General Education Council
2016-2017 Academic Year

Agenda, for the meeting on Thursday, Apr. 27, 2017, in ELL205 at 3:30 P.M.

1. Call to order
2. Review and approve the minutes of the previous council meeting – Attachment A
3. Old Business
   a. Reports from our Standing Committees
      i. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)
         1. Minutes from its meeting on Apr. 19, 2017 – Attachment B
         2. GEC Grants Proposal from English (Dr. Kungl) – Attachment C
      ii. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)
         1. Minutes from its meeting on Mar. 30, 2017 – Attachment D
         2. EYE Proposal & Assessment Plan (draft) – Attachment E
      iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)
         1. Minutes from its meeting on Apr. 4, 2017 – Attachment F
         2. Minutes from its meeting on Apr. 17, 2017 – Attachment G
         3. EYE Proposal & Assessment Plan (draft) – Attachment E
      iv. Entry Year Experience (Dr. Matt Ramsey)
   b. Reports from our representative to the UCC (Kirk Moll)
   c. Final nominations for GEC faculty co-chair, GEC secretary, and UCC rep.
4. New Business
   a. Hold elections for GEC faculty co-chair, GEC secretary, and UCC rep.
5. Announcements
6. Call to adjourn
MINUTES
General Education Council, 3:30 PM March 28, 2017, ELL 205


II. Dr. Clements motioned, seconded by Dr. Lorenz, to approve the February 28, 2017 minutes. No corrections were noted, and the motion passed unanimously.

III. Old Business
   a. Dr. Drzyzga reminded departments of the three-year rotation to the GEC membership, which ensures continuity. Some departments need to conduct elections report new members by the end of the year.
   b. Dr. Drzyzga presented a Penn State data report that maps population change. It provided a visual representation of the expected growth in southeast portion of the state and the expected decrease in northwest that we discussed at the previous meeting. Shippensburg, Millersburg, and West Chester/Cheyney are a few of the PASSHE schools that are well situated to accommodate the future growth.

IV. New Business
   a. Report from standing committees:
      i. Assessment: Dr. Girard reported that the Assessment Committee has been working with the Math department and has reviewed their assessment. They have been looking at TractDAT and need to figure out how it can be aligned with program goals. The committee started to review tags and learning objectives of the proposed program. They recognize there are some words in the tagging system that have different meanings to different departments. The committee has started to gather data to assess the current Category E curriculum, and in their next meeting, they will examine the EYE proposal.
      
      ii. Program: Dr. Bergsten reported that the Program Committee has spent a lot of time getting feedback on the draft of the general education proposal. They have met with department chairs, held open forums, had each department respond orally, and have met with individuals. Comments from across campus were distilled into a list of 45 issues that the committee is working through and documenting each, such as changing words, (e.g., from logical analysis to critical analysis and reasoning to fit better with Middle States Standards) and considering including a citizenship tag. The committee has asked departments to report which or the proposed student learning objectives (i.e., ‘tags’) they will support with their existing general education courses. The following departments have not yet reported: Criminal Justice, Computer Science, Computer Engineer, Disability Studies, Ethnic Studies, Management and Marketing, Modern Languages, and Music and Theater. This information is necessary to estimate potential changes to FTEF.
      
      iii. Entry Year Experience: Dr. Ramsey reported that they did not meet this past month but they have update the digital version of the Sherman Alexie flyer to report GEC sponsorship.
iv. Budget: Dr. Meyer reported that the Budget Committee received no new proposals, and they did not meet this past month. $5,000 of the $12,000 budget has been expended, with nearly $7,000 remaining.

b. Dr. Moll reported that UCC held a relatively quiet and brief meeting. The two ethnic studies courses that GEC discussed during the previous meeting were approved by UCC. Some confusion occurred with another course proposal. Dr. Drzyzga will clarify with all parties that GEC did approve the Anthropology course at the previous meeting.

c. The elected position for GEC faculty co-chair and secretary need to be conducted at the next meeting. Dr. Drzyzga noted he would not run again. Dr. Birch made a motion, seconded by Dr. Moll, for GEC to recognize Dr. Drzyzga’s 4 years of exemplary service where he has been instrumental to the success of this council. All were in favor and the motioned passed unanimously. Dr. Burg, as APSCUF representative, will handle the elections.

V. Dr. Birsch motioned, seconded by Dr. Moll to adjourn. The meeting concluded at 5:10 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Alison E. Feeney
I. Meeting was called to order by Dr. Ben Meyer, chair of the GEC Budget Committee. The meeting was attended by Tom Frielle, David Hwang, and Ben Meyer.

II. The Budget Committee of the General Education Council (GEC) reviewed a General Education Grant proposal that was submitted by Dr. Carla Kungl (English). Dr. Kungl would like to invite novelist Gish Jen as the WIFYS speaker in October 2017. The ENG 114 WIFYS course (Writing Intensive First Year Seminar) has 32 sections currently scheduled for Fall 2017, and with 25 students per section, this computes to 800 students required to attend the lecture by Gish Jen. Many additional individuals attended Sherman Alexie’s lecture, and a large turnout is also expected for the lecture by Gish Jen. The lecture addresses the following Learning Outcomes: Writing Skills and Competencies, Category B (Linguistic, Literary, Artistic, and Cultural Traditions), and Diversity Learning Objectives. The Budget Committee highly recommended funding the proposed event for $5000.00 and moved its positive recommendation to the GEC.

III. In February the committee had approved $1449.50 for a project by Dr. Clements and $888.70 for a project by Dr. Mitaut, leaving $6914.10 (of the total $12,000 budget) as of April 19. With the approval of the project by Dr. Kungl, $1914.10 remains in the budget for the 2016-2017 academic year.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:15pm.

