

General Education Council

2015-2016 Academic Year

Agenda for the meeting on Tuesday, February 23, 2016, in ELL 205 at 3:30 P.M.

1. Call to order
2. Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting
 - a. Attachment A: Minutes from the meeting on Jan. 26, 2016
3. Old Business
 - a. 2015 Open Faculty Forum, follow up
 - i. Attachment B: Letter of support from President Harpster and Provost Lyman
 - b. Report from our GEC representative at the UCC (Dr. Beverley Wallace)
 - c. Reports from our Standing Committees
 - i. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)
 - ii. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)
 1. Attachment C: Minutes from its meeting on Dec. 3, 2015
 - iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)
 1. Attachment D: Minutes from its meeting on Jan. 19, 2016
 2. Attachment E: UCC Proposal 15-152 regarding MAT117
 3. Attachment F: UCC Proposal 15-155 regarding MAT217
 - d. Reports from our ad hoc Committees
 - i. Amendment Committee (Dr. James Hamblin)
 1. Attachment G: Current GEC Bylaws (last updated on Nov. 21, 2011)
 2. Attachment H: List of proposed bylaw amendments (Feb. 3, 2016)
 - ii. First Year Experience (Dr. Allison Predecki)
4. New Business
 - a. Department and program representative terms are three-years long.
 - b. To foster information transfer, terms were grouped and staggered so that no more than 1/3 of the council membership turns over in a given year.
 - c. Departments and programs with terms that expire in Spring 2016

APSCUF	Human Communication Studies
Chemistry	Modern Languages
Computer Science	Finance and Supply Chain Management
Geography / Earth Science	Teacher Education
5. Announcements
6. Call to adjourn

General Education Council

2015-2016 Academic Year

Agenda for the meeting on Tuesday, January 26, 2016, in ELL 205 at 3:30 P.M.

Members in attendance: J. Mike, S. Drzyzga, S. Bergsten, A. Predecki, C. Sipes, D. Girard, D. Kalist, S. Burg, J. Hamblin, M. Lucia, K. Shirk, C. Botteron, C. Bertram, K. Lorenz, B. Wentz, M. Bratina, B. Meyer, J. Clements, H. Liu, K. Moll, K. Sypniewski

1. Call to order

The meeting was called to order at 3:36pm.

2. Approve the Minutes of the previous meeting

- a. Attachment A: Minutes from the meeting on Nov. 24, 2015

Motion (Bergsten) to approve the minutes. No corrections were given. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Summary of recent events [2015 Annual Meeting of the MSCHE]

Dr. Drzyzga spent a couple days in Washington, DC at the 2015 annual meeting of Middle States. He reported that Middle States is voting on changing their current 5-year cycle to an 8-year cycle. The results of the vote have not yet been reported.

If the new system is approved, the University will need to generate annual reports to Middle States. Only changes from the previous year need to be reported. Larger reviews are performed at the 4- and 8-year marks. Any areas of non-compliance result in (expensive) follow-up reports and team visits.

Dr. Drzyzga also attended a workshop related to General Education while in Washington. He reported that, according to Middle States, “[Gen Ed programs must be] 1. Mission centered, 2. Focused on student learning, 3. Exhibit continuous improvement, and 4. Foster Innovation.” Last year, 11% of institutions required follow-up related to their Gen Ed program after completing self-studies last year, up from 4% ten years ago.

Middle States will be giving a progress report on twelve universities who are currently working on revising their program to fit the new guidelines. Shippensburg will be up for review in 2018-19.

4. Old Business

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

Dr. Wallace was not present, so the official UCC report was not given.

The math department has submitted several UCC proposals related to the creation of a Data Science minor. This minor would be for students in non-Math majors to gain technical and statistical skills to apply to their major field, with a focus on non-STEM majors. The Gen Ed change would be to reduce MAT 117 to three credits, and create MAT 217, a four-credit class that would include the major

topics from MAT 117 and also prepare students who are more math-capable for the Data Science minor. Both MAT 117 and MAT 217 would be Category A courses.

b. Reports from our Standing Committees

i. Budget (Dr. Ben Meyer)

A grant proposal from Dr. David Godshalk was received and will be reviewed soon. The remaining Gen Ed grants budget is still substantial, and the Budget Committee is considering different ways to solicit additional proposals.

ii. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard)

1. Attachment B: Minutes from its meeting on Nov. 11, 2015; amended
2. Attachment C: Minutes from its meeting on Dec. 3, 2015

Dr. Girard was not present at the time this item came up for discussion. The Assessment Committee met to address concerns about some unclear statements in the previous meeting's minutes. Attachment C presents the minutes of that meeting, including a clarification about those minutes.

