committee to approve the proposed ENG 190 course as a Category B (Literature) course. Motion passed.

4. New Business

   a. Open nominations for GEC faculty co-chair and GEC secretary, AY 2016-17
The call for nominations was opened and will remain open until the next GEC meeting in April.

Dr. Hamblin was nominated for Secretary and accepted. Dr. Hamblin noted that he will be on sabbatical during Fall 2016, and so someone else will have to fill in during that semester if he is elected as secretary for 2016-17.

Dr. Drzyzga was nominated for Faculty Co-Chair and accepted.

b. Departments and programs that expire in Spring 2016

The following departments still need to elect a GEC representative and alternate for a 2016-2019 term: Chemistry, Human Communication Studies, Modern Languages, Finance and Supply Chain Management, and Teacher Education.

5. Announcements
6. Call to adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:16pm.
MEMO

DATE: March 24, 2016

TO: Cathy Sprenger, Kelly Ile, and Drs. Shannon Mortimore-Smith; Carla Kungl; and James Mike

FROM: Dr. Scott Drzyzga, faculty co-chair of the General Education Council

SUBJECT: Special topic Reading Graphic Narratives

On Thursday, March 24, 2016, the General Education Council reviewed and approved the special topic proposal submitted by the Department of English (via Dr. Shannon R. Mortimore-Smith). The GEC found the topic Reading Graphic Narratives to be appropriate for a 190-type course in Category B - Literature (and very interesting). The GEC also found the submitted proposal and syllabus made clear and explicit connections between the general learning objectives of the Category B curriculum and the specific learning objectives of the course.

In accordance with university policy, the special topic Reading Graphic Narratives may now be offered up to but no more than 4 times. If the Department of English wishes to offer the course more than 4 times, then it must submit a new general education course proposal to the UCC and receive its approval before doing so.

This instance of ENG190 may now be activated by the Registrar’s Office and made available to students for Fall 2016.

Sincerely,

Scott A. Drzyzga, PhD, GISP

faculty co-chair of the GEC
MEMO

DATE: March 25, 2016

TO: Drs. Curtis Zaleski, Mark Spicka, Lea Adams, Corrine Bertram, and Steve Haase

FROM: Dr. Scott Drzyzga, faculty co-chair of the General Education Council

SUBJECT: UCC #15-177: General Psychology

On Thursday, March 24, 2016, the General Education Council (GEC) reviewed the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) proposal #15-177 regarding General Psychology (PSY101). The proposal describes a minor change to the course Catalog Description only and seeks to remove language that states Psychology majors are prohibited from taking PSY101. This change redresses an inconsistency with past practice, for the prohibition is not enforced and Psychology majors have been enrolling in PSY101 for many years. By unanimous vote, the GEC recommends the UCC approve the proposed change to the Catalog Description of PSY101: General Psychology.

The GEC found that PSY101 is a directed general education course because it is a general education course that is “required for the major” (PASSHE BOG #2012-13, p3).

The GEC also found that UCC proposal 15-177 does not indicate a substantial policy change that will generate impacts for other academic units and the General Education program. The GEC noticed (in UCC #15-033) that the Psychology department has also proposed to allow Psychology majors to count PSY101 “toward General Education Requirements,” which counters the current policy and past practice of not allowing Psychology majors to count PSY101 toward their Category E General Education Requirement. The GEC recognizes that there is precedent for such a change and that it will provide Psychology majors (n ~ 480) with new and needed flexibility (a goal of General Education Program renewal). That said, the GEC is concerned that the impacts on other academic units that support the Category E curriculum might not have been recognized and, hence, discussed. Again, the added flexibility for Psychology majors is good, but the other academic units will want to prepare for reduced annual demand for seats in Category E courses (~120 seats/yr).

Sincerely,

Scott A. Drzyzga, PhD, GISP
faculty co-chair of the GEC
MEMO

DATE: March 25, 2016

TO: Provost Lyman and Drs. Godshalk and Harrow

FROM: Dr. Scott Drzyzga, faculty co-chair of the General Education Council

SUBJECT: General Education Grant proposal

On Thursday, March 24, 2016, the General Education Council (GEC) reviewed a General Education Grant request for $1363.00 to support student travel to the U.S. National Holocaust Memorial Museum and other museums and monuments on the National Mall. The students are currently enrolled in Dr. Godshalk’s honors history course (HIS123, 2 sections) and Dr. Harrow’s honors literature course (HON249, 1 section). Several students enrolled in HIS106 might also participate. All of these courses are general education courses.

