

# General Education Council

2019-2020 Academic Year

## Agenda, for the meeting on Tuesday, September 24, 2019, in ELL205 at 3:30 P.M.

1. Call to order
2. Review and approve the minutes of the previous council meeting – **See Attachment A**
3. Remarks by Co-Chairs – Dean James Mike, Dr. Kirk Moll – **See Attachment B**
4. Old Business
  - a. Reports from our Standing Committees
    - i. Assessment (Dr. Dudley Girard) – **See Attachments C, D, E, F**
    - ii. Budget (Dr. Sam Forlenza) – **See Attachment G**
      1. Review of Grant Proposals - **See Attachments H, I**
    - iii. Program Committee (Dr. Kate Shirk) – **See Attachment J**
      1. UCC-19-21 – Physics Course and Program Revisions – **See Attachments K, L**
    - iv. Entry Year Experience (Dr. Steve Burg & Dr. Laurie Cella)
5. New Business
6. Announcements
7. Call to Adjourn

# Attachment A

## MINUTES

General Education Council, 3:30 PM August 27, 2019, ELL 205

- I. Dr. Moll called the meeting to order at 3:38 pm. Attendance at the meeting included: S. Bergsten, B. Culbertson, D. Girard, A. Vassallo, C. Huo, L. Cella, S. Drzyzga, A. Feeney, B. Ulrich, A. May, D. Gochenaur, L. Bryant, R. Lesman, M. Hartman, K. Shirk, J. Carbo, J. Mike, T. Morgan, M. Greenberg, W. Kubasko, S. Haase, K. Lorenz, B. Wentz, D. Hwang, C. Rojas, J. Chovanes, S. Forlenza, S. Benbow, K. Johnson, J. Smith, and S. Burg.
- II. Dr. Drzyzga motioned, seconded by Dr. Culbertson, to approve the April 25, 2019 minutes. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.
- III. Dr. Moll made opening remarks welcoming everyone to a new year and acknowledging all of the committee chairs for serving last year and continuing to serve this year. Dr. Moll suggested that Alison Feeney be officially commended for her long-time service as the GEC Secretary. Dr. Ulrich motioned and Dr. Gochenaur seconded. All were in favor and the motion passed unanimously. Dr. Moll reminded GEC members to sign up for participation in sub-committees. A sign-in sheet was circulated.
- IV. Old Business
  1. Assessment Committee-Dr. Girard shared that the committee received lots of data from 18-19. Data review and analysis will begin at the first committee meeting of the new year.
  2. Budget Committee-Dr. Forlenza recapped last year's grant report, just over \$10,000 was expended not including those trips that were cancelled due to weather. Dr. Forlenza shared that this year's allocation is \$15,000. A new grant application is now online. Grants are due by the 15<sup>th</sup> of the month. All final reports were submitted. The following budget requests were made to the committee:
    - I. Dr. Ulrich requested funds for the UNIV101 students for a Lake Tobias Trip. The committee recommended funding the proposal for \$1440. All were in favor and the motion passed.
    - II. Dr. Vaites requested funds for the UNIV101 students for a trip to Pine Grove Furnace State Park. The committee recommended funding the proposal for \$400. All were in favor and the motion passed.
    - III. Dr. Wadas requested funds for the UNIV101 students for a trip to Aki Japanese Steakhouse. The committee recommended funding the proposal for \$1136. All were in favor and the motion passed.
  3. Program Committee-Dr. Shirk did not have any updates to report for the committee since the last meeting.
  4. First-Year-Experience Committee-Dr. Cella and Dr. Berg reported that they have been running faculty workshops and working to get peer anchors in place. There are 78 sections of UNIV101, 4 sections of UNIV101 for transfer students 1 UNIV101 honors section. Dr. Cella shared the goal of the faculty workshops and collaboration is to increase consistency workload and expectations for UNIV101. There are three areas of focus for the 19-20 school year; reviewing learning objectives, securing classroom space, and where are UNIV101 faculty are housed.

Dr. Cella and Dr. Berg stated that the FYE program is looking toward Sept. 16<sup>th</sup> to determine impact on rate of retention. Dr. Moll recognized the Provost Award earned by Dr. Berg and Dr. Cella for their outstanding work on the First Year Experience and UNIV101.

V. New Business

a. Follow-up Activities to our Successful Middle States Reaccreditation – Dr. Tracy Schoolcraft & Dr. Jose Ricardo-Osorio

Dr. Schoolcraft shared the Middle States communication regarding the Middle States Reaccreditation and follow-up activities. Dr. Schoolcraft explained that Middle States Commission has requested a supplemental report. A supplemental information report is requested when the institution is in compliance, but the Commission needs further evidence that the institution is carrying out activities that are being planned or are newly implemented. The supplemental information report is due March 1, 2020 providing further evidence of:

1. The development and implementation of organized and systematic assessments that evaluate the extent of student achievement (Standard V)
2. Demonstrated and documented use of assessment results to improve educational effectiveness (Standard V)
3. Financial planning and budgeting processes that are aligned with mission, goals, and objectives and are evidence-based (Standard VI)

Dr. Schoolcraft explained that after the report is submitted, a peer review will occur based on the report and a site visit. This is a collegial visit, not a compliance visit. A question emerged about the accreditation status – Is the 2026 Middle States Accreditation contingent on this report or site visit? Dr. Schoolcraft responded that SU is accredited through 2026. The visit does not remove accreditation that was earned. The process is intended to be a verification that the university is implementing the plan submitted in the self-assessment. Dr. Schoolcraft shared that there are assessment workshops coming up on September 16<sup>th</sup> and September 17<sup>th</sup>. Emails will be or have already gone out about the workshops. A question was posed regarding the positive responses from Middle States to the self-assessment report. Dr. Ricardo-Osorio stated that the GEC program was highly regarded and First Year Experience was also praised. Additionally, the Middle States team acknowledged that all of the faculty who spoke to the reviewers were aware of the self-assessment report. Dr. Schoolcraft will make the report feedback available. Dr. Moll suggested that GEC members can be the ambassadors to their departments and take back the message that SU did receive Middle States Accreditation and the supplemental report is the next step to demonstrate our progress. Dr. Schoolcraft thanked the GEC members in working through the new General Education Program as it was a large part in receiving Middle States Accreditation. She also noted that accreditation cycles for Middle States is now eight years.

VI. Announcements – Day of Human. Understanding – (find the date) week of events with the poster – Weds. Oct. 2<sup>nd</sup> (LPAC – 7:00 PM) Live streaming from the CUB

VII. The meeting adjourned at 4:38 pm.

Minutes submitted by Dr. Wendy Kubasko

## General Education Council Officers – 2019-2020

### Co-Chairs

Faculty: Dr. Kirk Moll

Administration: Dr. James Mike

### Secretary

Dr. Wendy Kubasko

### Representative to the University Curriculum Committee

Dr. Scott Drzyzga

### APSCUF Representative:

Dr. Steve Burg

### GEC Sub-Committees

#### Program Committee

Chair: Dr. Sherri Bergsten

Secretary: Dr. Brian Ulrich

#### Budget Committee

Chair: Dr. Carrie Sipes,

Secretary: Dr. Carlos Rojas

#### Assessment Committee

Chair: Dr. Dudley Girard

Secretary: Dr. Robert Lesman

#### First Year Experience Committee

Chair: Dr. Laurie Cella, Dr. Steve Burg

Secretary: Prof. Josefine Smith

## GEC Assessment Committee Meeting

Sept 3<sup>rd</sup> 2019

**Members Present:** Dudley Girard, Jim Mike, Lance Bryant, Robert Lesman, Debbie Gochenaur

### Minutes taken by Robert Lesman

Discussed and voted Dudley Girard to continue as chair for the committee for the 2019 AY. Rob agreed to continue to be the secretary for the committee for the 2019 AY>

Going under the previous assignments have each member of the committee check with each dept. rep. to see if they are still the contact person. Use last year's list as the starting point.