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

Department: English

Email: Dr. Carla Kungl (Interim Chair): ctkung@ship.edu / Dr. Laurie Cella(Chair) : ljcella@ship.edu

Phone: Carla Kungl: 717-477-1716 / Laurie Cella: 717-477-1204

Date of Proposed Project/Event/Excursion:

Thursday, October 4, 2017

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 Requirements.**

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

We have invited novelist Gish Jen as the WIFYS speaker. Her lecture will discuss issues of national and personal identity, immigration, assimilation, and the American experience. All WIFYS instructors will build writing assignments from an issue she presents in her literature. Students will be asked to respond critically to her texts and/or her presentation.
Summary of Grant Proposal for Gish Jen as First-Year Writing Featured Speaker

The English Department Writing Committee is striving to develop programming that will help brand the (emerging) FYE program here at Shippensburg. As part of the effort to create a cohesive FYE program, we plan to invite another speaker, the novelist Gish Jen, to follow up on the very successful inaugural address by Sherman Alexie. Gish Jen's lecture will discuss issues of national and personal identity, immigration, assimilation, and the American experience.

Jen will be an ideal speaker for our purposes. Her novels and short fiction discuss “families and identity and race and the American Dream” (Michiko Kakutani, gishjen.com); of *Typical American*, Jayne Anne Phillips writes: “Gish Jen’s immensely intelligent, thunderously funny, truly heartbreaking novel is perhaps the best story of contemporary immigrant experience ever to grace our literature.” The nonfiction *Girl at the Baggage Claim: Explaining the East-West Culture Gap*, builds on these ideas in a more sociological way. And because she herself took a circuitous route through college and young adulthood to find her place in the world, her lectures resonate with college students who are also trying to discover their paths.

Like we did for Alexie, we will require ALL WIFYS professors to incorporate Gish Jen 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. Students will be asked to respond critically to her texts and/or her presentation. The “WIFSY Speaker” thus creates a common pedagogy across classes, and this is a strong step toward creating a cohesive First-Year Experience for new students here at Ship. Currently, we have 32 ENG 114 courses on the books for Fall 2017. With the course capped at 25, there will be at 800 students required to attend this lecture. We hope many more will attend.

We anticipate that Gish Jen’s lecture will draw local high school teachers and students, like the Alexie presentation did. Thus, her presentation would also function as a way to attract high school students to Shippensburg and provide relevant programming that would have an impact on the community and the surrounding area.

Jen’s presentation will be co-funded by a Human Understanding grant, and so her lecture would serve as both the keynote for the Day of Human Understanding as well as 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. I have been in regular contact with both DHU and FYE committees, soliciting feedback and gathering ideas for speakers. Gish Jen was considered an excellent choice by all involved.

Basic Assessment of WIFYS Speaker

Over 900 people attended the lecture by Alexie, the first WIFYS speaker, as part of the FYE experience. This attendance exceeded our initial expectation of 725, implying that not only WIFYS students attended. We made substantial outreach to area high schools and know that at least 70 high school teachers and students attended.

We combined efforts with the Day of Human Understanding, and the lecture was the culmination of several DHU pieces of programming—a ShipTalk earlier in the day, a showing of *Smoke Signals* (based on one of Alexie’s books and directed by him), and a fantastic Native American dinner at
Reisner. We feel these features helped solidify what the FYE committee is trying to do. The crowd seemed to love it; as *The Slate* put it: “Audience members roared with laughter and applause...as Sherman Alexie wove ideas of cultural competence and personal stories together” (10 April).

We are working on more concrete assessment concerning how WIFYS professors integrate Alexie into their classes and how students responded. Since this talk was initially scheduled for October but had to get moved to April, we simply don’t have the data yet. We will forward our assessment results on to you when it is complete. And we will use results from that assessment to make the experience our students have with Gish Jen even better.

### Learning Outcomes

This lecture would address a wide variety of Learning Outcomes: Writing Skills, Category B, and the Diversity Requirements.

#### Writing Skills and Competencies, Learning Objectives

- **Engage in a college-level discussion:** Featuring Gish Jen 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 or similar texts and preparing for her 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 Jen (she has written short stories, fiction and non-fiction) 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 Jen, and the students will practice reading, thinking about, and responding to her work. Reading this text will provide a useful framework for understanding and reflecting on Jen’s lecture.

- **Demonstrate analytical and critical thinking skills:** Jen’s texts and presentation will raise challenging questions regarding culture, identity, race, and assimilation. Her 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 her presentation.

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

- **Identify styles, genres, and techniques in literature:** A critical analysis of Jen’s approach to short stories, novels, and nonfiction 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:** Jen’s literature is a product of her
immigrant status (Chinese growing up in America) and her sociological background (moving from Queens to a wealthy Jewish suburb), both of which lead her to consistently question what it means to be “American.” Her work questions the divide between Eastern and Western Cultures.

Diversity Learning Objectives:

• Engaging in Jen’s work in classes and through her 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 her work, and hearing her 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;

• 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;

In addition, a speaker like Jen could help fulfill learning objectives in other categories such as Category D: show how sub-groups interact (economically, politically socially) and Category E: identify examples of diversity in human organizations and the impact of social forces on individuals and groups.
**GENERAL EDUCATION PROJECT GRANT**

**BUDGET SHEET**

*(Written estimates from Vendors must be attached to Hard Copy)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME:</th>
<th>DR. CARLA KUNGL / DR. LAURIE CELLA</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT: ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL:</td>
<td><a href="mailto:CTKUNG@SHIP.Edu">CTKUNG@SHIP.Edu</a> / <a href="mailto:LJCELLA@SHIP.Edu">LJCELLA@SHIP.Edu</a></td>
<td>PHONE: 477-1716 / 477-1204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MONTH AND YEAR OF PROPOSED EVENT:**

October 4, 2017

**ITEMIZED BUDGET (PROPOSED)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ITEM AMOUNT (Written Estimate Attached)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gish Jen, author</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL REQUESTED: $5,000**

*We will supplement this fee from a other grants on campus, specifically the Day of Human Understanding speaker.*

---

**FACULTY MEMBERS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DR. LAURIE CELLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. NICOLE SANTALUCIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. CARLA KUNGL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR. RAY JANIFER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF. JON DUBOW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT FIRST YEAR WRITING COMMITTEE**
Bob Davis got back to me. Gish Jen is available on 9/19 and 10/4 at the terms provided below. Please let me know how you want to proceed. I also need to know when you would have a commitment for the funds to make the offer.

