Minutes
General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday, September 14th, 2021

Zoom link: https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992
2:30-4:30 p.m.
GERC’s website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Mark Cooper, Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Joann Trimmer, (UCC), Catherine Read
Excused: Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements
   • Reminder about mock Site Visit this Thursday at 1:00-1:45 p.m. All GERC members are invited, though a couple members have said they have conflicts and cannot make it.
   • GERC Executive Committee met with Carmen Febles, UCC chair, on Friday and agreed on a trial basis this year to have the UCC and GERC chairs attend each other’s Executive Committee meetings instead of the full council meetings, unless there is some business that needs full council review or discussion.
   • Executive Committee decided to keep the updates and announcements at the beginning of meetings. If an update item needs more discussion, please inform the Executive Committee by Friday morning before the next GERC meeting so they can add it to the agenda as a business item.

2. Minutes for August 31, 2021 -- forthcoming for review next meeting

3. Updates and Information:
   a. Program Review & Assessment updates - Ann Hackert: none this week.
   b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson
      • SBOE is making some changes to the annual Gen Ed Summit usually held in October; more information will be forthcoming, but they are considering holding it in Spring 2022 since they prefer to have everyone there in person.
      • SBOE had its first reading of revisions to Policy III.N. relevant to General Education. The second reading to approve the revised Policy is scheduled for the October SBOE meeting.
   c. UCC update – Carmen Febles: none this week.

4 Unfinished Business:
   a. Physics Assessment Plans to be reviewed and considered for approval
      (Reference: Review Guide for General Education Course Assessment Plan)
      Members reviewed each of the Assessment Plans submitted by Physics and had several observations:
      • Council noted the form Physics used does not have the first question asking when each outcome will be assessed; GERC does need that question answered. Not all outcomes need to be assessed every year, so long as all outcomes are assessed at least once every 5 years. Objective 5 has five outcomes, so assessing one outcome per year would work very well.
      • Threshold question also is not in the form that Physics used; they appear to have used an old form.
      • Suggest that instead of using target percentages, the department should choose specific questions correlated to the individual outcomes to measure how well students are performing on each outcome separately.
      • Not all plans include indirect assessment measures; that is not a requirement so not a problem if the department does not intend to review syllabi or other indirect measures. If they are collecting
syllabi, then explain how the indirect measures will be used in assessment. GERC has not yet made a determination whether to require indirect measures.

- Clarify how assignments will be used to assess each outcome.
- Good random sampling is an efficient way of assessing courses with large enrollment.
- Pros and cons for having a single point person for Gen Ed assessment versus spreading the responsibility among multiple faculty within the department. Can be a burdensome workload for a single person.
- If grading criteria matches the Gen Ed Objective learning outcomes, it can be okay to use grades in assessment. However, if different criteria or program or course learning outcomes are used in grading student performance in addition to the gen ed learning outcomes, grades should not be used in the Gen Ed assessment.
- For now, not required to show rubrics in the Plans, since not all Plans GERC approved do include rubrics.
- Consider including who will be involved in evaluating instruments and assessing student performance, though it’s not required.
- Some concern that the 1000-level assignments appear to be the same as the 2000-level assignments; not clear whether more advanced responses are expected of the 2000-level students. The main difference between the course levels are the Math pre-requisites.
- Matt and Ann will get together and discuss GERC’s concerns for Ann to take back to the department to consider as they revise the Plans.

1) 2021 PHYS 1100 Assessment Plan
2) 2021 PHYS 1101 Assessment Plan
3) 2021 PHYS 1101L Assessment Plan
4) 2021 PHYS 1111 Assessment Plan
5) 2021 PHYS 1112 Assessment Plan
6) 2021 PHYS 1113 Assessment Plan
7) 2021 PHYS 1114 Assessment Plan
8) 2021 PHYS 1152 Assessment Plan
9) 2021 PHYS 1153 Assessment Plan
10) 2021 PHYS 2211 Assessment Plan
11) 2021 PHYS 2212 Assessment Plan
12) 2021 PHYS 2213 Assessment Plan
13) 2021 PHYS 2214 Assessment Plan

ACTION: Council’s consensus was to send the Plans back to Physics with comments for them to consider and revise the Plans accordingly.

b. Revisit Feedback Summaries created last Spring – finalize for sending to departments
   1) Objective 1, Objective 2, and Objective 7: (Matt and Jennifer)
   2) Objective 3 and Objective 5: (Ben and Erika)
   3) Objective 4: (Matt and DeWayne)
   4) Objective 6 and Objective 8: (Cathy and Joanne)
   5) Objective 9: (Shu-Yuan and Joanne)

Matt clarified the goal is to have a finalized feedback document for each 2019-20 annual report submitted that GERC can send to the departments as soon as possible ahead of the next round of assessment reports due November 1.

ACTION: Matt asked members to complete the Summaries by next Tuesday, Sept. 21, and then review the final versions in preparation for approving them during the September 28 meeting.

Reference documents for Feedback Summaries:
   1) 2019-20 Annual Assessment Reports submitted as of Aug. 25, 2021:
      Objective 1 annual reports  Objective 6 annual reports
      Objective 2 annual reports  Objective 7 annual reports
Due to time constraints, the rest of the agenda items were deferred until next time:

c. **GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment**
   Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (PoliSci)
   Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.

5. **New Business:**
   a. ANTH 2203 proposal as new Objective 8 course
   b. Discuss proposed replacements for state disciplinary group representatives:
      **Objective 3:** Xiaoxia (Jessica) Xie, (CoSE) and Don Allen, (CoT) - replacing Bob Fisher and Jim Wolper
      **Objective 4:** Ryan Babcock (CAL) - replacing Pat Brooks
      **Objective 6:** Kevin Marsh (CAL) - replacing Gesine Hearn

6. **Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:**
   a. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
   b. Revisit Process for Selecting ISU’s State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps
   c. **Objective Review Committee (ORC) Report Action Items**
      1) Consider suggested changes to **Objective 7** Outcomes 4 and 5
      2) Consider creating subcommittee to update **Objective 8** outcomes
   d. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine
   e. Pilot assessment project
   f. Revisit **Annual Assessment Report Questions** in Qualtrics
   g. Consider revising **GERC’s purpose statement** on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
   h. **Bylaws Revisions** – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
   i. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC
   j. ENGL 1101 assessment plan - forthcoming; hasn’t been submitted to GERC yet

7. **Adjourn:** 4:48 p.m.

Approved by GERC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot
Accepted by UCC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot
Accepted by Faculty Senate: October 25, 2021
Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 5, 2021