These minutes will be revisited at the February 2016 GEC meeting.

iii. Program (Dr. Sherri Bergsten)

1. Attachment D: Executive Summary of the Open Faculty Forum
2. Attachment E: Minutes from its meeting on Nov. 17, 2015
3. Attachment F: Minutes from its meeting on Dec. 1, 2015
4. Attachment G: Minutes from its retreat on Jan. 13, 2016
5. Attachment H: UCC proposed new Subject Code Policy (#Policy_1_2015)

The Program Committee met several times in the past couple of months. Much of that time was spent trying to rethink Gen Ed approaches based on the new information from Middle States, feedback from faculty forums, and a desire to make the program easier to understand. Major tweaks are still being made, but the overall structure of the draft program is not being changed.

Attachment H represents a UCC proposal that has been withdrawn and no longer needs to be discussed.

Attachment D was presented at the previous GEC meeting. The idea is that this document would be distributed to the entire faculty.

Motion (from the committee) to release Attachment D to the university faculty via the GEC website and faculty-wide email.

Discussion: Dr. Steve Berg stated that he doesn't feel that the summary accurately reflects the discussion at the forums. He felt that much of the discussion reflected fears about retrenchment, and that this is not strongly represented in the summary. Additional issues raised by Dr. Berg related to

assessment and whether the Middle States assessment requirements require a full revision of the program. He also wondered about the results of the online survey.

Regarding retrenchment, Dr. Drzyzga reported that he and Dr. Jim Mike requested a letter from Provost Lyman and President Harpster stating that Gen Ed reform would not result in retrenchment. Both Provost Lyman and President Harpster stated that such a letter would be produced. Dr. Lyman was invited to speak at GEC and stated that she would come to the February meeting.

Dr. Kirk Moll indicated that, in his opinion, the document as presented reads more like the Program Committee's *response* to the faculty forums, rather than a summary. The Program Committee intends to release the raw data from the online faculty survey, because they didn't feel able to briefly summarize more than 40 pages of responses.

Motion (Hamblin). Amend motion to rename Attachment D from "Summary of" to "GEC Program Committee Response to," and simultaneously release the raw online forum data.

Motion (Lorenz). Amend the amendment to additionally release the notes taken at the face-to-face faculty forums with names redacted. (This document was distributed to GEC at its October 2015 meeting.) Motion passed.

Motion (Hamblin). Amend the amendment to [appropriately] change *all* references of "summary" to "response" (rather than just the title). Motion passed.

The amendment (which was amended twice) passed.

The motion is now: To release Attachment D (revised to appropriately change *all* references of "summary" to "response") to the university faculty via the GEC website and faculty-wide email, to simultaneously release the raw online forum data, and to additionally release the notes taken at the face-to-face faculty forums with names redacted.

The motion passed.

- c. Reports from our ad hoc Committees
 - i. First Year Experience (Dr. Allison Predecki)
This committee has not yet met.
 - ii. Amendment Committee (Dr. James Hamblin)
This committee has not yet met.
- 5. New Business
No new business.
- 6. Announcements

Meeting dates for the remainder of the semester:

- **Tuesday 2/23**
- **Thursday 3/24**
- **Tuesday 4/19**

Dr. Lorenz announced that his 190 special topics course is running this semester and has 50 students.

7. Call to adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm.

to be approved

Office of the President

Shippensburg University
1871 Old Main Drive
Shippensburg, PA 17257-2299



www.ship.edu

Office: 717-477-1301
Fax: 717-477-4005

Letter of Support for General Education Renewal from the President and Provost - February 18, 2016

We write this letter to support and encourage ongoing faculty led efforts to renew our General Education Program at Shippensburg University. It continues to be a priority for all of our stakeholders that our core educational program helps students to prepare for life and work in the 21st Century. It is also important that we be able to effectively communicate the goals and value of that program to our stakeholders.

In 2009, the Middle States Commission on Higher Education (MSCHE) commended our former General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC) for assessing student learning in our General Education Program and for evaluating program strengths as well as opportunities for enhancement. A later GECC report identified specific aspects of the assessment process that merited further attention.

In 2014, MSCHE updated its standards for accreditation. In doing so, Middle States updated its list of minimum curriculum requirements for general education programs (Standard III, Criterion 5) and elevated the importance of assessing educational effectiveness (Standard V), in effect raising standards for reaffirmation of accreditation related to the general education program. MSCHE no longer characterizes sound assessment protocol as simply conducting assessment; now the expectation is that the institution undertakes a periodic process that is defensible, meaningful, sustainable and useful in informing improvements as needed (Standard V, Criterion 2). From these changes, it is clear that our accrediting body expects our institution to demonstrate that: 1) we are having continual conversation about our General Education Program; and 2) we are taking periodic action to strengthen the program as warranted by institution-based assessment and informed by the revised accreditation standards.