Leslie

Got it. Back to you soon. How long will it be to know if the funds will be available?

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE Droid
On Apr 12, 2017 7:01 PM, "Kungl, Carla" <CTKung@ship.edu> wrote:
Thanks for following up so quickly. Oct 3-4 would be best, since we need to work in material by Jen into our WIFYS classes. It would be difficult to do substantial (or even a little) work with this author only three weeks into the semester. So let’s keep our fingers crossed for one of those two dates!

Thanks again,

Carla

I spoke to Bob Davis. The three dates I gave him that the Luhrs Center would be available are Sept. 19 (Sept. 20 and 21 is Rosh Hashanah) and Oct. 3 and 4.

He is going to check her calendar and let me know her availability. I am suggesting an offer of $10K inclusive of airfare (Boston) and that she would do a student session, dinner, lecture and book signing.

If you want to also explore dates the week of Sept. 25 with a CUB location, please let me know.

Yes, I believe the attendance was at least 900 for Alexie.

Leslie
GEC Assessment Committee meeting minutes  
Thursday, March 30th, 2017, 1:00pm, MCT 156

Present: Scott Dryzga, Lance Bryant, Dudley Girard, Becky Ward  
Secretary: Dudley Girard

Discussion of EYE Proposal:
Initial discussion covered the organization of the EYE Committee’s draft proposal for a university-wide entry year experience program. The proposal includes an aspirational statement (section I); a list of program goals (5 in section II); a list of general education program goals (7 in section IV); an expanded list of EYE program goals (4 in section V); and another section with additional EYE program goals (2 more in section VI). The committee noted that, section III proposed a four-course structure of the program before all of the EYE program goals had been described and before even the first student learning objective or the first best practice was documented.

Dudley started by noting the proposal confuses what are supposed to be program goals and what are supposed to be student learning objectives.

Scott suggested the committee refer to the glossary included on page 8.
1. A competency is the ability to do something successfully.
2. A program goal is a clear statement that expresses what a program will do. Each goal is designed to prompt and guide teaching practice and foster program assessment.
3. A student learning objective is a clear statement about what we expect students to learn or accomplish. Like any type of objective, a student learning objective is a desired outcome.
4. A student learning outcome is the result of a learning process; in other words, it is an actual outcome. To foster assessment, student learning outcomes must be observable, observed, measurable, and measured.

Dudley noted that much of the proposal seem to reflect the content of the four courses rather than aspirations and objectives related to an EYE program. Dudley also said some of the aspirations were closer to what the goals of an EYE program might be (see section I and sections V.2, V.4, V.1.3 and VI – these are good).

Scott noted that any program proposal needs to be clear about what the program will do (so we can do good program assessment) verses what the students will get from the program (so we can do good student learning assessment).

Lance noted that section V seemed to have a large number of things that the program would do. He also noted, that there is no explanation on just what the resource issue is, mentioned at the beginning of the document, just that there is one.

Becky suggested that an EYE proposal needs to be clear about the EYE curriculum as it relates to an EYE. She was also concerned that neither retention nor diversity was addressed by any of the proposed goals or objectives.
When reviewing the rubrics, the entire committee wondered why the proposal was trying to accomplish (and assess?) all of the general education learning objectives and not focus on what students would get from an EYE program.

Discussion then focused on what if any of the research done last year (e.g., best practices, what our competitors are doing) was behind the goals/objectives being proposed. The committee wondered if Sarah Stokely or Denise Yarwood had been consulted while writing the proposal, and if any of the objectives from existing EYE-like courses on campus right now (e.g. in exploratory studies, computer science, biology, business) were incorporated into the document. The committee thought it would be good for any EYE proposal to reference this kind of information where possible to help with the review process.

Dudley noted that the assessment committee at this time doesn't have the time to fix the goals and objectives of the current proposal.

The committee decided that the current proposal should not be approved. The key concerns were that section III is too focused on putting set courses and set course content into the EYE, and section IV seems to promise the entire general education curriculum can be accomplished by taking the four courses identified in section III. The lack of focus on true EYE goals and information about how such goals are determined was concerning. Lastly, student learning objectives need to be mapped to program goals.

**Discussion on the Assessment of the current Cat E and Cat A curricula:**
Dudley mentioned he had received information for GEO 140. Becky had sent out requests to get data for HCS 100, WST 100, and DS 100, but had not heard back yet. Lance had not yet sent out a request for information from PHL 101-103, 105, SOC 101, and ANT 111.

**Next meeting:** April 27th at 3:30pm

Submitted by Dudley Girard
Background: In the 2014-2015 academic year, the GEC EYE Committee studied first-year experiences at universities around the nation and sought to develop a program for Shippensburg University based on national best practices. The committee developed learning objectives for such a program, and a plan for a first-year seminar that would be taken by all Shippensburg University students. However, financial considerations made that particular approach unfeasible. In the 2015-2016, the GEC EYE Committee focused on an EYE program that should reflect a shared culture. Simultaneously, the chairs of the English, History, and Human Communication Studies Departments developed a more detailed EYE proposal that focused on utilizing existing resources, integrated learning, collaboration, and shared assessment among courses in the Shippensburg University general education core. In the spring of 2016, the chairs met with the faculty co-chair of the GEC, the chair of the GEC Program Committee, and the chair of the GEC EYE Committee to share and discuss the draft proposal. This proposal reflects the culmination of two years of research, planning, and collaboration to develop an Entry Year Experience Proposal reflecting national best practices, the learning objectives of Middle States, our university’s existing expertise in first-year general education teaching and learning, and the realities of Shippensburg University’s resources. The GEC EYE Committee recommends adoption of this proposal.
Shippensburg University Entry-Year Experience Program Proposal (February 2017)

I. Shippensburg University Entry-Year Experience 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.

II. Shippensburg University Entry-Year Experience General Objectives

To achieve this purpose, the EYE program should be focused on accomplishing five 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. Facilitate collaboration, connections, and common assessment among the entry-year core general education courses based on program-level learning objectives.