According to my records, the balance of the 2015-2016 General Education Grants Budget is sufficient to fund the amount requested.

This is an event that the GEC and the Provost’s Office have supported in prior years. It is important to remember the victims of the Holocaust and to recognize the pattern of events that preceded it. Accordingly, the GEC continues to support this important and worthwhile project.

**The GEC voted to recommend that you approve Drs. Godshalk’s and Harrow’s request for $1363.00 to support student travel to the U.S. National Holocaust Memorial Museum and other museums and monuments on the National Mall.**

Sincerely,

Scott A. Drzyzga, PhD, GISP

faculty co-chair of the GEC
MEMO

DATE: March 25, 2016

TO: Provost Lyman and Dr. Robert Clark

FROM: Dr. Scott Drzyzga, faculty co-chair of the General Education Council

SUBJECT: General Education Grant proposal

On Thursday, March 24, 2016, the General Education Council (GEC) reviewed a General Education Grant request for $1499.05 to offset the cost of bringing an expert to campus to lecture about and demonstrate flint knapping.

The students are currently enrolled in Dr. Clark’s anthropology courses: ANT111 (Category E, 1 section), ANT121 (Category C, 2 sections) and ANT350 (1 section).

According to my records, the balance of the 2015-2016 General Education Grants Budget is sufficient to fund the amount requested.

The learning objectives associated with the project support some of the learning objectives in both the Category C and E curricula.

**The GEC voted to recommend that you approve Dr. Clark’s request for $1499.05 to offset the cost of bringing an expert to campus to lecture about and demonstrate flint knapping.**

Sincerely,

Scott A. Drzyzga, PhD, GISP

faculty co-chair of the GEC
MEMO

DATE: March 25, 2016

TO: Provost Lyman and Drs. Laurie Cella, Carla Kungl, Nicole Santalucia and Ray Janifer

FROM: Dr. Scott Drzyzga, faculty co-chair of the General Education Council

SUBJECT: General Education Grant proposal

On Thursday, March 24, 2016, the General Education Council (GEC) reviewed a General Education Grant request for $10,000 to offset the cost of bringing the writer and filmmaker Sherman Alexie to campus in support of a coordinated entry-year experience. The experience has been designed specifically for all WIFYS (ENG114) students, but will also be available to all SHIP students.

Dr. Cella’s proposal is special because it is comprehensive and forward-looking in terms of pedagogy, recruiting, and alignment of curricula. The learning objectives associated with the event are aligned well with the learning objectives associated with our required writing skills, category B, and diversity curricula. The subject matter is appropriate for first year students.

The intent, scale, scope, and budget of the proposed project generated much discussion and excitement on the floor of the council. I, personally, have not seen as much excitement and coordination among faculty on the GEC’s Entry-Year Experience, Budget, and Program Committees as I have seen over the last two months as this proposal has taken shape.

According to my records, the balance of the 2015-2016 General Education Grants Budget is not sufficient to fund the full amount (see Table 1); only $8337.95 are available.

The GEC voted to recommend that you approve Dr. Cella’s proposal and provide the remaining balance of $8337.95 to offset the cost of bringing Sherman Alexie to campus in support of a coordinated entry year experience among all sections of ENG114.

Sincerely,

Scott A. Drzyzga, PhD, GISP
faculty co-chair of the GEC
Table 1: General Education Grant balance sheet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>When</th>
<th>Debit</th>
<th>Amount requested</th>
<th>Recommend to approve</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Balance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant proposals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benbow (2015)</td>
<td>Fall 2015</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td>800.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark (2016)</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>1,499.05</td>
<td>1,499.05</td>
<td>1,499.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,700.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Godshalk &amp; Harrow (2016)</td>
<td>Spring 2016</td>
<td>1,363.00</td>
<td>1,363.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,337.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cella et al. (2016)</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>10,000.00</td>
<td>8,337.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Dr. Lyman,

Thank you so much for your continued support of Entry Year Experience Programming. We are especially excited to welcome Sherman Alexie (http://fallsapart.com/) as our inaugural First Year Writing Featured Speaker, as well as the Day of Human Understanding Keynote speaker. Alexie’s work asks important questions about race, culture, class, and essentially, what it means to be Native American in today's society. This will certainly be a signature event for the Fall semester, and we are looking forward to building more programs like this one.

