

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 25 September 2015
Faculty Senate Conference Room
2:30-4:05 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Teresa Casey, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Jordan Withers (ASISU)
Ex-Officio: Bob Houghton (UCC rep), Jacque Baergen, Margaret Johnson, Sarah Mead
Absent: Janette Olsen
Admin. Asst: Catherine Read
Guests: none

1. Andy – Gave an overview of the work that has been done on the Gen Ed Assessment plan. Immediate business is to review departments' Course Assessment plans, as well as any new Gen Ed course proposals. Must be vetted and approved by end of this semester. All documents and information are posted on GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gened
2. Timeline for meetings – how will we accomplish all of this work in the three meetings after the Oct 1 due date? Delegate different objectives across GERC member:
 - a. OBJ 1, 2, and 4: Jim Skidmore, Matt Wilson
 - b. OBJ 3 and 5: Andy Holland and Jim Wolper
 - c. OBJ 6 and 7: Teresa Casey and Jon Holmes
 - d. OBJ 8 and 9: Karen Appleby and Sandi ShropshireStill unassigned: Janette Olsen and the permanent ASISU rep, whoever that may be.
3. Step #1: Contact chairs and program directors – remind them of what is expected. All of us should reach out to constituents to get assessment plans done by Oct. 1.
Key points –
 - a. each Gen Ed course needs a detailed plan on how the course meets the state-specified Gen Ed outcomes
 - b. these plans need to include the review process and assessment instruments (assignments, writing prompts, actual quizzes and exams),
 - c. offer our help.

Discussion:

- a. evaluation might need to be less stringent the first time through, but each assessment plan must be workable. No grandfathering this time.
- b. develop a checklist of specific things that need to be included in assessment plans would be helpful in evaluating them. At a minimum:
 - i. Is procedure is organized enough to be workable?
 - ii. Will it allow the assessment information gathered to be used to:
 - 1) improve their courses, and
 - 2) prove to an accrediting body that the Gen Ed curriculum actually accomplishes the desired goals
 - iii. Do the assessment instruments described adequately assess the outcomes prescribed by the state, and meet the rigor required for college Gen Ed courses.

- c. GERC reps will communicate deficiencies found in assessment plans to their constituent department chairs and request rectification.
 - d. Academic Affairs is working with the ISU Records Manager on how long we have to keep this information, and clarification on retention of student work and issues of confidentiality
4. Reviewed Course Assessments for TGE 1140 and TGE 1135. GERC agrees both need more information; also recognizes the difficulty of assessing new courses that do not yet exist. These will be **remanded** back to the department.
 5. Course Proposal for TGE 1140
Motion: Move that we remand the proposal for more detail (Jim S. motion, Teresa C. second)
8 **approved**, 0 abstentions, 0 opposed
 6. Course Proposal for TGE 1135
Motion#1: Move to reject (Jim S., Sandi second -- withdrawn). Motion died.
Motion #2: Move to **remand** with major modifications (Teresa C. motion) Second (Matt W.)
Favor: 7, Opposed: 0, Abstain, 1
 7. Andy reminded everyone GERC needs to revisit the Gen Ed Course Proposal Form; there are some deficiencies found over time that should be addressed at some point.

Approved by GERC:	September 8, 2015
Accepted by UCC:	September 17, 2015
Accepted by Academic Affairs:	September 29, 2015

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 8 September 2015
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Bob Houghton (UCC), Jacque Baergen, Catherine Read
Excused: Jordan Withers, Sarah Mead
Absent: Teresa Casey, Lori Austill

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes from August 25, 2015
Motion: to approve the minutes; **approved** with one abstention
3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items
UCC Minutes for August 27, 2015 – no comments

Houghton reported UCC's concern that the original changes in ISU's gen ed program has adversely affected graduate students by eliminating several courses or sections they were normally assigned to teach. The Graduate School was left out of the planning process. Future proposed changes to gen eds or other major university programs should include all constituents and stake holders to adequately address impacts before changes are implemented.

UCC catalog proposal submissions are due soon. Any new gen ed course proposals that come to GERC will take top priority so as not to delay UCC's work on the corresponding catalog proposals.