Did some initial discussion on the data request email for spring 2019 data. Noted that that data will need to be turned in by late Oct. Additionally, that emails need to specify courses that have already turned in data, courses that have not turned in data, and courses not offered for the 2018 AY.

The committee then reviewed the CLA+ results concerning 2018 Freshmen and seniors and how they scored same. Dudley noted that level of effort indicated by seniors was lower than previous years. Presently waiting to what happens this year to see if the lower score is just do to lack of effort or if there is possibly another issue to be concerned about. Lesman noted that effort level on CLA+ would seem to measure student's feeling of commitment to institution, given that the student does not have an academic stake in the test. Lesman also asked what does the exam measure and how and requested looking at sample questions. **(See Attached Documents for CLA+ results and Sample Questions)**

### Course Reports (See Attached Documents):

ENG 114. Feedback from GEC Assessment was a need for more detail on the assessment instrument. Discussed how program was addressing the need to know below which line we are concerned about students.

UNIV 101: Dudley noted that in the meeting in spring 2019 that learning outcomes likely need to be adjusted to be made more measurable. Lesman noted that certain syllabus requirements can be tied reliably to the existing outcomes. For example, coordinating so that all sections of UNIV 101 require reflective writing assignments based on first semester experiences that take students outside of the classroom related to specific concepts, i.e. diversity.

Lastly the committee discussed the raw assessment data for fall 2018 **(See Attached Document – Raw Data)**. Dudley noted that there was a wide range of results in how students were doing and that calibration meetings over time will hopefully make data more consistent across and within goals. Dudley also noted that the data need to be taken with a grain of salt; over time data will show useful patterns and that we were still missing half of the 2018 AY. Lesman noted that the design of assessment system itself is valuable as it satisfies accreditation expectations. Dudley then noted that the first priority is to address those courses for which no form was submitted. Second, for courses that indicated "Not Assessed-Other," what the status of the course is.

The committee adjourned with plan to for the next meeting to focus on logistics for sending out the data request emails to the department contact for General Education assessment and for meeting with the departments that have courses in the goals being reviewed this semester: Quantitative, Diversity, and Historical.

## General Education Council Assessment Committee (GEC Assessment Committee)

Assessment Checklist – XXXXX

Assessment data from XXXXX through XXXXX

**Program:** General Education

**Department Chair/Program Chair/Assessment Coordinator:** Dr. Laurie Cella, Assessment Contact

**Course:** ENG 114

**Goal:** Written Communication

---

### Information

*The purpose of this document is to evaluate and provide feedback about your submitted Assessment Report to the GEC Assessment Committee. All parts of the report will be reviewed but only data from 20XX-20XX will be examined and how the results are being used.*

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

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

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

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

---

## Category Course Assessment Report Feedback

---

Directions for reviewers: Use this template for each Learning Outcome.

The student produces clearly worded and organized text conveys the logic used to make an assertion.

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

2. How many assessment methods are used to measure this outcome? 1
3. Describe each assessment method and classify whether it is direct or indirect, whether it is quantitative or qualitative. If you need to have more information about the assessment method in order to classify it, please ask the chair of the GEC Assessment Committee to get more information.

**Direct: The Written Rubric, developed by the General Education Assessment Committee and the English Department Writing Committee**

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

**Limited – Only due to lack of details on the rubric. Will review during calibration semester.**

### **COLUMN 4: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED**

5. When were the results collected?

**Fall 2018**

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

**Yes.**

### **COLUMN 5: USE OF RESULTS**

7. How were the results used?

We have developed Tutor Talks in response to these results, and our Professional Development series focuses on teaching logic and order.

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

**Yes, but need to establish an expected target.**

The student uses appropriate evidence to support assertions, with documentation of sources in accordance with disciplinary conventions.

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

2. How many assessment methods are used to measure this outcome?   1
3. Describe each assessment method and classify whether it is direct or indirect, whether it is quantitative or qualitative. If you need to have more information about the assessment method in order to classify it, please ask the chair of the GEC Assessment Committee to get more information.

**Direct: The Written Rubric, developed by the General Education Assessment Committee and the English Department Writing Committee.**

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

**Limited – Only due to lack of details on the rubric. Will review during calibration semester.**

### **COLUMN 4: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED**

5. When were the results collected?

**Fall 2018**

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

**Yes.**

### **COLUMN 5: USE OF RESULTS**

7. How were the results used?

In order to increase these numbers, we have developed a more focused library instruction, and we have enhanced the Written Work Rubric to include Information Literacy as well.

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

**Yes, but need to establish an expected target.**

The student uses language that is controlled, readable, clear, proofread, and suitable for the discipline.

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

2. How many assessment methods are used to measure this outcome?   1
  
3. Describe each assessment method and classify whether it is direct or indirect, whether it is quantitative or qualitative. If you need to have more information about the assessment method in order to classify it, please ask the chair of the GEC Assessment Committee to get more information.

Direct: Written Text Rubric.

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

**Limited – Only due to lack of details on the rubric. Will review during calibration semester.**

**COLUMN 4: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED**

5. When were the results collected?

**Fall 2018**

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

**Yes**

**COLUMN 5: USE OF RESULTS**

7. How were the results used?

We have developed Tutor Talks focused on proofreading, and have increased the number of tutors who are visited ENG 114 classes.

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

**Yes, but need to establish an estimated target.**

**Strengths of the annual assessment report:**

Data collected has connection to the SLOs. Report shows data has been reviewed and is being used to make improvements to the course. All measures seem to be direct measures and providing a good measure on how students are meeting the SLOs.

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

Little more detail on the assessment tool and need to establish targets on when changes are probably not needed.

**Notes from Meeting with Department:**

Present: Shari Horner, Laurie Cella, Kate Shirk, Steve Haase, Dudley Girard

Discussed next step of determining where should we be concerned about the students, what is the realistic target for how students should be doing. For determining a target, basing it on an overall value across all students and sections. The English Department will work with the program committee to determine realistic targets. Discussed about how 2/3rds of ENG 114 are staffed by adjuncts. There is concern over number of adjuncts needed to cover this key course for both General Education and across all majors. Additionally, discussed the need for more details on the assessment tool when reporting data. Lastly, noted that ENG 115 did not run this AY. Low enrollment in ENG 115 caused it to be cancelled, mostly due to HON ENG 114. English Department is aware this is an ongoing issue and is trying to determine a plan for ENG 115.

## Examples and additional guidelines:

### **Assessment utilizes some form of *quantitative* information and data**

Examples include end-of-program comprehensive portfolios; embedded and *rubric-scored* end-of-course exam questions; rubric scored term or research papers; scores and pass rates on national norm or criterion-reference exams; gain/loss scores on pre-post measures taken at the beginning and end of courses; and *rubric-scores* from internships, projects, demonstrations, labs, performances, exhibitions, and service learning

### **Assessment utilizes some form of *qualitative* information**

Examples include written and/or verbal feedback from site supervisors, "minute papers," progress reports from internship coordinators, and qualitative review (internal and external) of senior projects, et al.

### **Assessment utilizes some form of *direct* measure of student educational outcomes**

Examples include end-of-program comprehensive portfolios; embedded and *rubric-scored* end-of-course exam questions; rubric scored term or research papers; scores and pass rates on national norm or criterion-reference exams; gain/loss scores on pre-post measures taken at the beginning and end of courses; and *rubric-scores* from internships or site supervisors, projects, demonstrations, labs, performances, exhibitions, and service learning

### **Assessment utilizes some form of *indirect* measures of student educational outcomes**

Examples include graduation rates; admission rates into graduate school; percentage of students finding employment in chosen field within 6 months of graduation; satisfaction surveys; exit interviews; alumni surveys or other types of self-reported data; and number of student publications and presentations given at refereed conferences

# Attachment E

General Education Council Assessment Committee (GEC Assessment Committee)

Assessment Checklist – XXXXX

Assessment data from XXXXX through XXXXX

**Program:** General Education

**Department Chair/Program Chair/Assessment Coordinator:** Dr. Steven Burg, FYE Committee

**Course:** UNIV 101

**Goal:** UNIV 101

---

## Information

*The purpose of this document is to evaluate and provide feedback about your submitted Assessment Report to the GEC Assessment Committee. All parts of the report will be reviewed but only data from 20XX-20XX will be examined and how the results are being used.*

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

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

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

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

---

## Category Course Assessment Report Feedback

---

Directions for reviewers: Use this template for each Learning Outcome.