In order to better brand our Entry Year Experience, we are requesting funds to hire one undergraduate student worker this summer - about $1,500 - who would be responsible for developing a PR campaign, focused on our new Entry Year Experience. Most importantly, this student would develop a logo that would appear on all Entry Year Experience events, programming, and materials that would help students, and their parents, see how all of these events are tied together in a cohesive way. This student would create: Entry Year Experience tutoring brochures, Entry Year Experience Course expectation brochures, and promotional materials we can use all year to help better brand the EYE programming.

We hope you will grant our request; we believe that effective branding will be an important step in creating a cohesive and thoughtful EYE program.

With many thanks,
The Entry Year Experience Committee
General Education Council
Allison Predecki, Chair
Minutes
Program Committee of the General Education Council, 3/1/16, 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. Clements/Botteron motioned to approve the minutes from the 2/2/16 meeting, which were approved unanimously.

III. The committee then discussed the results of the vote to approve the English Department’s proposed ENG 190 course on Graphic Narratives. The vote was six for and two against the proposal, thus the proposal will be recommended for a vote by the full council at the next GEC meeting on March 24. Related to this, the committee expressed a need to establish a numbering system to keep track of 190 proposals submitted throughout the year.

IV. The committee began efforts 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.

The committee had a lengthy discussion of how to revise and simplify the wording of some of the learning objective tags associated with the five program themes of: 1) Foundations, 2) Culture, Reflection and Responsibility, 3) Interconnections, 4) Natural Science and Technology, and 5) Creativity/Expression.

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 define terms of each Core Program Goal according to the AAC&U format. The committee decided to table discussion of how the H2 Tag will be applied to existing courses. Also, the committee expressed a need to maintain a master list of courses that meet the current diversity requirement.

VI. The next Program Committee meeting will be Tuesday, 3/22/16 in FSC 248 at 3:40 pm.

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm.
Minutes  
Program Committee of the General Education Council, 3/22/16, 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, Karl Lorenz, Kathryn Shirk, Jennifer Clements, and Doug Birsch.

II. Drs. Birsch/Clements motioned to approve the minutes as amended from the 3/1/16 meeting, which were approved unanimously.

III. The committee then discussed whether to recommend the “Minor Revision” proposal for PSY 101 requesting the removal of the language “Not open to psychology majors” from the course catalog description. A great deal of discussion was generated as to what this change actually means with regard to impact on the current general education program. Some committee members thought the proposed change should have no impact on general education since there was no mention in the proposal that the course would now count as a general education for all psychology majors. Because it currently does not count as a general education requirement for psychology majors, and because the section of the proposal addressing “Impact on Other Academic Units” and “General Education Impact” was left empty, it was assumed that psychology majors will count this course as part of their major requirements and not as a Category E General Education requirement. With this assumption in mind, the committee voted to recommend the proposed change to the General Education Council at its next meeting on March 24. The vote was three for and one against, with one abstaining. If the committee’s assumption is not correct, then the committee recommends that another proposal should be submitted explaining how the proposed change will impact other academic units and the general education program as it surely will if 450-500 psychology majors will now enroll in PSY 101 instead of any of the other Category E General Education courses.

IV. At the next meeting the committee will continue in its efforts to revise and simplify the wording of some of the learning objective tags associated with the five program themes of: 1) Foundations, 2) Culture, Reflection and Responsibility, 3) Interconnections, 4) Natural Science and Technology, and 5) Creativity/Expression, and 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.

V. The next Program Committee meeting will be Tuesday, 4/5/16 in FSC 248 at 3:40 pm.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.
CHM 121: Chemical Bonding

Preliminary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Category</th>
<th>Minor Revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Ed/Diversity Status</td>
<td>on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance Ed Status</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Abbreviation</td>
<td>CHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Subject Code</td>
<td>CHM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Course Number</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Course Title</td>
<td>Chemical Bonding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor</td>
<td>Curtis Zaleski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Email</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmzaleski@ship.edu">cmzaleski@ship.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponsor Phone</td>
<td>x1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental Approval Date</td>
<td>04/06/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Implementation Date</td>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCC Sequence Number</td>
<td>15-297</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Syllabus