4. Encourage Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to collaborate in developing innovative programming.

5. Providing support structures and assist students to acquire the skills they need to succeed at Shippensburg University, in their major program of study, and as lifelong learners.

III. Structure of the Entry-Year Experience Academic Core

The academic core of the Entry-Year Experience will consist of the following courses:

- **English 114: Writing Intensive First-Year Seminar** (50% of first year students each semester)

- **Human Communication Studies 100: Introduction to Human Communications** (50% of first year students each semester)

- **History 105: Historical Foundations of Global Cultures** (100% of first-year students in the fall semester)

- **History 106: Thinking Historically in a Global Age** (100% of first-year students in the spring semester)

Each of these courses will be focused on meeting its specific course objectives, but also to contributing to the overall Program Goals of the Entry-Year Experience. The three core departments will work collaboratively to foster connections among the courses, to coordinate EYE programming and events, to develop innovative ways to support student learning, and to collaborate on program assessment.
IV. Shippensburg University Entry-Year Experience Program-Level Learning Goals

The Shippensburg University Entry-Year Experience will:

A. Guide and prompt students to locate and organize information with appropriate evidence and language for clear **written communication**.
B. Guide and prompt students to develop **oral communication** skills necessary to organize and deliver a clear message with appropriate supporting material.
C. Guide and prompt students to develop **analytical reading skills** that allow them to read and assimilate information from complex and unfamiliar texts.
D. Guide and prompt students to gain an historical **appreciation of diverse global cultures** and through the critical reading and analysis of texts and artifacts from diverse cultures and times, and to formulate evidence-based arguments using evidence grounded in chronology, context, and causation.
E. Guide and prompt students to develop a **historical understanding of contemporary issues**, through the process of research, critical analysis of evidence, and application of multi-causal analysis.
F. Guide and prompt students towards **information literacy**, and the capacity to locate, evaluate, and use information in intelligent, appropriate, and ethical ways.
G. Guide and prompt students towards **engagement in campus life**, and the development of skills and utilization of services, and participation in cultural and artistic events, that will encourage student retention, persistence, completion, enrichment, and success.

V. 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 the EYE program.
3. Provide programming about college level expectations and opportunities, including during orientation and Welcome Week.
4. Facilitate collaboration among the three primary academic departments (English, History and Human Communication Studies) that includes common language about the EYE purpose and goals.

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. Establish an EYE Program Coordinator (a faculty member who will receive appropriate reassigned time) to work with faculty and to plan EYE Program events for first-year students.
2. Undertake program-level assessment and engage faculty in ongoing conversations about continuous improvement seeking to use assessment data to strengthen the Entry-Year Experience.
3. Hold a continuous faculty awareness campaign and provide faculty with a flowchart of available resources for first-year students.

3) Facilitate collaboration, connections, academic support, and common assessment among the entry-year core general education courses based on program-level learning objectives:

1. Envision the first-year experience as a sub-program of Shippensburg University’s General Education Program with its own specific first-year learning objectives.

2. Develop a set of learning objectives and assessment methods that specifically evaluate the total impact of the first-year college experience on student learning (These can be found on page 6).

3. Use the four-course sequence of ENG 114, HCS 100, HIS 105, and HIS 106 to provide an integrated first-year experience for students that bridges students’ entire first year.

4. Provide comprehensive academic support through tutoring programs and supplemental instruction.

5. Embed training in college success skills in core courses, and supplement with outside support.

6. Integrate information literacy more holistically into the program by using the “personal librarian” or “embedded librarian” model so that faculty and students can have a personalized and ongoing relationship with campus librarians to assist with their information needs.

7. Use the academic component of the Entry-Year Experience as a hub for engaging students with the broader campus learning experience, activities, programs, campus offices, and campus resources.

8. Organize students in six-person “learning teams” in History 105, and then have students continue with the members of their learning team into a common section of HIS 106 (ideally taught by a different faculty member than History 105) to provide a consistent, year-long cohort experience for students.

4) Encourage Academic Affairs and Student Affairs to develop innovative, collaborative programming.

Program planning, administration, assessment and success will require the following:

1. A Program Coordinator (with reassigned time), as well as a student intern and student worker.

2. A designated budget for EYE programming

3. Establishment of an Entry-Year Experience Steering Committee comprised of members of the GEC, representatives from the English, and the History/Philosophy, Human Communication Studies departments, and Library departments; The College of Exploratory Studies, and additional members from Academic Affairs and Student Affairs who are interested in providing programming or services connected to the Entry-Year Experience. For example, this might include the First Alert Coordinator, representatives from Residence Life, representatives from Dining Services, and representatives from the Career Development and Community Engagement Center, and others.
4. Faculty resources to ensure class sizes are appropriate to meet the program’s learning objectives. Ideal class sizes would be: HIS 105 & HIS 106: 40; ENG 114: 20; HCS 100: 25.

5. An institutional commitment of space & financial support for student academic support:
   - Learning Center: Tutoring (History, English, Human Communication Studies)
   - English Department Writing Lab
   - History Peer Tutoring Program
   - Human Communication Studies: Communications Center

4. Support for annual inter-departmental retreat to coordinate EYE program, foster interdepartmental collaboration, review assessment data, and explore ways to strengthen the EYE program.