The student engages in academic exploration and adapts and applies the meta cognitive and academic skills to be a successful student-scholar.

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

2. How many assessment methods are used to measure this outcome?   1
3. Describe each assessment method and classify whether it is direct or indirect, whether it is quantitative or qualitative. If you need to have more information about the assessment method in order to classify it, please ask the chair of the GEC Assessment Committee to get more information.

#### **Direct: Final Course Grades**

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

**Somewhat for this learning objective.**

### **COLUMN 4: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED**

5. When were the results collected?

#### **Fall 2018**

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

#### **Limited**

### **COLUMN 5: USE OF RESULTS**

7. How were the results used?

The relatively high number of students who failed UNIV 101 has resulted in a concerted effort to redesign and bringing greater standardization to the course curriculum and design, especially making sure there is more emphasis by instructors on study skills, time management, stress management, and campus resources. We are also working more closely to identify ways to have earlier intervention for students who are struggling. The FYE Program worked with the Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning to have workshops in Spring 2019 to assist faculty with differentiated learning and increasing active learning in our UNIV 101 classrooms.

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

**Yes**

The student engages in opportunities for learning beyond the classroom.

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

2. How many assessment methods are used to measure this outcome?   1
  
3. Describe each assessment method and classify whether it is direct or indirect, whether it is quantitative or qualitative. If you need to have more information about the assessment method in order to classify it, please ask the chair of the GEC Assessment Committee to get more information.

Indirect: Student Self-Reported Data in Post-Test Survey. The survey included four questions asking about student involvement in organizations, attending out of class campus events, participating in campus-sponsored community service projects, and college-sponsored social events. The data below is the average number of students for the four questions.

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

**Most likely as it doesn't require the students to self-rate an ability, but some concern if no way to verify the reporting and is a required component of the course.**

**COLUMN 4: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED**

5. When were the results collected?

**Fall 2018**

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

**Yes**

**COLUMN 5: USE OF RESULTS**

7. How were the results used?

In general, the Posttest Survey indicated high levels of student engagement. We are going to continue to require all faculty to have students in UNIV 101 attend two campus events. We are also looking for ways to increase the number of sections of UNIV 101 with a service-learning component.

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

**Yes**

The student develops strategies and goals to support their personal wellness and academic and professional success.

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

2. How many assessment methods are used to measure this outcome?   1
3. Describe each assessment method and classify whether it is direct or indirect, whether it is quantitative or qualitative. If you need to have more information about the assessment method in order to classify it, please ask the chair of the GEC Assessment Committee to get more information.

Indirect: The Posttest Survey asked students to respond to the question, "I understand how wellness connects to my success in college." The data reflects the 733 students who responded to that question.

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

**Can help, but more direct questions about knowledge of actual strategies and proposed goals set by the students should be incorporated.**

**COLUMN 4: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED**

5. When were the results collected?

**Fall 2018**

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

**Partially**

**COLUMN 5: USE OF RESULTS**

7. How were the results used?

We were pleased to see the number of students at the proficient or mastery level, and particularly the increase between the pretest (September) and posttest (December). We had intentionally worked with the faculty at the Counseling Center wellness into the curriculum. We intend to continue that process, and also provide faculty with additional training in how to teach basic stress management and relaxation practices.

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

**Yes**

The student engages with core concepts of diversity and universality, and demonstrate principles of responsible citizenship within and beyond the campus community.

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

2. How many assessment methods are used to measure this outcome? 1
3. Describe each assessment method and classify whether it is direct or indirect, whether it is quantitative or qualitative. If you need to have more information about the assessment method in order to classify it, please ask the chair of the GEC Assessment Committee to get more information.

Indirect: On the Student Survey, students were asked to respond to the question, "To what extent do you agree with the following statement: "I feel prepared to have conversations about challenging topics with people whose viewpoints are different than my own." 731 students responded on the Posttest Survey.

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

**Some, but without any direct measures is hard to determine the level at which the SLO is being met. Engages with makes this a hard SLO to assess directly.**

### **COLUMN 4: SUMMARY OF DATA COLLECTED**

5. When were the results collected?

**Fall 2018**

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

**Yes**

### **COLUMN 5: USE OF RESULTS**

7. How were the results used?

The general outcomes for this Learning Objective were positive, but we would have liked to see a bigger change in student perceptions over the course of the semester. We are developing a stronger unit in connection with the Day of Human Understanding to address the issue of diversity. We also feel that the survey questions may not have adequately gauged student learning for this particular objective. We are going to be revising the survey to see if we can develop questions that will provide a better sense of student growth and also ask specific questions about civility and civic responsibility.

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

**Yes**

**Strengths of the annual assessment report:**

Data collected has connection to the SLOs. Report shows data has been reviewed and is being used to make improvements to the course.

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

Some of the SLOs appear to something more to strive for and less an SLO for the course. For the 4<sup>th</sup> SLO "engages" and "demonstrates" should likely be replaced with understands. Other assessments outside the course might then be used to measure "engagement" and "application". For example, collecting data on student participation in certain events. Similar can be said for the first SLO. The 2<sup>nd</sup> SLO looks to be measurable even though it uses similar language to the 4<sup>th</sup>. Lastly, concerns over lack of direct assessment measures.

**Notes from Meeting with Department:**

Present: Steve Burg, Laurie Cella, Dudley Girard, Kate Shirk.

Discussed ongoing work to revise one assignment with a common rubric to create a common assignment across the courses for assessment of one or more SLOs. There is presently 3 common assignments that can be used by the instructors. For direct measures discussed how to best introduce them. Due to the number of sections and instructors, suggested only introducing one at a time to help determine logistic issues. Discussion then moved to concern over the SLOs and how assessable some of them are and how some appear to be two SLOs and not one. See below for the suggested rewording and breaking up of the objectives.

**SLO 1a: The student engages in academic exploration.**

**SLO 1b: The student understands** meta cognitive and academic skills to be a successful student-scholar.

-Split into two, and reworded to make more assessable.

SLO 2: The student engages in opportunities for learning beyond the classroom.

-Some discussion on is it important to assess why.

SLO 3: The student develops strategies and goals to support their personal wellness.

-Removed other half as felt covered by SLO 1a.

SLO 4a: The student **understands** the core concepts of diversity and universality.

-Propose changing the word diversity. Noted is key for students that diversity is part.

-Change in wording to make more assessable.

SLO 4b: The students will demonstrate service beyond the campus community.

-Discussion on if to make optional or remove for now.

## Examples and additional guidelines:

### **Assessment utilizes some form of *quantitative* information and data**

Examples include end-of-program comprehensive portfolios; embedded and *rubric-scored* end-of-course exam questions; rubric scored term or research papers; scores and pass rates on national norm or criterion-reference exams; gain/loss scores on pre-post measures taken at the beginning and end of courses; and *rubric-scores* from internships, projects, demonstrations, labs, performances, exhibitions, and service learning

### **Assessment utilizes some form of *qualitative* information**

Examples include written and/or verbal feedback from site supervisors, "minute papers," progress reports from internship coordinators, and qualitative review (internal and external) of senior projects, et al.