| Syllabus                  | (empty)                      |

Distance Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>(empty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief Description</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Course Length in Weeks</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Will Be Taught</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor Information</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program In Which Course Will Be Offered</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Audience</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Information and Curriculum Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Degree Credits Sheet</th>
<th>(empty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Course Description</td>
<td>Study of the structure of matter ranging from atoms through molecules to crystalline structures. Three periods lecture/week. Prerequisites: MAT 175 or math placement at Level 5 (may be taken concurrently with CHM 121) and passage of a chemistry placement exam, which is administered by the Chemistry Department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Requisites</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Credits</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Credit</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Other Academic Units</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent Courses</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Frequency</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Education Impact</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Grading System</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth Impact</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Number of Sections</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction Method</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Audience</td>
<td>(empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for Proposal</td>
<td>Current Description: Study of the structure of matter ranging from atoms through molecules to crystalline structures. Three periods lecture/week. Prerequisites: MAT 175 (either may be taken concurrently with CHM 121) or math placement at Level 5 and one year of high school chemistry or CHM 105 with a grade of C or better. Proposed Description: Study of the structure of matter ranging from atoms through molecules to crystalline structures. Three periods lecture/week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Description: Study of the structure of matter ranging from atoms through molecules to crystalline structures. Three periods lecture/week. Prerequisites: MAT 175 (either may be taken concurrently with CHM 121) or math placement at Level 5 and one year of high school chemistry or CHM 105 with a grade of C or better. Proposed Description: Study of the structure of matter ranging from atoms through molecules to crystalline structures. Three periods lecture/week.
Prerequisites: MAT 175 (either may be taken concurrently with CHM 121) or math placement at Level 5 and passage of a chemistry placement exam, which is administered by the Chemistry Department. We are having difficulties determining the high school requirement; thus, we have determined that a placement exam will be a better way to gauge the readiness of students for CHM 121. This exam will be administered prior to the start of classes. In addition, we have noticed that the math requirement alone is not sufficient.

Core Support Services

Additional Computing Resources Required (empty)
Additional Costs (empty)
Additional Library Resources Required (empty)
Faculty Coverage (empty)

General Ed and Diversity

Commonalities among the Courses (empty)
Credits Count Toward Degree (empty)
Final Exam (empty)
Gen Ed Category (empty)
Gen Ed Goals Met (empty)
Justification for Status (empty)
Learning Objectives (empty)
Need for Course (empty)
Other Departments Impact (empty)
Own Department Impact (empty)
Sections (empty)
Similar Courses (empty)

Council Approvals

Academic Outreach Subcommittee (empty)
UCC Academic Policies and Standards Subcommittee (empty)
College Council (empty)
General Education Council (empty)
Graduate Council (empty)
Teacher Education Council (empty)
Developmental Education Council (empty)
Revisions Recommended (empty)

Workflow History & Comments

4/6/2016 12:20 PM:
Anonymous moved the proposal from (no workflow state) to Department Review with the following comment:
Item created

4/6/2016 12:23 PM:
cmzaleski moved the proposal from Department Review to Under Review with the following comment:
(no comment provided)
Math Follow Up

Dudley reviewed the results of meeting with the math department (see attached). Did not do all math courses, focused more on state of learning objects and goals of the Skills. Beverly and Jim noted that we need to ensure a common way to score the objectives as there are a number of different courses students take for math skills. On the concern for what the target should be, Jim noted that the Assessment Committee needs to set this. Dudley noted he would continue to work with Math in that regard, taking their expertise into account. Dudley agreed to send the issues with the assessment of the present learning objectives for math skills to the Program committee so both them and Math work together on revising them based on the recommendations made previously.

Initial Report ENG 106 (now ENG 114)

English is assessing under new objectives that are different from the objectives by GEC. In past the departments more managed the content in the courses at the time of GECC. Discussed that part of continued assessment is informing departments on the proper way to propose changes to objectives related to General Education Assessment. The present report is mapping the new objectives to the old objectives. Dudley noted that part of this review is better establishing with departments the means to modify objectives. Multiple committee members noted examples of other courses that have more than one purpose and potentially different learning outcomes for each objective (e.g. Calculus is in both Math Skills and Category A). Dudley also noted that there is a need to update the Writing Skills requirement. At present it reads more as a description for WIFYS. Jim noted as with Math Skills need to work with English to decide the target, not let English set the target.

Dudley would schedule a meeting the English assessment committee to go over the feedback and concerns. Issues that fall under the Program Committee would then be forwarded on.
Initial Report HIS 105

Dudley reviewed the initial report on concerns with History Skills Assessment. First that as it presently is stated assessing really requires both courses data to be combined together. Additionally, the History Skills description is just describing 105 and 106, not a general description of what it means for a course or pair of courses to meet the history skills requirement. Like with English, History also changed their learning objectives, but GEC did approve the changes to assessment objectives as they were attached to the course. However, this should not be the case, but at the time there was not a clear official way to make such a change other than in that regard. The committee discussed that any such learning objective changes should be separate and tied to the skills/category and not to a specific course. In this case something should be moved through the Program Committee for approval. Dudley noted that a department can change the learning objectives of the course, but for it to stay in a specific category will need to map those to the learning objectives for that category.