4. ISU representation on SBOE Gen Ed groups. Should GERC play a role in selecting delegates to state discipline groups? (Margaret Johnson)

Holland outlined the SBOE's Gen Ed committee structure: An SBOE Gen Ed committee oversees a steering committee with 1 representative from each institution, which in turn oversees subcommittees for each of the 6 GEM Objectives. Those Objective subcommittees have up to 3 faculty representatives from each institution, and meet annually. They are responsible for state-wide guidelines for learning outcomes, assessment, and other requirements for gen ed programs. In the past, deans were asked to submit names to Academic Affairs of faculty members to serve on the subcommittees, with no further vetting. Johnson asked the council if GERC should have a role in selecting ISU's faculty representatives for those subcommittees. Several selection options were discussed.

The **consensus** was that GERC should review and approve appointments of proposed faculty representatives for all state-level Gen Ed committees, and post them on GERC's website. Also establish a reporting mechanism for those reps to keep GERC informed of the state subcommittee's and steering committee's activities and discussions. It also would be worth

considering having GERC members serve on those committees; the additional work would be offset by the valuable insights and improved communication lines gained from seeing both sides of the coin. Holland will contact the chairs of Faculty Senate and UCC to get their feedback on these ideas. If accepted, it would require changes to GERC's bylaws. Holland will draft the bylaws changes for review next week. Johnson will forward the names of the proposed SBOE task force reps to GERC for consideration next meeting.

Johnson reported the Gen Ed steering committee meets this Friday; she will update GERC on its proceedings. The Gen Ed Objective task forces meet in December.

5. Preparing for Course Assessment Plans

- a. Input, questions, or concerns from departments? None, other than “what are we supposed to do?”
- b. Should we try to standardize the achievement level categories for rubrics used to describe assessment results? (Jim Skidmore)
 - Need several categories, not just “yes/no”
 - If have a category “inadequate”, should be okay that some students will fall into that category. The key would be to show how the inadequacies are being addressed and show continuous improvement.
 - A source of concern is if students pass the course, but do not learn the expected outcomes.
 - Another concern would be if a large percentage of students are failing. Students are the outcomes of the assessment, not the assessment instruments.
 - Gen Ed assessment does not necessarily correlate with grades; grading is somewhat problematic as an assessment tool.

c. Rubrics for Course Assessment Plans

Create a checklist to guide GERC's work in assessing the rubrics. Discussion of the variations from discipline to discipline, program accreditation requirements. Some courses have national rubrics that will be followed, whether those meet this assessment mandate or not. But those courses still need to meet gen ed criteria. Removing a particular course from the Gen Ed list could be a productive result if the course fulfills its niche well but does not fit the gen ed structure. Need some guidance regarding retention of student work and stay in compliance with FERPA guidelines.

Tentative checklist – to be posted on GERC's website:

1. Does the plan outline a clear schedule for both the collection and review of assessment information, and indicate who will be responsible for these actions?
2. Does the plan collect data in a way that accurately represents the entire course, encompassing multiple instructors and delivery formats? (If only a selection of students are assessed, are they adequate in number and selected randomly?)
3. Are the direct assessment instruments appropriate to the learning outcomes they are intended to assess? Do they have appropriate rigor, response format, and evaluation criteria/process? Is the required number of learning outcomes adequately assessed?

4. Is there a clear and reasonable procedure for the recording and tabulation of summary assessment data from original instruments?
5. Is it clear that assessment data will be used productively to improve course content and delivery?

If departments or programs change their assessment plans, they will need to submit the revised assessment plans to GERC for approval.

d. Select objectives for Janette and Jordan

Janette: Objectives 8 & 9

Jordan has not been reassigned as the ASISU rep on GERC this year.

i. Preliminary Draft Assessment Plans for discussion purposes

Reviewed and discussed the preliminary draft assessment plans prepared by Holland and Skidmore as test cases. Suggestions will be incorporated and the revised drafts will be posted on GERC's website as examples.