As a reflective and professional community, we will consistently evaluate ourselves, student learning, and our programs so that we can effectively provide the best experiences for our students, faculty, and staff, with changes to the General Education program pursued and accomplished in a thoughtful and planned manner. Our Mission and Academic Master Plan, the new Middle States standards, the PASSHE Board of Governors policy, and the GECC evaluation report are important guideposts for this work. Our complement of faculty is vital to our Mission, so it is important to note that no faculty retrenchment will occur as a result of General Education Program renewal.

With all this in mind, we encourage the General Education Council (GEC) to pursue as central to its charge the following goals, using the above guidance in addition to our own self-inquiry: 1) continue using appropriate means to keep the faculty and other constituencies informed of the progress of your work; 2) continue identifying and obtaining input from faculty and other appropriate internal and external constituencies; 3) move forward with renewal of our general education program consistent with our Mission and including the following components:

- a) appropriate revisions of the general education program mission, program goals, and student learning objectives;
- b) establishment of a periodic process for assessing student learning that is defensible, meaningful, sustainable and useful for driving future program improvements;
- c) a curriculum proposal or a series of proposals designed to achieve items *a* and *b*; and
- d) a plan with a timeline for implementing the proposal(s).

We also encourage the GEC to present its proposal(s) to the UCC in as timely a manner as possible in view of the fact that we are about to embark on preparations for our next re-accreditation review, with the Middle States visit expected to take place on schedule in the Spring Semester 2019.

Best wishes for success,

G.F. "Jody" Harpster, Ph.D.
President

Barbara G. Lyman, Ph.D.
Provost

GEC Assessment Committee Minutes

Date: December 3rd, 2015
Prepared by Dudley Girard

Present: Han Liu, Dudley Girard, Dean Mike, Lance Bryant, and David Kalist

Assessment Chair: Dudley Girard
Assessment Secretary: Beverly Wallace (Not in Attendance)

First order of the meeting was to review the purpose of the Assessment Committee. Discussion focused on the Assessment Committee's purpose is to gather and review all assessment data related to the General Education program. It was also noted that the Assessment Committee is not charged with defining the learning objectives for courses in the program or mapping the learning objectives to the goals of the program. However, it was determined the Assessment Committee may discuss the mapping of course level objectives to the program level goals if one does exist. This in turn brought up the concern that the present learning objectives for courses and the presently approved program level goals have no defined mapping. So at this time the Assessment Committee has no way to determine if the General Education Program is meeting its program level goals using the course level data being gathered. It was determined that the GEC Program Committee would be made aware of this problem immediately as it is the role of the Program Committee to create this mapping.

The second order of the meeting focused on the proposed mapping of the existing course level objectives by category to the new Middle States program level goals that the Assessment Committee had been working on. It was first noted that as this was technically the Program Committee's job, that after reviewing any issues of the created map it would be sent to the Program Committee and not discussed further. It was also noted that the previous meeting's minutes did not state in a clear fashion that while it is possible to change the present program to meet the Middle States goals, it would not be a trivial process. Noted issues with trying to use the present program:

- Adding missing standards to any one category would require all courses in that category to meet that standard.
- Based on the initial mapping of the present course learning objectives by category creates large problems as it concerns assessment. All categories mapping to too many program goals. Making it very difficult to assess just how well the program is meeting the Middle States goals, and put additional workload on departments that would need to assess on those goals.
- Some categories and objectives have "or" clauses (Category A is the best example) that make guaranteeing a Middle State's goal is

completed by a given category uncertain. This would require changing the objectives of a specific category and potentially affecting one or more courses in the category.

The final order of business focused on assessment of the present program. Math, English, and History skills courses assessment data would be reviewed at the next meeting of the GEC Assessment Committee in the spring. First, to see if the data provided can be used to assess the learning objectives for those skills courses. Second, to see if there were any concerns raised by the data. The last part of the process will be to meet back with each department to see if any improvement in the assessment process is needed or changes in the courses due to concerns raised by the data. The GEC Assessment Committee also planned to gather data from Category A courses starting in the spring, hoped to have access to the second round of CLA+ testing, and find out how the HCS assessment went.

Minutes

Program Committee of the General Education Council, 1/19/16, 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, Paris Peet, and Doug Birsch.

II. Drs. Peet/Botteron motioned to approve the minutes from the 1/13/16 day-long retreat. Dr. Drzyzga motioned to amend the minutes to specify that the proposed themes address new Middle States standards. Drs. Peet/Botteron then motioned to approve the amended minutes, which were approved by a unanimous vote.