VI. Additional Goals for Campus Engagement Elements of the Entry-Year Experience

A. Health Needs and Holistic Perspectives
   - Develop the key skills and behaviors necessary for successfully navigating university life and becoming self-directed, lifelong learners.
   - Describe processes, strategies, and resources, and explain the implications of their decisions, related to their overall wellness.
   - Gain a deeper appreciation and engagement with the arts, music, and culture.
   - Develop an awareness of the importance and healthy diets and impact of alcohol consumption.
   - Identify the multi-faceted network of support services at Shippensburg University that address their academic, personal, and social needs.
   - Explore and appreciate the artistic, cultural, and educational resources available on campus and in the community available for personal enrichment and lifelong learning.

B. Peer Connections and Campus Engagement
   - Develop and apply skills that contribute to building positive relationships with peers, staff and faculty.
   - Develop strong collaborative relationships with fellow EYE students.
   - Foster academic connections and discussions across the entire campus. Provide students with a 360-degree learning experience that extends beyond the classroom and engages students at all points of their Shippensburg University experience (for example, integrating food history into meals at dining services, encouraging a more visible presence of faculty in the residence halls, encouraging academic connections at Red Raider sporting events, etc.).
   - Describe and demonstrate principles of responsible citizenship within and beyond the campus community, and promote opportunities for community engagement and service learning.
Assessment of the Shippensburg University Entry Year Experience

The Shippensburg University Entry-Year Experience addresses the Middle States Commission on Higher Education goals for Standard III: Design and Delivery of the Student Learning Experience and Standard IV: Support of the Student Experience.

1. Program Goals for the Shippensburg University Entry Year Experience

The Shippensburg University Entry-Year Experience will:

H. Guide and prompt students to locate and organize information with appropriate evidence and language for clear written communication.

I. Guide and prompt students to develop oral communication skills necessary to organize and deliver a clear message with appropriate supporting material.

J. Guide and prompt students to develop analytical reading skills that allow them to read and assimilate information from complex and unfamiliar texts.

K. Guide and prompt students to gain an historical appreciation of diverse global cultures and through the critical reading and analysis of texts and artifacts from diverse cultures and times, and to formulate evidence-based arguments using evidence grounded in chronology, context, and causation.

L. Guide and prompt students to develop a historical understanding of contemporary issues, through the process of research, critical analysis of evidence, and application of multi-causal analysis.

M. Guide and prompt students towards information literacy, and the capacity to locate, evaluate, and use information in intelligent, appropriate, and ethical ways.

N. Guide and prompt students towards engagement in campus life, and the development of skills and utilization of services, and participation in cultural and artistic events, that will encourage student retention, persistence, completion, enrichment, and success.

2. Method for Assessing the Shippensburg University Entry-Year Experience

Assessment of the Entry-Year Experience will occur in odd-numbered falls/even numbered springs to coincide with the university’s administration of the National Survey of Students Engagement (even numbered springs).

A. EYE Program Goal A: College-Level Writing:

1. Writing will be a component of all of the core academic courses. To assess writing, all students enrolled in ENG 114 or the equivalent over the course of the academic year when assessment is taking place will complete a written assignment as part of a common final exam designed to assess the program learning objectives for college-level writing. The common assignment will be graded holistically using the common rubric, and then a random sample of 10% will be selected for assessment purposes.

2. In History 105, a pretest will be administered to all first-year students during the first week of class to provide a baseline assessment of their writing ability at the start of their college career. A sample of 10% of those essays evaluated using the common writing rubric. The final examination for HIS 105 and HIS 106 during the academic year when assessment is taking place will include a common required essay that will be completed by all first year students. This essay will be evaluated holistically by faculty using the common rubric. A sample of 10% of those essay will then be drawn to evaluate student writing development at the midpoint and conclusion of the first year.
B. EYE Program Goal B: Oral Communication
1. All students enrolled in HCS 100 or the equivalent course during the academic year when assessment is taking place will complete an assignment that can be used to assess the program learning objectives for college-level oral communication.

C. EYE Program C: Analytical Reading Skills
1. Analytical reading will be an element of all EYE Core courses, but will be emphasized in History 105 and History 106 through the close analysis of primary and secondary sources. A common essay question required by all sections of HIS 106 will evaluate this learning goal and will be graded holistically by professors using a common rubric. A random sample of 10% of those final exam essays will then be used to evaluate students’ performance regarding this learning goal.

D. EYE Program Goal D: Historical Appreciation of Diverse Global Cultures
1. In History 105, a pretest will be administered to all first-year students during the first week of class to provide a baseline assessment of their historical skills and understanding of diverse global cultures. A sample of 10% of those essays evaluated using the common Program Goal C rubric. The final examination for HIS 105 will include a common required essay that will be completed by all first-year students. This essay will be evaluated holistically by all faculty teaching History 105 using the common rubric. A sample of 10% of the pre-test and final essay will then be drawn to evaluate student learning in EYE Program Goal C.

E. EYE Program Goal E: Historical Understanding of Contemporary Issues
1. In History 106, a pretest will be administered to all first-year students during the first week of class to provide a baseline assessment of their historical skills and historical understanding of contemporary issues. The final examination for HIS 106 will include a common required essay that will be completed by students in all sections of History 106. This essay will be evaluated holistically by all faculty teaching History 106 using the common rubric. A sample of 10% of the final essay will then be drawn to evaluate student learning in EYE Program Goal E.

F. EYE Program Goal F: Information Literacy
1. All students enrolled in the ENG 114: Writing Intensive First-Year Seminar will be required to complete the modules of the Ship to Shore modules and then to undertake an online evaluation to assess their mastery of the program learning objectives for EYE Goal E.
2. At the beginning of the fall semester, all first-year students in HIS 105 will complete a pre-test evaluating their information literacy. A post-test will be administered at the end of HIS 106 to all first-year students, evaluating their progress towards the learning goals for EYE Program Goal F.