Han noted with Middle States the need for ethics, and if this could be added to the History Skills requirements. Something to pass on to the Program Committee.

Dudley reported he would schedule a meeting with the History assessment committee to review the feedback and concerns before completing a final report.

Future Work

Dudley concluded the meeting noting that the next meeting would hopefully review the discussion that occurred with English and History as well as the plan to start meeting with Category A. Additionally, hoping to report on the status of HCS 100 assessment.
Skills (Mathematical Competency) - MAT 211

### Mission Statement – Goal Linkages

**Mathematical Competency:** After completing the General Education math competency, students should be able to use numerical data and mathematical methods for analysis and problem solving. Specifically, they will be able to solve problems involving mathematical models, including problem formulation, solution, and interpretation of the resulting answers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Intended Educational Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. The student exhibits the ability to solve problems involving mathematical models, including problem formulation, solution, and interpretation of the resulting answers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Method and Criteria for Success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Five random choice questions are given to all students in the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Data Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. A total of 94 students were assessed in spring 2015. 17% got all correct, 30% got four correct, 19% got three correct, 27% only got two correct, and 7% got one correct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course: MAT 211

Department Chair/Program Chair/Assessment Coordinator: TBD

---

**Information**

The purpose of this document is to evaluate and provide feedback about your submitted Assessment Report to the GEC Assessment Committee. All parts of the report will be reviewed but only data from 2014-2015 will be examined and how the results are being used.

For each part of the assessment report, the following is examined.

Assessment methods: The assessment methods chosen for each outcome should provide data that will show if the outcome is being achieved or what improvements need to be made. Each outcome should have one direct method of assessment and an indirect method of assessment appropriate to the outcome. Ideally, in the overall assessment plan for the program, multiple methods of assessment should be used, both direct and indirect, and both quantitative and qualitative.

Data: For this report, there needs to be at least one outcome with data from 2014-2015 that is presented and reviewed.

Use of results: For this report, there needs to be at least one notation of the resulting discussion of the use of results of data collected in 2014-2015. For example, how do you intend to use the results or what changes have you made because of the results? What was affirmed? What conclusions did you come to? Other years for which data was collected will also be examined, but the focus of this checklist is on notes added to the “use of results” section of the assessment report that occurred in the year.
Category Course Assessment Report Feedback

Directions for reviewers: Use this template for each Learning Outcome, copying and pasting if they have more than 1 Learning Outcome.

**COLUMN 3: ASSESSMENT METHOD & CRITERIA FOR SUCCESS**

2. How many assessment methods are used to measure this outcome? ____1____

3. Describe each assessment method and classify whether it is direct or indirect, whether it is quantitative or qualitative. If you need to have more information about the assessment method in order to classify it, please ask the chair of the GEC Assessment Committee to get more information.

Five random choice questions are given to all students in the course.

Is a **direct quantitative measure**

4. In your professional opinion, will the assessment method(s) provide meaningful information that will direct change (if change is needed)? Discuss each assessment method separately.

Unknown due to complexity of learning objective.

**COLUMN 4: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED**

5. When were the results collected?

Spring 2015

6. Is enough information presented to understand whether the results will provide direction on what might need to be improved to meet the outcome?

No target was given as it relates to the results, so not clear on if the results indicate if a change is needed. Additionally, complexity of learning objective makes determining what needs to be changed/improved a problem as well.

**COLUMN 5: USE OF RESULTS**

7. How were the results used?

No use of the results was provided with the data.

8. Is there enough information in the report to understand how the results are going to be used?

Not at this time.
Strengths of the annual assessment report:

- States clearly the method of assessment and the results from the assessment

Constructive feedback and opportunities for growth for your annual assessment report:

- There is a need to modify the learning outcome for Mathematical Competency so that any assessment results can be more clearly understood. There needs to be a way to know if the results are acceptable to know when a problem has occurred.

Notes from Meeting with Department:

- Discussed the issue of the three different learning outcomes being listed as one learning outcome.
- Explained that changing the learning outcome would be a proposal developed by the Program Committee.
- Department plans to look at how to better classify the questions used in assessment to the three different learning outcomes that are being assessed (formulation, solution, and interpretation). Due to the large number of courses classified as a skills math course (technically all Math courses have this classification) we discussed.
- What courses fit the concept of a skills course. The department planned to look at determining what are the target values for the course and including notes on if the data caused them to make any change.