### **Assessment utilizes some form of *direct* measure of student educational outcomes**

Examples include end-of-program comprehensive portfolios; embedded and *rubric-scored* end-of-course exam questions; rubric scored term or research papers; scores and pass rates on national norm or criterion-reference exams; gain/loss scores on pre-post measures taken at the beginning and end of courses; and *rubric-scores* from internships or site supervisors, projects, demonstrations, labs, performances, exhibitions, and service learning

### **Assessment utilizes some form of *indirect* measures of student educational outcomes**

Examples include graduation rates; admission rates into graduate school; percentage of students finding employment in chosen field within 6 months of graduation; satisfaction surveys; exit interviews; alumni surveys or other types of self-reported data; and number of student publications and presentations given at refereed conferences

# Attachment F

## Fall 2018 Raw Data Report

### Arts

Description Communication Objective :  
Unsatisfactory: 13.16%  
Emerging: 0.00%  
Developing: 76.32%  
Proficient: 10.53%  
Mastery: 0.00%

Analysis and Context Objective :  
Unsatisfactory: 25.00%  
Emerging: 0.00%  
Developing: 50.00%  
Proficient: 25.00%  
Mastery: 0.00%

Interpretation and Response Objective :  
Unsatisfactory: 10.53%  
Emerging: 0.00%  
Developing: 36.84%  
Proficient: 52.63%  
Mastery: 0.00%

### Citizenship

Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Objective :  
Unsatisfactory: 18.18%  
Emerging: 12.95%  
Developing: 25.34%  
Proficient: 28.37%  
Mastery: 15.15%

Individual and Collective Action Objective :  
Unsatisfactory: 18.18%  
Emerging: 12.95%  
Developing: 25.34%  
Proficient: 28.37%  
Mastery: 15.15%

Responsibilities of Citizenship Objective :  
Unsatisfactory: 18.18%  
Emerging: 12.95%  
Developing: 25.34%  
Proficient: 28.37%  
Mastery: 15.15%

## Creative

Artistic/Creative Competencies Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

Problem Solving and Process Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

Creativity and Transformation Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

## Critical Analysis

Conceptualization Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.52%

Developing: 12.50%

Proficient: 18.23%

Mastery: 68.75%

Analysis Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 3.65%

Emerging: 6.77%

Developing: 10.94%

Proficient: 28.65%

Mastery: 50.00%

Evaluation Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 15.62%

Developing: 11.98%

Proficient: 22.92%

Mastery: 49.48%

## Diversity

Human Diversity (Individual, Group, Institutional) and its Impact on Behavior Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 19.13%

Emerging: 19.46%

Developing: 22.15%

Proficient: 22.15%

Mastery: 17.11%

Historical and Cultural Roots of Inequality Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 10.67%

Emerging: 16.67%

Developing: 26.33%

Proficient: 24.67%

Mastery: 21.67%

Attitudes, Beliefs, Behaviors Regarding Diversity Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 27.27%

Emerging: 26.91%

Developing: 20.36%

Proficient: 11.27%

Mastery: 14.18%

## Ethical Reasoning

Conceptualization Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

Application Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

Comparison and Evaluation Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

Foreign Lang

Oral Communication Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 9.79%

Emerging: 14.47%

Developing: 30.21%

Proficient: 27.66%

Mastery: 17.87%

Written Communication Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 8.82%

Emerging: 20.59%

Developing: 19.33%

Proficient: 28.99%

Mastery: 22.27%

Cultural Awareness Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 1.27%

Emerging: 36.71%

Developing: 30.80%

Proficient: 24.47%

Mastery: 6.75%

Global

Factors and Interactions Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 12.50%

Emerging: 10.71%

Developing: 20.36%

Proficient: 20.36%

Mastery: 36.07%

Representation and Sources Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 13.45%

Emerging: 3.27%

Developing: 12.36%

Proficient: 18.55%

Mastery: 52.36%

Perspectives Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 15.38%

Emerging: 8.04%

Developing: 16.08%

Proficient: 16.43%

Mastery: 44.06%

## Historical

### Knowledge and Understanding Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

### Sources and Evidence Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

### Application of Languages and Critical Thinking Skills in an Historical Context Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

## Literature

### Comprehension Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 4.71%

Emerging: 20.00%

Developing: 20.00%

Proficient: 28.24%

Mastery: 27.06%

### Analysis Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 2.33%

Emerging: 13.95%

Developing: 17.44%

Proficient: 41.86%

Mastery: 24.42%

### Interpretation and Significance Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 1.16%

Emerging: 9.30%

Developing: 36.05%

Proficient: 27.91%

Mastery: 25.58%

Natural World

Scientific Method Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 4.58%

Emerging: 7.51%

Developing: 13.47%

Proficient: 27.46%

Mastery: 46.98%

Scientific Principles Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 16.84%

Emerging: 14.14%

Developing: 20.94%

Proficient: 23.91%

Mastery: 24.17%

Data and Problem-Solving Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 9.27%

Emerging: 14.74%

Developing: 14.56%

Proficient: 24.36%

Mastery: 37.07%

Oral Communication

Organization Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

Supporting Material Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

Delivery Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.00%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 0.00%

Proficient: 0.00%

Mastery: 0.00%

## Quantitative

### Interpretation Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 1.46%

Emerging: 4.88%

Developing: 19.51%

Proficient: 30.24%

Mastery: 43.90%

### Analysis Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 3.72%

Emerging: 2.79%

Developing: 15.35%

Proficient: 25.58%

Mastery: 52.56%

### Communication Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 4.39%

Emerging: 6.83%

Developing: 21.46%

Proficient: 26.34%

Mastery: 40.98%

## Technological

### Information Technology Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 4.29%

Emerging: 12.86%

Developing: 12.86%

Proficient: 31.43%

Mastery: 38.57%

### Software and Systems Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 4.29%

Emerging: 12.86%

Developing: 12.86%

Proficient: 31.43%

Mastery: 38.57%

### Appropriate Use Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 27.14%

Emerging: 0.00%

Developing: 15.71%

Proficient: 57.14%

Mastery: 0.00%

UNIV 101

Cultivate Scholarly and Academic Success Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 10.40%

Emerging: 5.16%

Developing: 12.74%

Proficient: 22.83%

Mastery: 48.87%

Engagement with the University Community Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 6.87%

Emerging: 15.50%

Developing: 31.94%

Proficient: 26.95%

Mastery: 18.73%

Foster Personal Development and Wellness Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 0.95%

Emerging: 2.86%

Developing: 15.14%

Proficient: 38.61%

Mastery: 42.43%

Promote Understanding of Diversity and Social Responsibility  
Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 1.23%

Emerging: 4.51%

Developing: 23.26%

Proficient: 32.15%

Mastery: 38.85%

Written

Logic and Order Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 13.98%

Emerging: 13.98%

Developing: 13.98%

Proficient: 42.10%

Mastery: 15.96%

Sources and Evidence Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 17.77%

Emerging: 8.89%

Developing: 23.80%

Proficient: 42.62%

Mastery: 6.93%

Control of Language and Syntax Objective :

Unsatisfactory: 13.98%

Emerging: 3.95%

Developing: 12.01%

Proficient: 49.09%

Mastery: 20.97%

**Assessed**

CSC-104  
PHY-205  
ECO-101  
PLS-141  
SPN-202  
CHM-105  
PSY-101  
ESS-111  
ETH-102  
SWK-265  
CHM-103  
ECO-113  
PLS-100  
MAT-105  
ESS-110  
SPN-102  
MAT-117  
MAT-217  
SPN-101  
MAT-225  
HON-111  
UNIV-101  
GER-102  
BIO-161  
GER-150  
MAT-181  
GER-103  
BIO-100  
BIO-208  
BIO-150  
CSC-103  
THE-121  
BIO-145  
ESS-210  
CSC-180  
IAP-111  
MAT-211  
HIS-106  
GER-101  
MAT-111  
SPN-361  
CSC-120  
BIO-237  
CHM-121  
ENG-114  
FRN-102  
WST-100  
SPN-103