G. EYE Program Goal G: Engagement in Campus Life
1. All students enrolled in HIS 106 in the spring semester of the academic year when assessment is taking place will be required to complete the NSSE survey.
2. As a graded course requirement, students enrolled in HIS 105 and HIS 106 will be required to attend a set number of campus activities or programs, or to utilize campus support services in both the fall and spring semester. Student participation will be monitored using student identification cards and a swipe-card system or through other means.

Assessment Rubrics for Entry-Year Experience Program Learning Goals
A. Guide and prompt students to locate and organize information with appropriate evidence and language for clear written communication.

B. Guide and prompt students to develop oral communication skills necessary to organize and deliver a clear message with appropriate supporting material.

C. Guide and prompt students to develop analytical reading skills that allow them to read and assimilate information from complex and unfamiliar texts.

O. Guide and prompt students to gain an historical appreciation of diverse global cultures and through the critical reading and analysis of texts and artifacts from diverse cultures and times, and to formulate evidence-based arguments using evidence grounded in chronology, context, and causation.

D. Guide and prompt students to develop a historical understanding of contemporary issues, through applying skills of research, critical analysis of evidence, understanding of complex causation, and the application of historical thinking.

E. Guide and prompt students towards information literacy, and the capacity to locate, evaluate, and use information in intelligent, appropriate, and ethical ways.

F. Guide and prompt students towards engagement in campus life, and the development of skills and utilization of services, and participation in cultural and artistic events, that will encourage student retention, persistence, completion, enrichment, and success.

For each of the following rubrics:

A competency is the ability to do something successfully.

A program goal is a clear statement that expresses what our program will do for students. Each goal is designed to prompt and guide teaching practice and program assessment.

A student learning objective is a clear statement about what we expect students to learn or accomplish. Like any type of objective, a student learning objective is a desired outcome.