- a. Draft CHEM 1111/1111L Assessment Plan -- Andy Holland
- b. DRAFT PHIL 1101 Assessment Plan -- Jim Skidmore
- c. Draft Philosophy Gen Ed Assessment Rubric -- Jim Skidmore

6. Incoming Proposals and Plans (none received as yet)

- a. Course Proposals
- b. Assessment Plans

7. Adjourn: 4:39 p.m.

Next meeting: September 22, 2015

Approved by GERC: October 13, 2015

Accepted by UCC: October 15, 2015

Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 18, 2015

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 22 September 2015
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Jon Holmes, Teresa Casey, Spencer Jardine (for Sandi Shropshire), Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Bob Houghton (UCC), Jacque Baergen, Sarah Mead, Lori Austill, Catherine Read
Excused: Karen Appleby
Absent: none

1. Announcements
2. Minutes from **September 8, 2015** – *deferred until next time*
3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items
 - a. UCC Minutes for **August 27, 2015** and **September 3, 2015**
 - b. Faculty Senate Minutes for **August 31, 2015**

4. State General Education Committee Meeting Report (Margaret Johnson)

Johnson reported most of the discussion in the long meeting focused on the disparity of minimum grade policies for Gen Ed grades allowed by Idaho's higher ed institutions – some require a minimum grade of "C", some allow "D"s. The committee decided to leave the status quo for now since this cannot be easily reconciled since it has ramifications for each institution, but the matter may arise again in the future. Also discussed were institution-specific categories, granting certificates for completing a gen ed program or an institutionally designated gen ed course. Subgroup is working on resolving dilemma of credit transfers from institutions on quarter system. A student earns 5.3 credits in a category on quarter system vs. earning 6 credits on semester system, which causes them to come up short for graduation. What has been happening is institutions allow the student to pick one course from among any of the gen eds to fill out the 36-credit minimum. Goal is not to create more problems for transfer credits. Oregon and Washington schools are on quarter systems; transfer students have taken the required gen ed courses, just don't have quite the same number of credits they would have had on the semester system. Question for GERC is how many credits is enough?

Suggestion this is an argument for examining the learning outcomes instead of the number of credits – did the student get the same content in fewer weeks? Count classes instead of credits. One concern is the new gen ed 36-credit requirement is minimal already. It is only a question whether the students have to take a minimum number of credits from each particular category, or do they have freedom to take the additional credits from whichever gen ed courses they choose. A 1-credit course will not count, but the 2.3 credits would count as equivalent to a 3-credit ISU course, except for the credits granted. Only affects the 2-course Objectives, now that the new GEM system specifies number of credits for each

Objective. Discussion. Consensus seemed to be that maintain status quo for now, and come back to this issue later. Would help to have a couple of specific “dummy” examples to examine instead of a theoretical system. Mead will provide some case studies for GERC to consider. Discussed how Degree Works handles these problems. Goal is to achieve diversity in gen ed courses.

Idaho Transfer website: idtransfer.org. Students can get a list of gen ed courses by category or by institution and compare. College of Western Idaho is not accredited on its own yet, but they have created a set of learning outcomes for their gen ed courses which could help guide GERC in developing an assessment plan for ISU’s Gen Ed Program as a whole. Suggestion to meet with all of ISU’s statewide Gen Ed Assessment committee members to make sure all are on same page.

Johnson said Provost Woodworth-Ney wanted GERC’s opinion on how ISU should handle transfer credits for MATH 143 and Objective 3. Currently ISU and EITEC are the only Idaho institutions that do not allow MATH 143 to fulfill Objective 3. The Provost was concerned that ISU students are not getting same gen ed credit that other non-ISU students do. The main problem is with the sequence: MATH 1143 is a technical “how-to” skills-building course to teach students the fundamentals they need for more advanced courses, not a well-rounded gen ed class. Students that change their major will discover the requirements are different, and courses for one major are not suitable for another. GERC’s consensus was that under the current GEM Objective rubrics, no changes should be made. There are only a handful of students this affects, mostly transfer students or those who change their majors mid-stream.

5. Proposed GERC bylaws addition:

Article II -- Purpose

The purpose of the GERC is: to consider all courses and policies that relate to the University’s general education requirements; to evaluate, on a regular basis, the university’s general education courses for appropriateness, rigor, and assessment; to approve appointment of ISU representatives to external bodies with jurisdiction over ISU’s general education curriculum; and to make general education curricular recommendations based on these evaluations to the UCC. The General Education Objectives [as proposed in 2011] are to be reviewed on a staged 5 year cycle (meaning that not all of the Objectives need be evaluated at once).

Motion to approve, seconded. **Approved** unanimously (8-0-0)

Johnson will forward the list of candidate names to Holland for GERC to consider next meeting.

