General Education Council
2017-2018 Academic Year

Agenda, for the meeting on Tuesday, Sept. 26, 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. Greetings for the new year (GEC co-chairs, Dr. Kirk Moll; Dean James Mike)

4. Old Business
   a. Reports from our Standing Committees
      i. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)
         1. Report from meeting with part of the Middle States Steering Committee
      ii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)
         1. Minutes from May 2, 2017 meeting – Attachment B
         2. Minutes from August 24, 2017 retreat – Attachment C
         3. Minutes from September 5, 2017 meeting – Attachment D

5. New Business
   a. Report on 2017 Civic Learning and Democratic Engagement conference (Dr. Kirk Moll)

6. Announcements

7. Call to adjourn

II. Dr. Burg motioned, seconded by Dr. Lorenz, to approve the March 28, 2017 minutes. One typo was noted and changed, and the motion passed unanimously.

III. Old Business

a. Dr. Drzyzga reported that the Multicultural Student Affairs group that came to our previous meeting has moved forward with activities on campus and are actively promoting cultural awareness. They will continue their efforts and are planning activities for welcome week.

b. Dr. Drzyzga reported on an article written in the Slate about General Education. They focused on credit reduction and efforts to improve the program for students.

c. Dr. Drzyzga reported that Purdue University bought Kaplan University. Kaplan has a presence in Hagerstown and a transfer agreement with Penn State. They are targeting non-traditional students with online courses. It may affect Shippensburg University and force us to be more competitive.

IV. New Business

a. Report from standing committees:
   i. Budget: Dr. Meyer reported that the Budget Committee met after they received a grant proposal for $5000 from the English Department. The department will match funds from other sources to make this event part of the Day of Human Understanding in October. The committee supports the proposal and motioned to fund the project. A discussion arose on the recent support for Sherman Alexie, which received a lot of attention. The motion was approved unanimously. Dr. Burg motioned, seconded by Dr. Birsch, to recognize Dr. Meyer for his service to the budget committee this year. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

   ii. Assessment: Dr. Girard reported that the Assessment Committee met and their discussions focused on the EYE proposal. From the assessment point of view, it is hard to evaluate the goals of EYE and recommends their proposal needs more work.

   iii. Program: Dr. Bergsten reported that the Program Committee met three times since our last meeting. They have discussed the 45 points gathered from the proposed program feedback. The EYE and diversity component are the two biggest issues. They feel that the EYE needs more delineation outside of course content and they are working with the History, Human Communication, and English Departments. It was encouraged that the EYE program become more involved with the two other committees to solve issues and move forward.

   iv. Entry Year Experience: Dr. Ramsey reported that they did not meet this past month but they will re-engage with the Program Committee.
v. Dr. Moll reported that he attended the April 4, 2017 UCC meeting. A number of minor changes to programs and courses, all unrelated to general education, were approved. He reported to UCC on the progress of integrating faculty feedback into the revisions of the proposed program. UCC elections will take place during their May meeting. Brian Johnson and Cathy Sprenger reported on new software that has been licensed for producing the university catalog and for course proposal tracking. Brian Johnson is impressed with its user friendliness.

vi. Dr. Birsch motioned, seconded by Dr. James to thank all the standing committees for their service this past year. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

vii. Dr. Hamblin motioned, seconded by Dr. Ramsey, to nominate Dr. Moll as the faculty co-chair for the upcoming year. After a brief discussion of the position, no other nominations were made, and Dr. Hamblin motioned, seconded by Dr. Clements, to close the nominations. All were in favor of closing the nomination, and all were in favor of electing Dr. Moll as GEC faculty co-chair. The motion passed unanimously. Dr. Hamblin motioned, seconded by Dr. Bergsten, to nominate Dr. Feeney for secretary. Dr. Ramsey motioned, seconded by Dr. Birsch, to close nominations. Both motioned passed unanimously and Dr. Feeney was re-elected as secretary. Dr. Bergsten motioned, seconded by Dr. Moll, to nominate Dr. Drzyzga as UCC representative. Dr. Ramsey motioned, seconded by Dr. Ward, to close nominations. Both passed unanimously and Dr. Drzyzga will be the UCC representative. An extra-long and loud clapping and thank you was in order for Dr. Drzyzga’s service these past few years at GEC faculty co-chair.