A student learning outcome is the result of a learning process; in other words, it is an actual outcome. To foster assessment of student learning, student learning outcomes must be observable, observed, measurable, and measured. Student learning outcomes can be characterized using an ordinal scale of competency (e.g., unsatisfactory, emerging, developing, proficient, and mastery).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives/Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Levels of Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Logic and Order</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student employs disciplinary expectations to produce clearly worded and organized text that makes a valid assertion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to demonstrate awareness of the correct form or structure for this discipline.</td>
<td>Shows awareness of the disciplinary expectations of form; uses some elements of structure and language appropriate to support assertion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begins to develop a sense of order to convey an idea; an emerging structure is apparent.</td>
<td>Adheres to disciplinary conventions, terms, and methods, and demonstrates the ability to develop a clear and succinct assertion for the reader.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows awareness of the disciplinary expectations of form; uses some elements of structure and language appropriate to support assertion.</td>
<td>Skillfully uses field-specific conventions, terms, and methods to make a clear assertion that contributes to the discipline in an innovative way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adheres to disciplinary conventions, terms, and methods, and demonstrates the ability to develop a clear and succinct assertion for the reader.</td>
<td>Uses advanced reasoning and engaging scholarly evidence to support original argument; carefully documents evidence in accordance with disciplinary convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sources and Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student uses appropriate evidence to support assertions, with documentation of sources in accordance disciplinary conventions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skillfully uses field-specific conventions, terms, and methods to make a clear assertion that contributes to the discipline in an innovative way.</td>
<td>Provides support for assertions with credible evidence that it is well integrated into the argument; shows an awareness of the standards for documentation in the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses scarce support to explain or substantiate assertions; attempts to document sources.</td>
<td>Provides support for assertions with credible evidence that it is well integrated into the argument; shows an awareness of the standards for documentation in the discipline.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides some support for assertions but ideas not fully integrated with the argument; documents sources but may not fully adhere to disciplinary conventions.</td>
<td>Uses advanced reasoning and engaging scholarly evidence to support original argument; carefully documents evidence in accordance with disciplinary convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides support for assertions with credible evidence that it is well integrated into the argument; shows an awareness of the standards for documentation in the discipline.</td>
<td>Uses advanced reasoning and engaging scholarly evidence to support original argument; carefully documents evidence in accordance with disciplinary convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control of Language and Syntax</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student uses language that is controlled, readable, clear, proofread, and suitable for the discipline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to convey meaning due to lack of control.</td>
<td>Controls language such that it is readable with few exceptions, but contains some errors in usage and grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attempts to control language but meaning impeded because of weak syntax and consistent errors in usage.</td>
<td>Controls language such that it is readable with few exceptions, but contains some errors in usage and grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls language to convey meaning clearly, but syntax and grammar are still a distraction.</td>
<td>Controls language such that it is readable with few exceptions, but contains some errors in usage and grammar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Mastery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controls language such that it is readable with few exceptions, but contains some errors in usage and grammar.</td>
<td>Controls language such that it is readable with few exceptions, but contains some errors in usage and grammar.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EYE GOAL B – ORAL COMMUNICATION – RUBRIC OF LEARNING OBJECTIVES (DESIRED OUTCOMES) & COMPETENCIES – Program Goal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives/Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Levels of Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will successfully identify and interpret communication theories and models.</td>
<td>Students fail to correctly identify and interpret communication theories and models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student will use accepted rhetorical organization strategies to author original, public speeches</td>
<td>Students fail to develop speeches with introductions, bodies, and/or conclusions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will effectively deliver public speeches</td>
<td>Students fail to complete speeches or significantly violate the delivery requirements (verbal and nonverbal).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EYE GOAL C – ANALYTICAL READING SKILLS--RUBRIC OF LEARNING OBJECTIVES (DESIRED OUTCOMES) & COMPETENCIES--Program Goal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives/Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand and employ strategies for successfully approaching complex and unfamiliar texts.</td>
<td>Students is unfamiliar with reading strategies and unable to employ them for approaching a complex or unfamiliar text.</td>
<td>Students is familiar with reading strategies, but does not employ them when approaching texts.</td>
<td>Student understands reading strategies and employs them consistently in approaching texts.</td>
<td>Students correctly utilizes reading strategies and effectively employ them consistently to read and analyze complex and unfamiliar texts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can evaluate texts with consideration of context, authorship, audience, intent, and reliability.</td>
<td>Students does not adequately consider issues of context, authorship, audience, intent, and reliability when reading texts.</td>
<td>Students understands the importance of considering issues of context, authorship, audience, intent, and reliability, but does so in a superficial or inconsistent manner.</td>
<td>Students can evaluate texts for context, authorship, audience, and intent, but does not do so consistently.</td>
<td>Students consistently evaluate texts for context, authorship, audience, and intent, and reaches conclusions that are factually accurate and insightful.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can comprehend the meaning of texts and use that information to draw conclusions or make connections.</td>
<td>Students fail to consistently comprehend the meaning of texts.</td>
<td>Students can frequently comprehends the literal meaning of texts, but is unable to draw conclusions or make connections based on the reading.</td>
<td>Students consistently comprehends the literal meaning of texts, and inconsistently draws conclusions or makes connections based on the reading.</td>
<td>Students comprehends the literal meaning of texts, makes specific and complex connections, and formulates original conclusions or opinions based on deep understanding of the text.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Objectives/Desired Outcomes</td>
<td>Levels of Competency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge and Understanding</strong></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The student demonstrates knowledge and understanding of the major historical themes relating to historical origins of world’s major political, cultural, social, and religious traditions.</td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited awareness of major historical themes or trends.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fails to demonstrate awareness of the major historical themes or trends.</td>
<td>Uses limited historical evidence to explain ideas with little to no understanding of the roles of chronology, causation, and context; disciplinary standards not carefully followed.</td>
<td>Uses some historical evidence to further explore ideas that are not fully integrated or coherent with respect to chronology, causation, and context; shows awareness of disciplinary standards.</td>
<td>Uses persuasive historical evidence that is well integrated with respect to chronology, causation, and context to support the development of ideas; Disciplinary standards are followed.</td>
<td>Uses persuasive and appropriate historical evidence that is expertly drawn upon with respect to chronology, causation, and context to advance coherent ideas; disciplinary standards are carefully followed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources and Evidence</td>
<td>Fails to use evidence of any kind; disciplinary standards not carefully followed.</td>
<td>Uses some historical evidence to further explore ideas that are not fully integrated or coherent with respect to chronology, causation, and context; shows awareness of disciplinary standards.</td>
<td>Uses persuasive historical evidence that is well integrated with respect to chronology, causation, and context to support the development of ideas; Disciplinary standards are followed.</td>
<td>Uses persuasive and appropriate historical evidence that is expertly drawn upon with respect to chronology, causation, and context to advance coherent ideas; disciplinary standards are carefully followed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Language and Critical Thinking Skills in an Historical Context</td>
<td>Fails to establish historical comparisons or connections and meaning is lost by lack of language control.</td>
<td>Illustrates language and analysis that are largely clear, but some gaps in syntax, analytical rigor, and/or historical knowledge are still a distraction.</td>
<td>Applies language that is readable and historical analysis is logical with few errors or conceptual gaps.</td>
<td>Incorporates language that is correct, edited, proofread, and contains no or very few errors; analysis incorporates an ability to make sophisticated comparisons and connections.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EYE PROGRAM GOAL E – HISTORICAL UNDERSTANDING OF CONTEMPORARY ISSUES—RUBRIC OF LEARNING OBJECTIVES (DESIRED OUTCOMES) & COMPETENCIES—Program Goal:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives/Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Knowledge and Understanding</th>
<th>Sources and Evidence</th>
<th>Application of Language and Critical Thinking Skills in an Historical Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Failed to demonstrate awareness of the major historical themes or trends.</td>
<td>Fails to adequately explore the origins or causes of an issue or event. Poor historical understanding and no evidence of understanding concept of multiple causation.</td>
<td>Fails to develop a clear historical argument or muster appropriate evidence to support points, meaning is lost by lack of language control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrates a limited awareness of major historical themes or trends.</td>
<td>Provided a superficial explanation an issue or event using limited evidence, and an analysis of causation that did not adequately explore issues of history, context, or causation. Writing is poor and ideas are not well organized or sufficiently developed.</td>
<td>Presents a weak historical argument with vague or inadequate evidence to support points. Meaning is partially lost by lack of language control.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describes some historical background support in discussion of major historical themes or trends.</td>
<td>Provided an adequate understanding of the issue or event, good use of evidence, but weak analysis that insufficiently considered issues of history, context, and causation. Writing may be problematic with more careful organization or editing.</td>
<td>Illustrates a clear argument and appropriate but inadequate or inconsistent use of sources. Some gaps in syntax, analytical rigor, and/or historical knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Applies appropriate historical background that supports discussion of major historical themes or trends.</td>
<td>Provided a well-documented explanation of issue or event based on compelling evidence, and good analysis that considered issues of history, context, and multiple causation. It is generally well written, with minor grammatical or stylistic errors.</td>
<td>Applies a strong argument generally supported with high-quality evidence, good analysis of causation, writing is clear and readable, with few errors or conceptual gaps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporates appropriate and thorough historical background that supports discussion of major historical themes or trends.</td>
<td>Provided a detailed and compelling explanation of an issue or event that included reliable evidence, a strong understanding of the historical and contextual issues shaping the issue or event, and an analysis of that is based on a careful and balanced examination of multiple causes. It is well written and meets disciplinary standards.</td>
<td>Compelling argument, strong use of evidence, sophisticated explanation of causation, uses language that is correct, and contains no or very few errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A competency is the ability to do something successfully.