III. Drs. Botteron/Shirk motioned to approve the minutes from the 12/1/15 meeting. Drs. Drzyzga/Botteron motioned to amend the minutes to clarify that recent assessment committee minutes mistakenly indicated that we are meeting new Middle States standards. Additional information indicating that the committee discussed various ways the new program could be populated with courses was also suggested. Drs. Botteron/Shirk then motioned to approve the amended minutes of the meeting of 12/1/15, which were approved by a unanimous vote.

IV. The committee had a lengthy discussion of how to link the learning objective tags to the four program themes of 1) Culture, Reflection and Responsibility, 2) Interconnections, 3) Natural Science and Technology, and 4) Creativity/Expression. The committee also discussed strategies for moving forward with the series of steps that will precede the presentation of a full proposal for General Education Reform to the General Education Council. Considering the steps after a full proposal for General Education Reform is released to the General Education Council, the committee discussed possible strategies for soliciting input from the GEC representatives for which assessment rubrics might best fit their department's current general education course offerings.

V. Work continues on refining the program model and the assessment rubrics for each learning objective tag to ensure consistency between assessment and the program themes. Different committee members have volunteered to refine the rubrics and upload their proposed revisions on the S-drive for full committee input to be discussed at our next meeting.

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

VII. The meeting was adjourned at 5:07 pm.

Minutes submitted by Karl Lorenz

MAT 117: Applied Statistics

Preliminary

Proposal Category	Significant Revision
General Ed/Diversity Status	on
Distance Ed Status	(empty)
Proposed Abbreviation	Applied Statistics
Proposed Subject Code	MAT
Proposed Course Number	117
Proposed Course Title	Applied Statistics
College	Arts and Sciences
Department	Mathematics
Sponsor	Kate McGivney
Sponsor Email	kgmcgi@ship.edu
Sponsor Phone	717-477-1490
Departmental Approval Date	11/10/2015
Proposed Implementation Date	Fall 2016
UCC Sequence Number	15-152

Syllabus

Syllabus <f14syllabusmcgivney.pdf>

Distance Education

Assessment Methods	(empty)
Brief Description	(empty)
Proposed Course Length in Weeks	(empty)
Course Will Be Taught	(empty)
Instructor Information	(empty)
Justification	(empty)
Program In Which Course Will Be Offered	(empty)
Student Learning Outcomes	(empty)
Target Audience	(empty)

Course Information and Curriculum Considerations

New Degree Credits Sheet	(empty)
Catalog Course Description	A first course in the concepts and methods of statistics with illustrations from across the humanities and the social, behavioral, and biological sciences. Specific topics include numerical and

	graphical descriptions of data, association between two variables, normal distribution, correlation and simple linear regression, and inference methods such as confidence intervals and hypothesis tests for one sample mean and one sample proportion, chi-squared test of independence, and ANOVA. A graphing calculator with statistical capabilities (such as TI-83+) is required. Recommended as a general education statistics course for students majoring in social and life sciences, but not limited to students in those majors. Not open to students who have passed SCM 200 or MAT 313; or math majors. Prerequisites: MAT 050 or math placement level 2 or above.
Co-Requisites	(empty)
Proposed Credits	3 credits
Degree Credit	(empty)
Impact on Other Academic Units	(empty)
Description	(empty)
Equivalent Courses	Based on the February 2015 survey of departments who require MAT117, we are keeping the integrity of current topics reported as being important to those departments. Therefore, we would like to keep the same course number so that students repeating the course should just get the replacement grade without additional provisions. It will entail their four-credit bad grade being replaced by a three-credit improved grade, but we believe this is appropriate.
Estimated Frequency	(empty)
General Education Impact	This change impacts neither the way the course meets general education goals nor the way the department assesses those goals.
Proposed Grading System	Standard
Growth Impact	(empty)
Initial Number of Sections	(empty)
Instruction Method	(empty)
Intended Audience	(empty)
Justification for Proposal	We are proposing changing the current course from 4 credit hours to 3 credit hours. This reduction in credit hours will allow the department to reallocate this savings so that the newly proposed Data Science minor may be offered. Departments affected by this change were surveyed about topics that they would like to see in the revised course. Results of the survey were used to restructure the 3-credit version of the course.
Proposed Level	Undergraduate
Methods of Instruction	(empty)
Pre-Requisites	MAT 050 or math placement level 2 or above.
Projected Offerings for Next Five Years	(empty)
Replace or Overlap Existing Course	(empty)
Restrictions	Not open to students who have passed SCM200 or MAT217; or math majors, computer science majors, or engineering majors

Schedule Type	(empty)
Similar Courses in Other Departments	(empty)
Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment	(empty)
Verification Grid	(empty)
Courses Not Taught	
Proposed Workload Equivalency	1/4

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

11/18/2015 2:44 PM:

Anonymous moved the proposal from (no workflow state) to Department Review with the following comment:

Item created

11/19/2015 9:56 AM:

cmzaleski moved the proposal from Department Review to Returned to Submitter with the following comment:

(no comment provided)

11/19/2015 4:36 PM:

Anonymous moved the proposal from Returned to Submitter to Department Review with the following comment:

Attached is the revised proposal for MAT 117.