V. Dr. Clements noted that she still has two seats available for her upcoming trip to the African American museum

VI. Dr. Birsch motioned, seconded by Dr. Bergsten, to adjourn. The meeting concluded at 4:33 pm.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Alison E. Feeney
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, Jennifer Clements, Scott Drzyzga, Karl Lorenz, Kathryn Shirk, Brian Wentz, Mike Greenberg, Alice James, Sarah Stokely and Jim Delle.

II. Drs. Birsch/Bergsten motioned to approve the minutes the 4/18/17 meeting, which were approved unanimously.

III. The committee discussed the feedback it had received through Dr. Steven Burg, Chair of History and GEC EYE Committee member of the History Department's interest in pursuing the possibility of offering an EYE 101 type course with historical thematic content. Dr. Delle has offered resources from the Dean’s Office of Arts and Sciences for faculty training for a future EYE type course. If the History Department faculty do not agree to offering an EYE course with historical thematic content, then any department would be eligible to offer an EYE course with content from their academic discipline. Regardless of whether the History Department agrees to such an EYE course, the committee suggests that separate from an EYE course, there should be only one H tag within the Foundations core of the program.

IV. The committee then went on to unanimously approve three motions related to amending the language in three of the program goals of the General Education Reform proposal revision.

Motion 1. With regard to the Diversity program goal, Drs. Shirk/Greenberg motioned to amend the language of the Diversity program goal and its three learning objectives/desired outcomes in its meeting on 5/2 to make the language more consistent between the program goal and its three learning objectives.

Motion 2. With regard to the Technological Competency program goal, Drs. Clements/Drzyzga motioned to amend the language of the Technological Competency program goal and its three learning objectives/desired outcomes in its meeting on 5/2 to make the language more consistent between the program goal and its three learning objectives.

Motion 3. With regard to the newly created Citizenship program goal, Drs. Shirk/Drzyzga motioned to accept the language of the Citizenship program goal and its three learning objectives/desired outcomes as amended in its meeting on 5/2.

V. The committee agreed to schedule a full day retreat on Thursday, August 24 to review and finalize changes to the General Education Reform proposal revision before presenting it to the GEC at the start of the Fall 2017 semester.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 5:50 pm.
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, Steve Burg, Jennifer Clements, Scott Drzyzga, Karl Lorenz, Kathryn Shirk, Brian Wentz, Mike Greenberg, Alice James, and Kirk Moll.

II. Drs. Shirk/Wentz motioned to approve the minutes of the 5/2/17 meeting as amended, which were approved (7 Aye, 1 Abstain).

III. Dr. Drzyzga gave a summary of his meeting with the new university president, Laurie Carter about her interest in supporting an entry year experience program as a way to improve student success and increase student enrollment. President Carter wants Shippensburg to develop its own “signature program” that might attract prospective first year students, and in turn increase enrollment. The committee discussed the various ways that the General Education reform proposal could include a three-credit entry year experience course and still limit itself to the proposed 45 credits for the entire program. The committee discussed that the entry year experience course could be offered along three possible avenues of inquiry from which students could choose: as part of the ASP program for its students, as part of an exploratory theme-based seminar for undeclared majors, or as part of a specific major program. The committee discussed that a rubric for the entry year experience course needs to be developed along the same lines as those of the other program goals of the general education reform proposal, with three learning objectives that might include: learning strategies, personal management, and information literacy.