**Not Assessed - Not Offered This AY**

SPN-152  
PHY-110  
HON-141  
SPN-385  
FRN-320  
FRN-150  
HON-224  
GER-215  
GER-204  
HON-180  
GER-203  
FRN-202  
HON-165  
HON-108  
ENG-115  
FRN-331  
SPN-153  
HON-166  
SPN-150  
SPN-330  
GER-151  
HON-142

**Not Assessed - Assessing Course Spring 2019**

HON-140  
GEO-101  
ECO-102  
SOC-101  
ANT-111  
FRN-204  
HIS-105  
DS-100  
ANT-121  
GEO-140  
ESS-108

**Not Assessed - Other**

ART-232

ENG-248

FRN-330

HIS-201

PHY-122

MAT-107

ART-101

ART-233

ETH-100

HON-123

PHY-221

GEO-103

HON-122

MAT-219

ART-231

HON-100

ENG-250

ENG-243

HCS-100

PHY-108

PHL-105

HON-249

HCS-125

ART-339

**No Form Submitted**

PHL-102

HON-102

HON-210

MUS-129

CHN-102

SPN-360

HON-208

HON-244

HON-101

CHN-101

MUS-261

MUS-121

ANT-105

HON-274

HON-151

BIO-162

PHL-101

HON-196

HON-279

SPN-204

HON-159

MUS-227

ETH-101

PHY-121

HON-145

FRN-103

HON-135

FRN-101

HON-161

HON-130

HON-186

HON-182

HON-160

HON-105

CHN-103

HON-261

# Attachment G

## MINUTES

### GEC Budget Committee Meeting

September 20, 2019

Starting time - 12:00 p.m.

Ending Time – 12:20 p.m.

Location: DHC 310

1. Dr. Forlenza called to order at 12:00 p.m.
  - a. Present: Drs. Forlenza, Vassallo, Chen, Sipes (audio call)
  - b. Absent/Excused: Dr. Carbo
2. Welcome message by Dr. Forlenza and introduction of new committee members. Dr. Forlenza explained the responsibilities of the committee chair and gave an update about grant funds available
3. Elections
  - a. Dr. Sipes was elected as committee chair; all in favor
  - b. Dr. Rojas was elected as secretary; all in favor
4. Grant Applications
  - a. **Applicant:** Dr. Benbow (Social Work and Gerontology).  
**Event:** Visit to National Holocaust Museum, Washington DC.  
**Amount:** \$2,546  
**Recommendation:** Rubrics reviewed; all in favor to approve
  - b. **Applicant:** Dr. Lucia (Music and Theatre Arts)  
**Event:** Piano performance with silent film accompaniment, commentary and lecture demonstration at Luhrs Performing Arts Center-Shippensburg University  
**Amount:** \$2,474  
**Recommendation:** Rubrics reviewed; all in favor to approve
5. Other items:
  - a. Dr. Forlenza gave an update about available funds and standard procedures to make sure that any unused grant funds are reimbursed.
  - b. Event reports might include examples of students' assignments
6. Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Minutes submitted by Carlos Rojas

# Attachment H

## GENERAL EDUCATION GRANT

### INFORMATION AND SUMMARY PAGE

Title of Project/Event: Field trip to the Holocaust Museum	
Date of Project/Event: December 3, 2019	
Your Name: Samuel R. Benbow	Department: Social Work & Gerontology Department
Email: Srbenb@ship.edu	Phone: (717) 477-1781
General Education Program Goal Supported: Program goal: <b>Diversity:</b> Guide and prompt students to evaluate the diversity of human experience, behavior, and thought, in order to better understand ourselves and others, to respond to the roots of inequality that undermines social justice, while developing awareness regarding diversity in culture, ethnicity, race, gender/gender expression, religion, age, social class, sexual orientation, or abilities.	
List the GE course(s) and sections you are teaching (or will teach) that this proposal is for: SWK 265: section 01 & section 02 Understanding Diversity for Social Work Practice	
If the project/event is open to the entire campus, list any additional students/populations who may be interested in attending: DS 400	
Total Amount Requested: \$	

### PROJECT/EVENT SUMMARY

In your project/event summary, please include: (1) a clear description of the project/event, (2) who will or can participate (e.g., students of specific courses, open to campus community), (3) how it will support the learning objectives of the specified GE Program Goal, and (4) if there are any assignments associated with this project/event. You may start writing in the space below (continuing onto new pages as needed) or attach the summary as a separate document.

1). The proposed project is a bus excursion to the National Holocaust Museum in Washington D.C. on the morning of December 3, 2019. This excursion is designed to directly support the course objectives relevant to SWK 265, which are to assist students to develop tools for increased understanding of and sensitivity to human diversity and cultural experiences different from their own. This “human behavior in the social environment lens” approach calls for students to examine their own values, beliefs, attitudes and approaches to human diversities. It must also be noted that the excursion experience and education with the Diversity Cubiculum program goal, which states: *“Guide and prompt students to evaluate the diversity of human experience, behavior, and thought, in order to better understand ourselves and others, to respond to the roots of inequality that undermines social justice, while developing awareness regarding diversity in culture, ethnicity, race, gender/gender expression, religion, age, social class, sexual orientation, or abilities.*

## GENERAL EDUCATION GRANT

*directly aligns with the university”* 2). Students who will participate in the field trip are those enrolled in SWK 265: Understanding Diversity for Social Work Practice (sections 01 and 02), as well as students enrolled in DS400: Disabilities Studies Capstone course, 3) The field trip excursion supports the learning objective, of Diversity program goal, by connecting class discussions of prior knowledge regarding historical and cultural policies and practices within as well as outside of the United States related to social injustices of minority groups. 4). Students will be assigned into small groups of three to engage in thoughtful, intentional dialogue about the exhibits and its relationship to what they were taught from family, friends, community, social media and prior educational experiences in high school as well as college. Assignments associated with the event include a Pre-Holocaust Museum Assessment, Exhibit Synthesis and Reaction/Reflection paper. Additionally, all assignments require students to explore historical aspects of diversity and oppression as a means to develop ways to effectively impact change in their professional lives as social workers, and or contributing members of our Shippensburg University community. These assignments are in direct alignment to the goals and objectives of the SWK 265, DS 400 and the General Education Program.

# GENERAL EDUCATION GRANT

## BUDGET PAGE

For each item, attach a written estimate from the vendor or a supporting document (such as an email message) that outlines the cost. Additionally, if you are requesting less than the total amount, please state where the remaining funds are coming from.

### ITEMIZED BUDGET

	Item	Cost	Quantity	Amount
1	38 Passenger Bus : Wolf's Bus Line	\$ 1173.00	2	\$ 2,346.00
2	Gratuity ( \$100.00)	\$ 100.00	2	\$ 200.00
3		\$		\$
4		\$		\$
5		\$		\$
6		\$		\$
7		\$		\$
8		\$		\$

**TOTAL AMOUNT OF PROJECT/EVENT: \$ 2,346.00**

**TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED: \$2,546.00**

# Acceptance

# Wolf's Bus Lines, Inc

Client ID Client Company Client Ref 1 Client Ref 2	SU-Benbow Sam Benbow Shippensburg University	Charter ID Movement ID Status Passengers Distance	16108 22834 Firm  284.3
--	--	---	-------------------------------------

First Pick-up Pick-up Date Single Journey Vehicle To Stay	Shippen Hall-Shippensburg University Tue 12/3/2019 Time 07:30 No Yes	Destination Arrival Date Leave Date Back Date	Holocaust Museum - Washington, DC Tue 12/3/2019 Time 09:30 Tue 12/3/2019 Time 15:30 Tue 12/3/2019 Time 18:00
--	---	--	---

<b>First Pick-up Instructions</b>	<b>Destination Instructions</b>
1871 Old Main Drive Shippensburg, PA 17257	100 Raoul Wallenberg Pl, SW Washington, DC 20024

\*\*PU at Shippen Hall, which is on the side of Memorial Auditorium.