11/23/2015 1:28 PM:

cmzaleski moved the proposal from Department Review to Under Review with the following comment:

Department Review

MAT 217: Statistics I

Preliminary

Proposal Category	Significant Revision
General Ed/Diversity Status	on
Distance Ed Status	(empty)
Proposed Abbreviation	Statistics I
Proposed Subject Code	MAT
Proposed Course Number	217
Proposed Course Title	Statistics I
College	Arts and Sciences
Department	Mathematics
Sponsor	Kate McGivney
Sponsor Email	kgmcgi@ship.edu
Sponsor Phone	717-477-1490
Departmental Approval Date	11/10/2015
Proposed Implementation Date	Fall 2016
UCC Sequence Number	15-155

Syllabus

Syllabus [S15MAT313syllabuspdf.pdf](#)

Distance Education

Assessment Methods	(empty)
Brief Description	(empty)
Proposed Course Length in Weeks	(empty)
Course Will Be Taught	(empty)
Instructor Information	(empty)
Justification	(empty)
Program In Which Course Will Be Offered	(empty)
Student Learning Outcomes	(empty)
Target Audience	(empty)

Course Information and Curriculum Considerations

New Degree Credits Sheet	(empty)
Catalog Course Description	Topics include exploratory data analysis, basic probability, the Central Limit Theorem, confidence intervals, hypothesis testing, linear regression, experimental design, analysis of variance and

	goodness of fit tests. A statistical software package will be utilized throughout course. Prerequisite: Math Placement Level 5 or higher
Co-Requisites	(empty)
Proposed Credits	4 credits
Degree Credit	Four
Impact on Other Academic Units	(empty)
Description	(empty)
Equivalent Courses	(empty)
Estimated Frequency	(empty)
General Education Impact	MAT 217 will be included in Category A.
Proposed Grading System	Standard
Growth Impact	(empty)
Initial Number of Sections	(empty)
Instruction Method	(empty)
Intended Audience	Non-majors interested in the newly proposed Data Science minor as well as Math, Computer Science, and Engineering majors.
Justification for Proposal	We are changing the course number from MAT 313 to MAT 217. We are removing the MAT 211-Calculus I prerequisite so that MAT 217 is appropriate for non-STEM students interested in our newly proposed Data Science minor.
Proposed Level	Undergraduate
Methods of Instruction	Face to Face.
Pre-Requisites	Math Placement Level 5 or higher
Projected Offerings for Next Five Years	(empty)
Replace or Overlap Existing Course	(empty)
Restrictions	(empty)
Schedule Type	(empty)
Similar Courses in Other Departments	(empty)
Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment	The General Education goals for Category A are: 1. Students will be able to build, interpret, and use mathematical models 2. Students will be able to solve problems, including problem formulation, solution, and interpretation of the resulting answers. 3. Students will be able to apply algorithmic reasoning to aid in problem solving. 4. Students will be able to apply logical reasoning to aid in problem solving. 5. Students will be able to apply logical reasoning to aid in understanding and analyzing discourse. MAT 217 Statistics I is a renumbering of MAT 313 Statistics I. The course goals include [source: Spring 2015 syllabus from Dr. Kate McGivney]: • To prepare [students] to be proficient in using statistics to analyze data. This addresses Category A Goal #2. • To understand how to collect data, organize data, and make inferences from data. This addresses Category A Goals #1 and #5. • To develop ... problem solving and critical thinking skills. This addresses Category A Goals #2, #3, and #4. Clearly MAT 217 satisfies the stated goals for a Category A course. The

	Mathematics Department already assesses these goals by having instructors assign a project and using a common rubric to measure how well students use statistical methods and interpret results.
Verification Grid	(empty)
Courses Not Taught	(empty)
Proposed Workload Equivalency	(empty)

Core Support Services

Additional Computing Resources Required	(empty)
Additional Costs	None.
Additional Library Resources Required	(empty)
Faculty Coverage	Yes.

General Ed and Diversity

Commonalities among the Courses	The same assessment procedures used for MAT 117 will be used for MAT 217.
Credits Count Toward Degree	Yes
Final Exam	Yes
Gen Ed Category	A

Gen Ed Goals Met	<p>The General Education goals for Category A are: 1. Students will be able to build, interpret, and use mathematical models 2. Students will be able to solve problems, including problem formulation, solution, and interpretation of the resulting answers. 3. Students will be able to apply algorithmic reasoning to aid in problem solving. 4. Students will be able to apply logical reasoning to aid in problem solving. 5. Students will be able to apply logical reasoning to aid in understanding and analyzing discourse. MAT 217 Statistics I is a renumbering of MAT 313 Statistics I. The course goals include [source: Spring 2015 syllabus from Dr. Kate McGivney]:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To prepare [students] to be proficient in using statistics to analyze data. This addresses Category A Goal #2. • To understand how to collect data, organize data, and make inferences from data. This addresses Category A Goals #1 and #5. • To develop ... problem solving and critical thinking skills. This addresses Category A Goals #2, #3, and #4. Clearly MAT 217 satisfies the stated goals for a Category A course. The Mathematics Department already assesses these goals by having instructors assign a project and using a common rubric to measure how well students use statistical methods and interpret results.
-------------------------	---

Justification for Status	We are dropping the MAT 211 prerequisite so that non-STEM majors interested in the Data Science minor can take this course which is required for the minor. MAT 117 - Applied Statistics is already in Category A so this course will now absorb students who would have taken MAT 117.
---------------------------------	---

Learning Objectives	MAT 217 assessment will be the same as what is currently used for MAT 117.
Need for Course	MAT 117 is already in Category A. MAT 217 will include students who would traditionally have taken MAT 117.
Other Departments Impact	There will be no additional impact.
Own Department Impact	There will be no additional impact. We are merely shifting some students from MAT 117 to MAT 217.
Sections	No.
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

11/19/2015 4:35 PM:

Anonymous moved the proposal from (no workflow state) to Department Review with the following comment:

Item created

11/20/2015 1:59 PM:

cmzaleski moved the proposal from Department Review to Returned to Submitter with the following comment:

Department Review

11/23/2015 10:23 AM:

Anonymous moved the proposal from Returned to Submitter to Department Review with the following comment:

Here is the revised MAT 217 proposal. Thanks.

11/23/2015 1:28 PM:

cmzaleski moved the proposal from Department Review to Under Review with the following comment:

Department Review

GEC Bylaws

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

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

I. Membership.

- A. The membership of GEC is described in the University Governance Document. For undergraduate academic departments, the Governance Document stipulates “One representative and one alternate of each undergraduate academic department, elected by the department.”
- B. The representative from APSCUF to GEC serves a one-year renewable term.
- C. A “primary member” of GEC is any member other than an alternate.
- D. Attendance.
 - 1. Attendance by primary members at all GEC meetings is expected. It is the responsibility of primary members to notify the co-chairs of the committee of absence in advance, when possible. More than two (2) unexcused absences from GEC meetings per semester shall lead to automatic dismissal from GEC. The executive committee of the University Forum shall determine what constitutes an unexcused absence.
 - 2. If the primary representative from an academic department is unable to regularly attend GEC meetings, the alternate may take over as primary representative. The department should then choose a new alternate.
- E. Role of Alternates.
 - 1. Alternate members may attend GEC meetings, but may not vote if the primary member is present.
 - 2. Alternate members may be members of GEC committees, but the primary member and alternate may not both be members of the same GEC committee.
 - 3. Only primary members (or alternates serving in lieu of the primary member) may make or second motions.

4. All GEC members (including alternates) may attend and participate in GEC and GEC committee meetings, but voting in these meetings is restricted as noted above.

II. Meetings.

- A. The GEC will meet monthly during the fall and spring academic semesters.
- B. The final meeting of the spring semester will include organization for the following academic year. The Faculty Co-Chair, the Secretary, and the Non-voting Representative to the University Curriculum Committee will be elected to one-year terms at this meeting.
- C. A quorum shall consist of 2/3 of the body. In determining a quorum, alternates shall be considered only if the department's primary representative is not present. Votes may only take place when a quorum of voting members is present.
- D. A motion shall be deemed passed if a majority of the members present vote "aye." In this determination, alternates who are not eligible to vote shall not be counted.
- E. Items may be placed on the agenda by either Chairperson, by any standing or ad-hoc committee, or by petition by any five members.
- F. Notice of meetings and an agenda shall be distributed at least five (5) days before each meeting to members, alternates, and other university constituencies. The mailing list will be developed by the Council, and reviewed annually at the spring organizational meeting.
- G. If an item is discussed which was not included on the agenda, any member has the right to have the vote postponed until the next meeting.
- H. Meetings shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures set down in the revised Robert's Rules of Order except as otherwise provided in these bylaws.
- I. Agendas and minutes from each meeting will be posted on a publically available website.

III. Committees

- A. The GEC has three standing committees: Budget Committee, Assessment Committee, and Program Committee. The purpose of each committee is to make recommendations to the GEC.
- B. The membership of each committee will be determined at the first GEC meeting of each academic year. See Sections III.E.2, III.F.6, and III.G.4 below for the selection procedures.

- C. Each standing committee will elect a chairperson and a secretary at its first meeting of each academic year.
- D. Each committee will deliver a report on its activities at the monthly GEC meeting.
- E. Budget Committee.
 - 1. The GEC Budget Committee will serve as a resource to recommend to the GEC the allocation and distribution of any funds available to the GEC. The committee may:
 - i. Develop recommended guidelines for distribution of any available funds in the form of grants.
 - a. The committee may serve, as needed, as a review body for grants, either as a whole or as a subcommittee.
 - b. The committee may recommend to the GEC that ad-hoc grants committees be formed, as necessary.
 - ii. Develop and recommend strategic requests for funding, tying such requests to the mission and goals of the GEC.
 - iii. Coordinate and assist with the seeking of external grant funding, especially when related to the mission and goals of the GEC.
 - 2. Membership.
 - i. Any member of GEC is eligible to volunteer to be a member of the Budget Committee.
 - ii. The Budget Committee shall have at least 5 but not more than 8 members.
 - iii. The co-chairs may jointly appoint any member of GEC (as defined in Section I.A.) to the Budget Committee if there are fewer than 5 volunteers.
 - iv. If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Budget Committee.
- F. Assessment.
 - 1. The GEC Assessment Committee will organize the assessment of general education courses: In terms of time frames (i.e., each department every 3 or 4

years), department rotations (i.e., coordinating staggered introduction of assessment)

2. The Assessment Committee will assist departments in devising and carrying out assessments according to best practices.
3. The Assessment Committee will review assessment plans with departments to facilitate best practices for both general education and department goals and aim.
4. The Assessment Committee will review assessment outcomes with departments and assist departments in improving outcomes if problems have been identified.
5. In addition to the course-level assessment described above, the Assessment Committee will develop and carry out program-level assessment using appropriate strategies. These strategies may include, but are not limited to:
 - i. National standardized tests
 - ii. Surveys
 - iii. Public forums
 - iv. Ongoing analysis of connections between course goals and program goals
 - v. General education curricula at other universities
 - vi. Published best practices
6. Membership.
 - i. Any member of GEC is eligible to volunteer to be a member of the Assessment Committee.
 - ii. The Assessment Committee shall have at least 5 but not more than 8 members.
 - iii. The co-chairs may jointly appoint any member of GEC (as defined in Section I.A.) to the Assessment Committee if there are fewer than 5 volunteers.
 - iv. If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Assessment Committee.

G. Program.

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

- iv. If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Program Committee.

- H. The GEC will create ad-hoc committees as necessary to perform its duties as described in the governance document.
- I. The co-chairs of GEC will serve as ex-officio members of each of the standing committees.

IV. Curriculum Proposals.

- A. In accordance with the Governance Document, the University Curriculum Committee will refer all proposals that relate to general education to the GEC.
- B. A standard part of each GEC meeting's agenda will be consideration of proposals which have been received prior to distribution of the agenda.
- C. Once the GEC has made a decision, it will forward its recommendations on to the University Curriculum Committee.

V. Interdisciplinary Programs.

- A. Interdisciplinary major and minor programs have an impact on General Education, therefore the GEC invites a representative from each program to participate as a non-voting member at each monthly meeting.
- B. Each program is encouraged to select a representative who is not already a member of GEC and who is interested in participating for at least one year.

VI. Amendments

- A. By a motion from the floor or a joint recommendation from the co-chairs, the GEC may form an Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee to review and make recommendations to the GEC for amendments to these bylaws.
- B. Membership of Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee.
 - 1. Any member of GEC is eligible to volunteer to be a member of the Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee.
 - 2. The Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee shall have at least 5 but not more than 8 members.
 - 3. The co-chairs may jointly appoint any member of GEC (as defined in Section I.A.) to the Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee if there are fewer than 5 volunteers.

4. If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Assessment Committee.
- C. Proposed amendments must be presented in writing to the Council at least ten (10) days before the Council meeting at which they will be considered.
 - D. An affirmative secret vote of $2/3$ of the voting membership is required for enactment. The APSCUF representative will be charged with administering this vote. Votes will be counted jointly by the APSCUF and the GEC co-chairs.
 - E. The bylaws should be reviewed at least every five years.