IV. The committee went on to review an existing list of general education courses and discussed to which program goal they would best correspond. The committee discussed that this list needs to be distributed to all department chairs in order to assist them in deciding under which program goal they want their courses to be included as a “tentative listing” of courses in the new general education program. The committee also discussed that the entire general education reform program should be put to a vote with this “tentative listing” of courses as an attached appendix before the formal approval process to list each course in the new general education program.

V. The committee then discussed the procedure for how a course would become part of the newly proposed general education program. The committee discussed that the process would be similar to the way it is now with a few minor differences. It was also discussed that courses that are already part of the general education program would receive an expedited review for their inclusion in the new program. This expedited review would proceed as follows. First, a short GEC application form for the course proposal would be submitted to the GEC Program Committee justifying which program goal an academic department thought was best suited for a particular course and how the course would be assessed. The Program Committee would then vote whether they would recommend to the GEC that the course be approved for its proposed program goal. Once approved by the GEC, all approved courses would be included in the single UCC proposal in order to populate the new general education program.

For existing courses that are not part of the current general education program, a UCC course revision proposal would be submitted, stating under which program goal the course
should be listed. This UCC proposal would then go through the existing approval procedure from GEC Program Committee to the GEC and then on to the UCC to include the course in the new general education program. New courses could follow two options, where they would either go through the same procedure as now with a UCC new course proposal then onto GEC and back to UCC or they could apply as a 190 selected topics course listing which only requires approval by the GEC. As our UCC representative on the GEC, Dr. Drzyzga has agreed to meet with the UCC chair to explain how this process might work.

VI. Finally, the retreat concluded with a discussion on how the assessment process would work in the new general education program. The committee discussed that course assessment should take place first at the department level by faculty teaching general education courses in their respective departments. The GEC Assessment Committee would then undertake general education program assessment of each program goal. The Program Committee would like to invite the chair of the GEC Assessment Committee, Dr. Dudley Girard and Dr. José Ricardo-Osorio, Special Assistant for Educational Effectiveness Assessment, to its next meeting to assist us in constructing a more detailed assessment plan for the general education reform proposal.

VII. The committee agreed to meet every first and third Tuesdays of each month this semester with our next meeting scheduled for September 5. The remaining meetings would be on September 19, October 3, October 24, November 7, November 21, and December 5.

VIII. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 pm.
I. The meeting was called to order by Dr. Sherri Bergsten, chair of the GEC Program Committee. The meeting was attended by Program committee members, Sherri Bergsten, Doug Birsch, Steve Burg, Karl Lorenz, Kathryn Shirk, Brian Wentz, Mike Greenberg, and Kirk Moll. Also in attendance were Jim Delle, José Ricardo-Osorio, and the GEC Assessment Committee members, Dudley Girard, Corrine Bertram, Rob Lesman, and Lance Bryant.

II. The entire meeting was devoted to discussion of how the assessment process would be implemented and addressed in the General Education reform proposal. Dr. José Ricardo-Osorio, Acting Associate Provost for Educational Effectiveness Assessment, and Jim Delle, Acting Associate Provost for Institutional Effectiveness and Associate Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, were present to explain the best strategies to assure the educational effectiveness of the assessment process. The Program Committee envisions that an important part of the GEC’s role is to analyze assessment protocol and compile data. Other aspects of the assessment process were also discussed, such as the importance that data assessment protocols be followed by every department participating in the General Education program in order to assure that assessment data are comparable between courses addressing the same program learning goal. To accomplish this goal, it was suggested that faculty in departments teaching courses within the General Education program might participate in some kind of short online program or workshop to certify that they understand how to implement the standard assessment protocol using GEC developed rubrics in every general education course they teach. There is also a need to specify how, when, and where the assessment results would be shared with the faculty teaching courses within the General Education program.

III. Upon completion of our discussion on assessment, Drs. Greenberg/Wentz motioned to approve the minutes of the 8/24/17 retreat meeting as amended, which were approved (4 Aye, 1 Abstain).

IV. The meeting was adjourned at 5:10 pm.