6. Incoming Proposals and Plans

a. Course Proposals:

*New Obj 3 TGE 1140 **revised** Gen Ed proposal (new course)

Not Vector analysis meant, just Vector algebra. Basic question: is the material in this course at a level that meets the rigor for a MATH course? A syllabus and/or sample exam questions would be helpful for the council to see what the students will be learning.

Motion: to **remand** for changes discussed, need more detail. Seconded. Motion **passed** (7 for, 1 abstention)

*New Obj 6 TGE 1150 Gen Ed proposal (new course -- replaces TGE 1135 remanded proposal)

Motion: to approve. Seconded. **Approved.** (6 for, 1 opposed, 1 abstention)

New Obj 7 CMP 2205 Gen Ed proposal (existing course)

Motion: to approve. Seconded. **Approved.** (6 for, 0 opposed, 2 abstention)

*New Obj 7 GEOL 1107 Gen Ed proposal (new course)

Some concern about catchy title; does not convey the seriousness appropriate for a university.

Motion to approve **with recommendation that UCC revisit the course title.**
Approved. (7 for, 0 opposed, 1 abstention)

**has corresponding UCC proposal awaiting GERC's decision*

b. Assessment Plans – *deferred until next time due to time constraints*

New Obj 3 TGE 1140 **revised** Assessment Plan

New Obj 6 TGE 1150 Assessment Plan (replaces TGE 1135 remanded plan)

New Obj 7 CMP 2205 Assessment Plan

New Obj 7 GEOL 1107 Assessment Plan

New Obj 7 GEOL 1107 Assessment Rubric

Obj 4 PHIL 1101 **revised** Assessment Plan (posted as sample on website)

Obj 4 PHIL 1101 **revised** Gen Ed Assessment Rubric (posted as sample on website)

Obj 5 CHEM 1111/1111L **revised** Assessment Plan (posted as sample on website)

Johnson said SBOE changed Obj 1 to require 6 credits, also changed the outcomes. New ENGL 1101 course proposal will be forthcoming from English. Will also require a revision to the Objective 1 Rubric and Learning Outcomes. Due date for this course proposal has already passed. Jennifer Attebery attended the meeting and is well aware of the discussion points. Obj 1 is aiming for skill competencies instead of ways of knowing.

7. Remaining assessment questions

- a. What is the procedure for amending assessment plans?
- b. General policies for the retention of student work throughout assessment. (see Provost Q & A document)
- c. Can we distribute policy on these issues when we approve course assessment plans?

Next meeting is in 3 weeks. Start reviewing and commenting on Google Docs in between meetings. Plan for next meeting is to start going through these Assessment Plans, starting with Obj 1 and progressing through.

8. Adjourn: 4:00 p.m.

Next meeting: October 13, 2015

Approved by GERC: October 13, 2015

Accepted by UCC: October 15, 2015

Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 18, 2015

Minutes
General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 13 October 2015
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, for Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Bob Houghton (UCC), Jacque Baergen, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read
Excused:
Absent: Teresa Casey; Lori Austill
Guest: Bryan Barclay (CoTech)

1. Announcements

2. Minutes from **September 8, 2015** and **September 22, 2015**

Motion to approve both sets with corrections. **Approved** with one abstention.

3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items

- a. UCC Minutes for September 24, 2015 and October 1, 2015
- b. Faculty Senate Minutes for September 14, 2014

4. Consider nominated representatives to SBOE gen ed discipline groups

Motion to approve the four nominees for the Social Science discipline group:

Michele Brumley, Psychology
Tara Letzring, Psychology
Wayne Gabardi, Political Science
Chris Loether, Anthropology

Approved unanimously.

Discussion of the nomination process and how GERC wants to handle their internal council business in the future.

5. ENGL 1101/1102 Issues

- a. What is the status of ENGL 1101?
English Dept. has confirmed it will submit a new proposal for ENGL 1101.
- b. Can we reevaluate ENGL 1102 for new learning outcome without new proposal?
Awaiting a response from English Dept., need proposal.