Seats	Vehicle Description	Vehicle No	Price	Tax %	Tax	Total
38	Deluxe Motorcoach	1	\$1,173.00	0	\$0.00	\$1,173.00
<b>Movement Totals</b>			<b>\$1,173.00</b>		<b>\$0.00</b>	<b>\$1,173.00</b>

Driver Description	Vehicle No	Driver Description	Vehicle No
Motorcoach Driver	1		

<b>Route</b>	<b>Further Requirements</b>
7:30-Depart Shippen Hall 9:30-Drop group at the Holocaust Museum 3:30-Pick group back up 6:00-Return to Shippen Hall	Contact person is Samuel Benbow 717-477-1781  **This is a 2 bus move

Price does not include driver gratuity, which is at your discretion.

Thank you for choosing Wolf's Bus Lines for your travel needs.

Included Items	Included	Included Items	Included
Driver Gratuity	No		

**References**

Charter Rep: Jolene

Your driver can drive up to 10 hours and/or work up to 15 hours from terminal back to terminal. Once that limit is reached, the driver must have 9 hours off duty. If these limits are exceeded, a minimal charge of \$320.00 or more will be billed after the trip to cover cost of extra driver/other company assistance. I have checked all the details above and agree that they are correct. I would like to make a firm booking & I accept the above price & the payment terms detailed in the attached letter.

Signature		Print Name		Date	
-----------	--	------------	--	------	--

# Acceptance

# Wolf's Bus Lines, Inc

Client ID Client Company Client Ref 1 Client Ref 2	SU-Benbow Sam Benbow Shippensburg University	Charter ID Movement ID Status Passengers Distance	16108 22835 Firm 284.3
--	--	---	---------------------------------

First Pick-up Pick-up Date Single Journey Vehicle To Stay	Shippen Hall-Shippensburg University Tue 12/3/2019 Time 07:30 No Yes	Destination Arrival Date Leave Date Back Date	Holocaust Museum - Washington, DC Tue 12/3/2019 Time 09:30 Tue 12/3/2019 Time 15:30 Tue 12/3/2019 Time 18:00
--	---	--	---

First Pick-up Instructions 1871 Old Main Drive Shippensburg, PA 17257	Destination Instructions 100 Raoul Wallenberg Pl, SW Washington, DC 20024
---	---

\*\*PU at Shippen Hall, which is on the side of Memorial Auditorium.

Seats	Vehicle Description	Vehicle No	Price	Tax %	Tax	Total
38	Deluxe Motorcoach	1	\$1,173.00	0	\$0.00	\$1,173.00
Movement Totals			\$1,173.00		\$0.00	\$1,173.00

Driver Description	Vehicle No	Driver Description	Vehicle No
Motorcoach Driver	1		

Route	Further Requirements
7:30-Depart Shippen Hall 9:30-Drop group at the Holocaust Museum 3:30-Pick group back up 6:00-Return to Shippen Hall	Contact person is Samuel Benbow 717-477-1781 **This is a 2 bus move

Price does not include driver gratuity, which is at your discretion.

Thank you for choosing Wolf's Bus Lines for your travel needs.

Included Items	Included	Included Items	Included
Driver Gratuity	No		

## References

Charter Rep: Jolene

Your driver can drive up to 10 hours and/or work up to 15 hours from terminal back to terminal. Once that limit is reached, the driver must have 9 hours off duty. If these limits are exceeded, a minimal charge of \$320.00 or more will be billed after the trip to cover cost of extra driver/other company assistance. I have checked all the details above and agree that they are correct. I would like to make a firm booking & I accept the above price & the payment terms detailed in the attached letter.

Signature		Print Name		Date	
-----------	--	------------	--	------	--

# Attachment I

## GENERAL EDUCATION GRANT

### INFORMATION AND SUMMARY PAGE

Title of Project/Event: Silent Film presentation(s) with live piano accompaniment by Ben Model
--

Date of Project/Event: 10/9/2019 (concert) and 10/10/2019 (class visits)
--

Your Name: Margaret Lucia	Department: Music & Theatre Arts
---------------------------	----------------------------------

Email: meluci@ship.edu	Phone: 717-477-1527
------------------------	---------------------

General Education Program Goal Supported: Creativity and Expression: Arts (Guide and prompt students to describe, analyze, and respond to the scope of works in the <b>arts</b> .)
--

List the GE course(s) and sections you are teaching (or will teach) that this proposal is for:
--

MUS 216-1, MUS 216-2, Music and Film; (also, IAP 111-2 Introduction to Interdisciplinary Arts)
--

If the project/event is open to the entire campus, list any additional students/populations who may be interested in attending: This project is open to the entire campus, and is of particular interest to students in Music, Theatre, Interdisciplinary Arts, English (Art of the Film and Film Criticism).
---

Total Amount Requested: \$2,474.00
------------------------------------

### PROJECT/EVENT SUMMARY

In your project/event summary, please include: (1) a clear description of the project/event, (2) who will or can participate (e.g., students of specific courses, open to campus community), (3) how it will support the learning objectives of the specified GE Program Goal, and (4) if there are any assignments associated with this project/event. You may start writing in the space below (continuing onto new pages as needed) or attach the summary as a separate document.

**See attached Project Summary.**

GENERAL EDUCATION GRANT

**BUDGET PAGE**

For each item, attach a written estimate from the vendor or a supporting document (such as an email message) that outlines the cost. Additionally, if you are requesting less than the total amount, please state where the remaining funds are coming from.

**ITEMIZED BUDGET**

	<b>Item</b>	<b>Cost</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Amount</b>
<b>1</b>	Live performance of an accompaniment to a full-length silent film by pianist/organist Ben Model	\$ 1,000	1 concert	\$1,000
<b>2</b>	Class lecture-demo with powerpoint on history and practice of silent film accompaniment, for two sections of the Music and Film class (MUS 216-01 and MUS 216-02)	\$500	2 classes	\$ 1,000
<b>3</b>	Screening license fee for Blu-ray edition of 1920s silent film	\$350	1 film	\$ 350
<b>4</b>	Amtrak round-trip from NYC/Penn Station to Harrisburg, PA	\$ 124	1 traveler	\$ 124
<b>5</b>		\$		\$
<b>6</b>		\$		\$
<b>7</b>		\$		\$
<b>8</b>		\$		\$

**TOTAL AMOUNT OF PROJECT/EVENT: \$2,474.00**

**TOTAL AMOUNT REQUESTED: \$2,474.00**

Please see attached written estimate from Ben Model.

## **General Education Project Summary: Silent Film presentation(s) at Shippensburg University with live piano accompaniment by Ben Model.**

**Proposed by: Professor Margaret Lucia, Music & Theatre Arts and Interdisciplinary Arts Program**

### **Description of project/event; who can and will participate**

The Music and Film course (MUS 216 – 01/02) is in its inaugural semester at Shippensburg University this fall; it is the first time such a course has been offered and, from all accounts, students and faculty in multiple disciplines—Interdisciplinary Arts, Theatre, English, and others, as well as Music—are enthusiastic about this addition to the General Education Arts curriculum (Creativity/Arts theme).

In order to call attention to the interdisciplinary nature and the broad appeal of this subject matter (film and its music is an art form that is experienced by all), we have scheduled an event that is truly unique to Shippensburg University.

On Wednesday, October 9, at 7:30 p.m., Ben Model, resident silent film accompanist at the Museum of Modern in New York City and the Library of Congress, will perform original live piano music in accompaniment to a 1920's silent film in the Luhrs Performing Arts Center. He will also provide brief commentary and context. The following day, he will give a lecture/demonstration on the history and practice of silent film accompaniment, for each of the two sections of the Music and Film class in the regular classroom, (PAC 235). Both the Wednesday concert and the classroom lectures are open to the entire campus and community. (Space is, of course, limited in the classroom, but we welcome all who are interested, as much as we can accommodate.) In addition, this is an event that is appropriate for all ages—school-age children through college and community adults. We will use all possible means in order to publicize this event to the campus and surrounding region.

Mr. Model is one of a handful of performers who have this unique musical ability and historical knowledge to accompany silent film. More information about his activities, qualifications and silent film music is available on his website: <https://www.silentfilmmusic.com/>

### **Support of General Education Learning Objectives**

The Learning Objectives for the Arts Curriculum are as follows:

*The student communicates clearly and precisely, with sufficient observational detail about the work of art. (Descriptive communication)*

*The student uses appropriate and discipline specific vocabulary to identify and prioritize the significant artistic elements found in the work while also analyzing the context surrounding its creation. (Analysis and content)*

*The student provides interpretation that expresses an articulate, thoughtful, and personal response to the meaning of a work of art, considering the relevance of the work at a variety of levels*

*(symbolic, metaphorical, emotional, cultural, artistic, historical, contemporary. (Interpretation and response)*

This event/classroom lecture-demonstration clearly supports these program goals. In addition to required attendance at the event, the students in the Music and Film classes will be assigned a paper to write in response to this event in which they will be asked to describe the event using discipline specific vocabulary (which they have been learning this semester), and, further, to offer a critical analysis of the film and the music's relationship to that film in terms of its cultural, historical, social and artistic significance in light of their personal responses to the viewing/listening experience.

Also, students in related courses—Introduction to Interdisciplinary Arts, Introduction to Theatre, Introduction to Music, and Art of the Film classes, among others, may use this event as a part of required elements in their coursework. For example, in my Introduction to Interdisciplinary Arts section, I will strongly encourage students to choose this event for one of their two required Arts Critiques.



Ben Model  
176 West 87th Street, Apt 1D  
New York, NY 10024-2902

original music scores for silent film

---

September 12, 2019

Margaret Lucia  
Shippensburg University  
1871 Old Main Drive  
Shippensburg PA 17257

### **OUTLINE OF COSTS FOR SILENT FILM EVENTS**

performing original live musical score on piano  
in accompaniment to 1920s silent film TBD,  
event to be held in in Luhrs Performing Arts Center .....\$ 1,000.00

screening license fee for Blu-ray edition of 1920s  
silent film TBD ..... 350.00

class lecture-demo with powerpoint on history  
and practice of silent film accompaniment,  
for 2 classes at \$500 each ..... 1,000.00

Amtrak round-trip from NYC/Penn Station to Harrisburg, PA ..... 124.00

---

**ESTMATE TOTAL ..... \$ 2,474.00**

# Attachment J

## *GECPC Minutes—April 16, 2019*

Present: Kathryn Shirk, Sherri Bergsten, Michael Greenburg, Brian Ulrich, Kirk Moll, Jennifer Clements, Karl Lorenz, Scott Drzyzga, and Brian Wentz

Guest: Karen Johnson

1. Approval of Minutes from 3/19/19 (Lorenz/Ulrich)—1 abstain
2. UCC Program Proposals: None received
3. UCC Course Proposals:
  - a. UCC18-199 AEES 190 – Writing Theory Tutoring and Praxis (Proposed “R” Special Topics course)
    - Reviewed revised syllabus submitted
    - Proposal to recommend to GEC as a “190” course for “R” (Greenburg/Lorenz)—all in favor
4. UCC—GEC course policy: discussion of minor changes to the revised UCC General Education form for sharing at the next GEC meeting (changes only intended to make application process clearer and more consistent). The form would then need UCC approval.
5. Calibration and Assessment Planning meetings are underway.
  - a. “O” met on 4/15/19:
    - Program level assessment revisions are ongoing within the department. Faculty members are in working groups based on their areas of specialization, and they are redefining department learning objectives and assessment for HCS 100.
    - HCS department would like to see this program goal as more than “public speaking.”
      1. “Supporting Material” learning objective could be revised.
      2. “Delivery” learning objective might change to address verbal and non-verbal communication.
      3. “Organization” learning objective might instead address audience analysis.
    - As HCS department works through their program level revisions, they will assist with the modification of the GE program goal rubric for “O.”
    - Dr. Amy May will bring the department edits of the rubric to the GE Program Committee in Fall 2019 (by the end of September) in hopes of discussion, recommendation to full GEC, and approval for inclusion in program revision in November.
  - b. “U” will meet on 4/17/19.
  - c. “W” will meet on 4/19/19.

# Attachment K

UCC CONTROL # \_\_\_\_\_

SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE  
**COURSE PROPOSAL**  
(New Course or Revision of Existing Course)

DEPARTMENT: Physics

COLLEGE: Arts & Sciences

SPONSOR: Michael Cohen

PHONE/E-MAIL: x1113/mrcohe@ship.edu

COURSE TITLE: Intermediate Physics I

PROPOSED COURSE NUMBER: PHY 205

TITLE ABBREVIATION (*Limited to 30 characters*): Inter. Physics I

APPROVAL DATE:

ACTION (check one): Delete Course \_\_\_\_\_ Add Course \_\_\_\_\_ Revise Course X\_\_\_\_\_

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: 8/2019

LEVEL: Undergraduate X Graduate \_\_\_\_\_ Mixed Graduate and Undergraduate: \_\_\_\_\_

ARE YOU ALSO SEEKING DISTANCE EDUCATION APPROVAL (ONLINE) Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No X\_\_\_\_\_

DESCRIPTION CHANGE: (Change in course number, name, or catalog description only): Yes or No Yes\_\_\_\_\_ (Existing Courses Only – See Section I)

FACULTY RESOURCES TO DELIVER COURSE: \_\_\_\_\_ Existing Course Dropped X Verification Grid (New Courses Only – See Section IV)

DIVERSITY COURSE DISTINCTION: Yes or No No\_\_\_\_\_

GRADE TYPE: Standard grading system or Pass/Fail Standard\_\_\_\_\_

CREDIT HOURS: 3\_\_\_\_\_

WORK LOAD EQUIVALENCY: 1/4 FTEF\_\_\_\_\_

SCHEDULE TYPE (see the instructions for the code to enter here): LE\_\_\_\_\_

INSTRUCTION METHOD (see the instructions for the code to enter here): 99\_\_\_\_\_

EQUIVALENT COURSE(S): n/a

CO-REQUISITE(S): none

PRE-REQUISITES (Include Minimum Grade and Concurrency): MAT 211 (may be concurrent)

RESTRICTIONS (Notate Include or Exclude): none

## SECTION I. INFORMATION FOR MINOR REVISION OF EXISTING COURSES

(Sponsors of New Courses may skip to Section II)

Note: Minor Revisions are defined by the UCC as course name changes, course number changes, or updating or rewording a course's catalog description in a way that does not significantly alter the nature of a course's content. All other revisions constitute the creation of a new course. Please answer all sections, indicating "not applicable" to any items that do not apply to your proposal.

- A. CURRENT NUMBER AND TITLE OF COURSE:
  - a. Proposed Change - none
  - b. Justification - n/a
- B. CURRENT CATALOG COURSE DESCRIPTION:
  - a. Proposed Change - Remove PHY123 co-requisite/pre-requisite.
  - b. Justification - PHY124 has a pre-/co-requisite of PHY 205. Removing the prerequisite here will simplify registration for PHY205 of students not requiring a laboratory science.
- C. PROGRAM CHANGE:
  - a. Proposed Change - new requirement for physics majors.
  - b. Justification - (see program revision)
  - c. Impact on other programs or departments - Programs requiring PHY 205 will need to have PHY124 as the concurrent lab in place of PHY123.
  - d. Impact on resources - none.
  - e. Impact on Student Learning Outcomes and Assessment - none.

## SECTIONS II-V. INFORMATION FOR NEW COURSE PROPOSALS

### SECTION II : NEW COURSE INFORMATION AND CURRICULUM CONSIDERATIONS

CATALOG COURSE DESCRIPTION:

CREDITS:

JUSTIFICATION FOR NEW COURSE:

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT:

- A: List the learning outcomes for the course (Outcomes are developed by completing the sentence "Upon successful completion of this course, the student will be able to...")
- B. List the assessment methods and link the methods to the learning outcomes.

CURRICULUM CONSIDERATIONS:

1. How will this course impact General Education?

2. For whom is this course intended, e.g., your department majors? Non-majors currently taking your department's courses? Non-majors currently taking courses outside your department?
3. How may the credit be counted in a degree program? How does the course fit into your curriculum?
4. What is the estimated frequency of the course offering? How many sections of this course will be offered initially? How often will this course be offered, e.g., every semester, once per year, once every two years . . . ? What are the projected offerings over the next five years?
5. Do similar courses exist in other departments? If so, which course(s)? Explain how this course does not duplicate the course in another department. Provide justification that this course is needed and does not conflict with offerings in other departments. What resource impact will this course have on other departments? Provide details regarding impact. (Consult with other departments prior to making the proposal.)
6. Does this course replace or overlap an existing course? If so, which course and how? If this is a new course, how will it be accommodated into the existing course structure? Please attach a three-year verification grid (Section IV--see sample grid at the end of the proposal) that will demonstrate how the course will be accommodated.
7. What course(s) will not be taught as a result of shifting resources to this new course?
8. If you project growth in the offerings, what is the expected impact on other courses, sections, or students?
9. What methods of instruction and learning will be used?
10. If you are seeking DE approval, explain how the course objectives will be met through an online format as well as how the course will be assessed.

**SECTION III. SUPPORT SERVICES:** Complete this section for **ALL new course proposals**.

1. Can this course be taught by several members of the faculty in the department, or is it restricted to a specialist in the field? Indicate likely instructors. (If a specialist is needed to teach this course, please provide the rationale.)
2. What additional costs are anticipated over the next calendar year by instituting this course? (Faculty, supplies, equipment, facilities, e.g.: classroom space, laboratory space, or support personnel.)
3. Will this course require any computing resources? (use of a microcomputer laboratory, use of the mainframe computer, additional software or recommendation that students should buy computers and/or software)
4. What additional library resources will be required? Has the library been consulted to determine the adequacy of library holdings or to estimate the cost to improve these sufficiently?

**SECTION IV: RESOURCE IMPACT:** In order to offer a new course, departments must adjust current course offerings. State how often the new course will be taught and indicate the sections that will be dropped to accommodate this change by completing a VERIFICATION GRID like the one below that will show how the course will fit into a department's existing teaching load. Include all faculty likely to be affected by the new course.

<b>Sample Verification Grid for one semester</b>				
<b>Please include projections for at least three years</b>				
TERM	FACULTY	COURSE	CREDITS	PROJECTED ENROLLMENT
Spring Year 1	Faculty A	Chair	3	
Spring Year 1	Faculty A	Intro 1	3	25
Spring Year 1	Faculty A	Intro 2	3	25

Spring Year 1	Faculty A	Intro 3	3	25
Spring Year 1	Faculty B	Intro 4	3	25
Spring Year 1	Faculty B	Intro 5	3	25
Spring Year 1	Faculty B	Intro 6	3	25
Spring Year 1	Faculty B	Special 1	3	35
Spring Year 1	Faculty C	Intro 7	3	25
Spring Year 1	Faculty C	Intro 8	3	25
Spring Year 1	Faculty C	Intro 9	3	25
Spring Year 1	Faculty C	Special 2	3	35
Fall Year 1	Faculty A	etc., through three years		

**SECTION V: COURSE SYLLABUS:** Please provide a detailed syllabus showing course objectives, assessment methods, and assignments. The syllabus should provide enough detail so that readers can obtain a reasonable understanding of the course’s workload, topics, and structure. Please note that syllabi for all 400-level courses must clearly differentiate additional requirements and expectations for students planning to register for graduate credit.

**Note: UCC will not act on proposals until the minutes of all appropriate councils documenting approval have been received. If suggestions or recommendations have been made at the council level, a revised proposal must be provided to UCC. If revisions are recommended by UCC, a final copy must be provided to the UCC Chair and Secretary before the proposal will be presented to the Forum.**

# Attachment L

UCC CONTROL # \_\_\_\_\_

SHIPPENSBURG UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA  
UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COMMITTEE  
**PROGRAM REVISION**

(Use for program changes which involve multiple revisions; changes to core, minor, concentrations; realignment of courses; and other extensive revisions.)

COLLEGE: Arts and Sciences

DATE:

DEPARTMENT: Physics

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: 8/2020

SPONSOR: Physics (Michael Cohen)

PHONE/E-MAIL: x1113, mrcohe@ship.edu

**PROPOSED REVISION:**

(List and explain all changes. Attach copy of current program and proposed program.)

We propose to revise the course offerings and requirements for the Physics Core, affecting all new physics majors and physics programs. The first year physics seminar, PHY 107, will no longer be required. The first physics sequence, PHY 221-2 (Fundamentals of Physics I – II), will no longer be required. Instead, all physics majors will be required to complete PHY 205-6 (Intermediate Physics I – II) with the new, related laboratories PHY 124 and 126. Additionally, a third course - PHY 207 (Intermediate Physics III) - will be added to the sequence with its new, related lab, PHY 127. (Please see the relevant course proposals. In particular, the labs for PHY 205-6 will now be distinct from the labs for PHY 121-2 to accommodate the needs of the Physics Department and the considerations of Engineering.) This change will not affect the lecture courses offered to other science majors, but will alter the labs accompanying those lectures for Chemistry and Engineering majors. The lab changes will better align the lab procedures with the level of the lectures.

**JUSTIFICATION:** The numbers and background preparation of entering physics majors has changed in recent years, concurrent with the introduction of new engineering degree programs. Most entering majors now have the necessary math background to begin the physics curriculum in the Fall of their first year. Of those lacking in math preparation, many require two semesters of math before they are prepared for calculus-based physics. This change in requirements aligns our programs with this alteration. Further, the launch of UNIV 101 alleviates the need for a physics-specific first year experience.

**RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS:**

1. How will this change affect program resources? Will additional sections of courses need to be added? What equivalent sections of courses will be deleted?

Program resources will not in principle be affected. The needed FTEF for PHY 207/127 is met by that released from PHY 107 and the reduction in credit hours from PHY 221-2 to PHY 205-6. Creation of the PHY 124 and 126 lab sections will be met from an equal reduction in PHY 123 and 125 lab sections, presently scheduled by PHY 205-6 students. Further, growth in engineering enrollment already requires serious consideration of augmenting department resources independent of this program revision.

2. Will this change affect resources of other departments? If so, how? Provide details regarding impact. (Consult with other departments prior to making proposal.)

Other departments presently requiring PHY205/123 and PHY 206/125 will need to update the lab requirement accompanying the lecture courses, i.e. PHY 123 to PHY 124 and PHY 125 to PHY 126. Similar practice is already in place in other departments (Chemistry and Computer Science).

3. How will this program be assessed? Assessment will continue in the current methods used by the Physics Department (uniform general exam for upper division students) and so can be compared with existing history.

Attach appropriate forms (new courses, course revisions) for any additional changes involved in the program revision (current and new program sheets; verification grid outlining how program changes will be covered, etc)..

**Note: UCC will not act on proposals until the minutes of all appropriate councils documenting approval have been received. If suggestions or recommendations have been made at the council level, a revised proposal must be provided to UCC. If UCC recommends revisions, a final copy must be provided to the UCC Chair and Secretary before proposal will be presented to the Forum.**