A program goal is a clear statement that expresses what our program will do for students. Each goal is designed to prompt and guide teaching practice and program assessment.

A student learning objective is a clear statement about what we expect students to learn or accomplish. Like any type of objective, a student learning objective is a desired outcome.

A student learning outcome is the result of a learning process; in other words, it is an actual outcome. To foster assessment of student learning, student learning outcomes must be observable, observed, measurable, and measured. Student learning outcomes can be characterized using an ordinal scale of competency (e.g., unsatisfactory, emerging, developing, proficient, and mastery).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives/Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Levels of Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Emerging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EYE GOAL G – ENGAGEMENT IN CAMPUS LIFE--RUBRIC OF LEARNING OBJECTIVES (DESIRED OUTCOMES) & COMPETENCIES--Program Goal:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Objectives/Desired Outcomes</th>
<th>Levels of Competency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Challenge:</strong> First year students will be engaged in learning that requires them to use higher-order learning, to use reflective and integrative learning, to employ learning strategies, and to engage in quantitative reasoning.</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students’ scores for the categories of Higher-Order Learning, Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning, Learning Strategies, and Quantitative Reasoning on the NSSE will be significantly lower than the PASSHE (p &lt; .05) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude.</td>
<td>Students’ scores for the categories of Higher-Order Learning, Reflective &amp; Integrative Learning, Learning Strategies, and Quantitative Reasoning on the NSSE will be significantly lower than the PASSHE (p &lt; .05) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Learning with Peers** First year students will participate in collaborative learning and have discussions with peers from a race or ethnic background, economic background, or racial or political background different from their own. | Students’ scores for the categories of Collaborative Learning and Discussion with Diverse Others on the NSSE will be significantly lower than the PASSHE (p < .05) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude. | Students’ scores for the categories of Collaborative Learning and Discussion with Diverse Others on the NSSE will be significantly lower than the PASSHE (p < .05) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude. | There will be no significant different between Shippensburg students’ scores and PASSHE scores for the categories of Collaborative Learning and Discussion with Diverse Others on the NSSE. | Students’ scores for the categories of Collaborative Learning and Discussion with Diverse Others on the NSSE will be significantly higher than the PASSHE (p < .05) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude. | Students’ scores for the categories of Collaborative Learning and Discussion with Diverse Others on the NSSE will be significantly higher than the PASSHE (p < .05) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude. |

| **Supportive Campus Environment** Campus will provide support to help students succeed academically, socially, and to care for their overall well-being, and to help manage their academic and non-academic responsibilities, and attend campus events. | Students’ scores for the categories of Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment on the NSSE will be significantly lower than the PASSHE (p < .05) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude. | Students’ scores for the categories of Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment on the NSSE will be significantly lower than the PASSHE (p < .05) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude. | There will be no significant different between Shippensburg students’ scores and PASSHE scores for the categories of Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment on the NSSE. | Students’ scores for the categories of Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment on the NSSE will be significantly higher than the PASSHE (p < .05) with an effect size less than .3 in magnitude. | Students’ scores for the categories of Quality of Interactions and Supportive Environment on the NSSE will be significantly higher than the PASSHE (p < .05) with an effect size at least .3 in magnitude. |
I. The meeting was called to order by Dr. Sherri Bergsten, chair of the GEC Program Committee. The meeting was attended by committee members, Sherri Bergsten, Doug Birsch, Scott Drzyzga, Karl Lorenz, Kathryn Shirk, Brian Wentz, Mike Greenberg, and Sarah Stokely.

II. Drs. Birsch/Shirk motioned to approve the minutes as amended from the 3/21/17 meeting, which were approved unanimously.

III. The committee met with Dr. Steven Burg in attendance to discuss the draft of an Entry-Year Experience (EYE) Proposal & Assessment Plan and how it might be incorporated into the comprehensive general education reform proposal currently under revision. After much discussion, several members of the Program Committee had concerns that the EYE proposal did not adequately address how the extra-curricular portion of the Entry Year Experience would be implemented or assessed. Instead, Program committee members felt that the EYE proposal duplicates both content and assessment of three of the courses (ENG 114, HCS 100, HIS 105), which are already within the Foundations theme of the proposed reform proposal for general education. Dr. Burg argued that the HIS 105 course already included some EYE content, but that more EYE content would be added to meet the recommendations of their proposal, while some historical content would need to be removed. Sarah Stokely reported that we have lost over 200 first-year students in the Fall 2016 semester and 80 more so far in the Spring 2017 semester, indicating that the current entry year experience could be improved. Finally, the Program committee suggested that Dr. Burg’s department consider the option of offering an EYE 101 type of course with historical thematic content open to the discretion of each faculty teaching the course, much like that of a special topics course. This EYE 101 course would be required of every entry-year student not taking ASP 101 as a replacement for the full content-based HIS 105 course. The committee also agreed that student retention would be maximized if this EYE 101 first semester course were limited to 25 students in each section. In addition, a second History course would be included as part of the second semester of the EYE program’s first year. Dr. Burg was open to presenting this idea and will present it to his department at its next meeting for their consideration.

IV. The meeting was adjourned at 6:10 pm.
Minutes
Program Committee of the General Education Council, 4/14/17, 12:00 pm, FSC 246

I. The meeting was called to order by Dr. Sherri Bergsten, chair of the GEC Program Committee. The meeting was attended by committee members, Sherri Bergsten, Karl Lorenz, Brian Wentz, Jennifer Clements, and Mike Greenberg.

II. The committee met to continue addressing the concerns raised by faculty. Committee members prepared motions to be considered at its next meeting on April 18.

III. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm.