Minutes
General Education Requirements Committee
With ISU’s State Discipline Group representatives
Tuesday, 10 September 2019
Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance:
GERC: Spencer Jardine (Chair), Jennifer Attebery, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson,
Tayo Omotowa (telecom), Paul Cady
Discipline Group Reps: Lydia Wilkes, Jim DiSanza, Bob Fisher, DeWayne Derryberry, Cathy Kriloff,
Andy Holland, Eddie Tatar, Gesine Hearn
Excused: Hal Hellwig, Pat Brooks, Tom Klein, Erika Fulton; Ann Hackert,
Absent:
Ex-Officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper, Susanne Forrest, Geoffrey Bennett (UCC) Catherine
Read (Admin. Asst.)

1. Welcome and Introductions
   • Welcome State Gen Ed Representatives. Introductions all around.


3. Information & Updates – no discussion, information only
   a. SBOE/IRSA initiatives to be aware of:
      • Complete College America/Momentum Pathways (Game-changers)
      • Credit for Prior Learning
      • Open Educational Resources (OER)
      • Credit for CLEP and AP Exams – statewide alignment of credit articulation across institutions
   
   b. UARC (University Assessment & Review Committee) update
      • NILOA coach coming to ISU and will attend GERC’s Oct. 22 meeting; developing 2-3
        outcomes for the group for 2019-2020

4. Upcoming GERC due dates: no discussion, information only
   a. September 20, 2019 – all new Gen Ed course proposals/assessment plans
   b. October 1, 2019 – send reminder to department chairs that Objectives 5 and 6 are due for 5-Year
      Review this January
   c. November 1, 2019 – annual Gen Ed Course Assessment Reports – one report per Gen Ed course
   d. January 7, 2020 – 5-Year Reports for Objective 5 and Objective 6 courses
   e. January 8, 2020 – appoint GERC members to chair the Objective Review Committees for Obj 5 & 6
   f. April 1, 2020 – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports

5. GERC concerns/recommendations for statewide Gen Ed Committee and Objective Discipline Groups
   a. Gen Ed Summit Sept 19 & 20 in Boise – Objectives and Rubrics are posted on SBOE’s website
      under “related” on the right-hand side of the webpage (the Rubrics are a new addition to the
      Objectives – they have apparently become official)
      • possible changes to learning outcomes for each Objective – are the learning outcomes suitable for
        effective assessment, and do they identify core elements of the subject area as intended?
      • specific recommendations from ORC Reports for Objectives 1 thru 4
      • disparity of dual credit instructor qualifications across colleges is an ongoing concern

   b. GERC Reports: 2018 + 2019
Discussion:

**Objective 1 Written Communication:** Early College Program and high school teachers’ qualifications are of great concern regarding ENGL 1101 and 1102 courses. Students who took ECP English courses in high school are struggling in their subsequent classes. At college, students do not get the same one-on-one contact time they experience in high school, and do not always know to seek out their professors during office hours. Objective 1 was recently reviewed by assessment experts outside ISU and received two recommendations which are now being implemented:

- Final assignments in ENGL 1101 & 1102: survey is being conducted to find out what final assignments are being used for assessment and how well the students are doing. Are the assignments similar, or are they comparing apples to oranges to zebras? Aiming to figure out common elements/criteria for final assignments.
- Teach conceptual content, which would be a new outcome. Will require a significant shift in current practices. Next year will select new content to incorporate, and develop a new mission statement.

There is also the question on how well HONS 1101 fits into Objective 1; seems to be a stretch to include it. Honors, Bengal Bridge, ECP, and College of Technology all teach Objective 1 courses, so their data and artifacts have to be included in the annual report as well.

**Objective 2 Oral Communication:** Jim DiSanza reported he and his counterparts are happy with the learning outcomes as written. His group had carefully revised the outcomes a couple of years ago. Concern expressed later in the meeting about the large number of diverse courses some institutions have designated as Objective 2 courses -- do they really have sufficient oral communication content to belong to this Objective? How are we managing the removal of Gen Ed courses through the assessment process?

**Objective 3 Mathematical Ways of Knowing:** Hard to write learning outcomes that are effective for all the Math courses. Math in Modern Society is undefined and amorphous, unlike College Algebra and Statistics. DeWayne Derryberry is involved with Complete College America and Momentum Pathways work group which is trying to help determine which Gen Ed courses students should take for their particular program.

**Objective 4 Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing:** Current learning outcomes appear to be well written, revisions may not be warranted. Faculty consensus is that dual-credit literature courses in high schools are watered down. Languages are an uncomfortable fit, but it would be difficult to move them out of this Objective – where would they be put? Languages follow their accrediting bodies’ curriculum. Objective 4 Review report recommends against adding any more courses to this objective; instead, consider winnowing it down to fewer courses.

**Objective 5 Scientific Ways of Knowing:** Be cautious in making major changes to the outcomes. Outcome #5 is either redundant or only applies to lab course. Many dual-credit BIOL and CHEM courses are taught at high schools. Ensure careful review of non-College of Science & Engineering courses to make sure they fit this Objective. Concerns that online courses are not equivalent to in-seat courses. Labs in particular are a problem; students are not prepared for the coursework. University of Idaho did a good thing when they increased the Calculus-based Physics courses from 2 semesters to 3 semesters. This will be raised at the discipline group sessions.

**Objective 6 Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing:** Gesine Hearn reported her Discipline Group has been trying for a couple of years to require all 5 competencies, not just 4 of the 5. Including upper division courses in Gen Ed program is quite problematic and does not seem to fit the spirit of a broad based General Education. Frustration expressed in the Discipline Groups that the faculty members work hard in their groups to make good, solid recommendations that appear to be subsequently ignored by the State Board Office.

Concerns across all Objectives:
• Early College Program teacher qualifications are a major concern that has never been discussed at the state level. No incentives for high school principals to care about quality or rigor of dual-credit courses. Need to ensure more consistency in acceptable qualifications.
• Suggestion to assign high schools to the university and/or colleges in their own region instead of letting them range statewide to choose the least stringent dual-credit institution.
• High schools are not teaching their dual-credit courses at university level. Big difference between courses taught 5 days a week in controlled high school environment versus 3 days a week on university campus where attendance is not mandatory. Variance between AP tests and dual-enrollment courses.
• Bottom line: Dual-enrollment students simply are not prepared for college.

6. Assessment Plans still missing: Physics (all) and MATH 1143 & 1147 – no action yet

7. Other Business
   Any substantive revisions to assessment plans will need to be reviewed and approved by GERC.

9. Adjourn: 4:20 p.m.

Approved by GERC: October 12, 2019
Accepted by UCC: October 24, 2019
Accepted by Faculty Senate: October 28, 2019
Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 8, 2019