Amendment 16-1

Revise Section I.E.2 as follows:

Original Text

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

New Text

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

Rationale

Clarification.

DRAFT

Amendment 16-2

Revise Section II.F as follows:

Original Text

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

New Text

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

Rationale

Originally GEC meetings were on Thursdays. This meant that, as a practical matter, the agenda would typically get sent out on Friday and the GEC membership would have most of the following week to look over it. Now that meetings are held typically on Tuesdays, having the agenda sent out over the weekend doesn't always give the members enough time to look over everything carefully.

Amendment 16-3

Revise Section III.F.1 as follows:

Original Text

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

New Text

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

Rationale

Correcting grammatical errors.

DRAFT

Amendment 16-4

Revise Section VI.B.4 (describing the membership of the Ad-Hoc Amendment Committee) as follows.

Original Text

If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Assessment Committee.

New Text

If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the **Ad-Hoc Amendment** Committee.

Rationale

Fixing a typo.

DRAFT

Amendment 16-5

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

Original Text

G. Program.

1. The GEC Program Committee will consider all curriculum matters, with a particular emphasis on long-term planning. This charge includes, but is not limited to:
 - i. Developing guidelines according to which curriculum proposals related to general education are drafted and evaluated
 - ii. Crafting statements regarding program vision, mission, and goals
 - iii. Crafting curriculum consistent with the vision, mission, and goals
 - iv. Documenting the vision, mission, goals, and curriculum, and the connections among them
 - v. Continually evaluating the vision, mission, and goals with the intention of proposing revisions whenever it is deemed appropriate
 - vi. Continually evaluating the curriculum with the intention of proposing revisions whenever it is deemed appropriate; the evaluation should include the delivery of the curriculum, as well as the content and its connection to the vision, mission, and goals

New Text

G. Program.

1. The GEC Program Committee will consider all curriculum matters, with a particular emphasis on long-term planning. This charge includes, but is not limited to:
 - i. Developing guidelines according to which curriculum proposals related to general education are drafted and evaluated
 - ii. Crafting statements regarding program vision, mission, and goals
 - iii. Crafting curriculum consistent with the vision, mission, and goals
 - iv. Documenting the vision, mission, goals, and curriculum, and the connections among them
 - v. Continually evaluating the vision, mission, and goals with the intention of proposing revisions whenever it is deemed appropriate

vi. Continually evaluating the curriculum with the intention of proposing revisions whenever it is deemed appropriate; the evaluation should include the delivery of the curriculum, as well as the content and its connection to the vision, mission, and goals

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

Rationale

This has become the standard operating procedure for GEC, but was not specifically codified as part of the Program Committee's charge.

DRAFT

Amendment 16-6A

Revise Section III.B as follows.

Original Text

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

New Text

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

Rationale

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

Over the summer and during the early part of the academic year, it is important that the committees continue to have members for work that comes up.

Amendment 16-6B

Revise Section III.B as follows.

Original Text

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

New Text

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

Rationale

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

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

Amendment 16-7

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

Original Text

n/a

New Text

H. Entry-Year Experience

1. The GEC Entry-Year Experience Committee will investigate the possible creation of an entry-year experience for Shippensburg University and report its findings to the GEC.
2. If/when such an experience is created, the Entry-Year Experience Committee will work with the Assessment and Program Committees to monitor and manage the experience to ensure that it meets the goals set by the General Education program. The Entry-Year Experience Committee is encouraged to work closely with any programs and departments related to the Entry-Year Experience at Shippensburg University.
3. Membership.
 - i. Any member of GEC is eligible to volunteer to be a member of the Entry-Year Experience Committee.
 - ii. The Entry-Year Experience Committee shall have at least 5 but not more than 8 members.
 - iii. The co-chairs may jointly appoint any member of GEC (as defined in Section I.A.) to the Entry-Year Experience Committee if there are fewer than 5 volunteers.
 - iv. If there are more than 8 volunteers, then the co-chairs will jointly determine which 8 of the volunteers will serve as members of the Entry-Year Experience Committee.

Rationale

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

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

Original Text

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

- B. The membership of each committee will be determined at the first GEC meeting of each academic year. See Sections III.E.2, III.F.6, and III.G.4 below for the selection procedures.

New Text

- A. The GEC has **four** standing committees: Budget Committee, Assessment Committee, Program Committee, **and Entry-Year Experience Committee**. The purpose of each committee is to make recommendations to the GEC.
- B. The membership of each committee will be determined at the first GEC meeting of each academic year. See Sections III.E.2, III.F.6, III.G.4, **and III.H.3** below for the selection procedures.

Rationale

These sections change to reflect the inclusion of a fourth standing committee.

DRAFT