6. Process for removing a course from the gen ed program – GERC proposal? UCC proposal?

Other programs use gen ed courses in their curricula, so need to inform affected programs and departments with sufficient lead time so they can take the necessary steps to change their curricula accordingly. Two reasons for withdrawal: department decides course does not fit gen ed criteria, vs. GERC determines does not fit. Either way, it will require UCC proposal to make the catalog change. GERC has purview over Gen Ed program and courses. Discussion. GERC should create a form to be used to formally request withdrawing a course from the Gen Ed Program. Consensus: UCC Proposal needs to come through GERC, for its review and approval; may require an extra year to allow time for affected departments to respond and make necessary changes in their curricula. Once a course

loses its Gen Ed status, it must be given a new course number since the course content changed. Originator of the withdrawal request, whether department or GERC, would have to write and submit UCC proposal.

Chemistry department will write a UCC proposal to remove CHEM 1101 as Obj 5 Gen Ed, for the 2017-2018 catalog.

7. Incoming Proposals and Plans

a. Course Proposals:

New course TGE 1140

Motion to approve, seconded. **Approved** with one abstention.

b. Assessment Plans:

Objective 1 – ENGL 1101/1102, HONS 1110

Discussion. Send back to department for more information:

- Is the Honors Program okay with HONS 1101 incorporated into this plan from the English Dept.?
- Need to map the results/findings to the State Outcomes as part of the report.
- There is no assessment of Outcome 1 in this rubric. Needs to be added.

Objective 2 – COMM 1101

Discussion. Send back to department for more information:

- Submit sample questions that would be used in assessment.

Objective 3 – MATH courses (all)

Discussion. Send back to department for more information:

- How to map State learning outcomes to specific Math Assessment Instruments. Okay to submit one Assessment Plan for all courses, as long as Assessment Instruments for each course are included as Appendices. Google Doc submission is preferable, if possible. All pieces included in one document, please.

MGT 2216 & RCET 1372 were not considered in this meeting.

Objective 4 – *deferred until next time.*

8. Remaining assessment questions (time permitting) – *deferred until next time.*

- a. What is the procedure for amending assessment plans?
- b. General policies for the retention of student work throughout assessment. (see Academic Affairs Q & A document)
- c. Can we distribute policy on these issues when we approve course assessment plans?

9. Adjourn: 5:00 p.m.

Approved by GERC: October 27, 2015
Accepted by UCC: November 5, 2015
Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 24, 2015

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 27 October 2015
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:30 p.m.

1. Announcements

Holland reported Academic Affairs appointed Michelle Brumley to the State's Gen Ed Social Science Discipline Group; she was one of the nominees approved by GERC. Margaret Johnson forwarded the list of faculty reps on the SBOE's Discipline Groups to GERC for posting on GERC's website. GERC members decided to post the list on the Membership page below the GERC roster. They also requested the Objective Learning Outcomes be posted on GERC's Information and Resources webpage.

2. Minutes from **October 13, 2015** – **approved** with one abstention

3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items – no comments

- a. UCC Minutes for **October 8, 2015** and **October 15, 2015**
- b. Faculty Senate Minutes for **September 28, 2014**

4. ENGL 1101/1102 Issues –

- a. What is the status of ENGL 1101?
Holland will follow up with the English department regarding this assessment plan.
- b. Can we reevaluate ENGL 1102 for new learning outcome without new proposal?
Skidmore reported the SBOE has recently added a 7th outcome for Objective 1.
- c. How does Honors factor into this - should ENGL 1101 be a prereq for HONS 1101?
Now that 6 credits are required for Objective 1: Written English, anyone taking ENGL 1102 will have to have transcript credit for ENGL 1101 as well. To ensure students have the proper credits to fulfill Objective 1, **HONS 1101 will need to have ENGL 1101 as a prerequisite, too.**

5. Incoming Proposals and Plans

- a. Course Proposals – none to review
- b. Assessment Plans
There are still a few assessment plans that have not yet been submitted. Most of those departments have responded that they are working on theirs, with the exception of History from which there has been no word. ACAD and HONS belong to the Student Success Center, but fall under the purview of College of Arts & Letters reps for Curriculum Council proposals, so should for Gen Ed, too. Geosciences is not offering GEOL 1108 now, nor in the foreseeable future, because of lack of student interest in the course. GERC still needs an assessment plan for each course on the Gen Ed list, whether is it currently offered or not. This also applies to CHNS and LATN 2201/2202 courses under Objective 9. Holland requested members follow up with their respective constituent departments to make sure assessment plans are in the works.

Objective 3 (continued)

- Revised MATH Assessment Plan – **approved** with 1 abstention
- MGMT 2216 Assessment Plan – **approved** with 1 abstention
- RCET 1372 Assessment Plan – **approved** with 1 abstention
- TGE 1140 Assessment Plan – **remanded**, it's close but needs a little more detail

Objective 4

- ENGL 1110, 1115, 1126, 2257, 2258 Assessment Plan – **approved** with 1 abstention
- Holland will ask permission to post this one as a sample on GERC's website

- PHIL 1101 Assessment Plan -- **approved** with 1 abstention
- PHIL 1103 Assessment Plan -- **approved** with 1 abstention
- TGE 1257 Assessment Plan -- **approved** with 1 abstention
- ART – all Assessment Plans -- **remanded** for further work
- DANC – all Assessment Plans -- **remanded** for further work
- MUSC – all Assessment Plans -- **remanded** for further work
- THEA 1101 Assessment Plan -- **remanded** for further work
- LANG – all Assessment Plans -- **remanded** for further work
- CSD 1151/1151L and 1152/1152L -- **remanded** for further work

Holland requested members prepare for the next meeting by perusing their assigned assessment plans; post comments, suggestions and requests for clarification or more information; then contact the departments and communicate what revisions or more information are needed. Members also should inform Catherine the names of those who need editing privileges for each assessment plan so she can change the document permissions accordingly. A Google Doc spreadsheet was set up as a time-saving device for members to create boilerplate comments addressing common deficiencies; the comments can be copied and pasted into each plan instead of retyping the same or similar message multiple times.

Due to time constraints the remaining agenda items were deferred for a subsequent meeting:

Objective 5

Objective 6

6. *Remaining assessment questions (time permitting)*

- a. *What is the procedure for amending assessment plans?*
- b. *General policies for the retention of student work throughout assessment. (see Academic Affairs Q & A document)*
- c. *Can we distribute policy on these issues when we approve course assessment plans?*

7. **Adjourn:** 5:23 p.m.

Next meeting: Tuesday, November 10, 2015

Approved by GERC:	November 10, 2015
Accepted by Curriculum Council:	November 12, 2015
Accepted by Academic Affairs:	November 24, 2015

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 10 November 2015
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen, Mitch Berry
Ex-officio: Bob Houghton (UCC), Margaret Johnson, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read
Excused: Teresa Casey
Absent: Lori Austill, Jacque Baergen
Guests: none

1. Announcements - none
2. Committee approved the Minutes from **October 27, 2015**
3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items
 - a. UCC Minutes for **October 22, 2015**
 - b. Faculty Senate Minutes for **October 12, 2015**
4. Upcoming SBOE Gen-Ed Discipline Group Summit Dec 3-4
 - a. Should GERC communicate with reps before meeting?
 - Yes – this should be done in face with a few member of GERC
 - Need to give them an overview of our concerns and limitations we are experiencing
 - Also need to let them know about the assessment plans, even to see some examples, and the general overview completed last spring.
 - Meeting scheduled for December 1st – Andy will determine if representative members are available on that day/time (2:30)
 - b. Should GERC request reports after meeting?
 - GERC reps can provide a report from the meeting we can look at on Dec. 8
 - Pass information onto Margaret that may need to go to the state group
 - c. Learning Outcome revisions:
 - ANTH 1100 assessment plan has a suggestion for changes to the learning outcomes for Objective 6.
 - Introductory language course assessments do not really fit with Objective 4's learning outcomes, need to let the task force reps know this.
5. Incoming Proposals and Plans
 - a. Progress report – which plans are still missing?
 - b. Assessment Plans
 - i. Motions to approve plans

Objective #5

- CHEM -- **Approved** all courses (8 in favor/1 abstention)

- GEOL -- **Approved** all courses (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- NTD 2239 revisions in progress
- PHYS all revisions in progress

Objective #6

- ECON all revisions in progress (will all be in one document)
- TGE 1150 has been revised
- HIST – have not received any assessment plans

Objective #7

- CSC 1181 – **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- PHIL 2201 and 2250 – **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- GEOL 1107 – **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)

Objective #8

- LLIB 1115 - **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- ACAD 1111 – **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- INFO 1101 - **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- FIN 1115 - **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- CMP 2203 - **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- PHIL 2210 - **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- IS 2202 - **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)
- ENG 2210 and 2212 - **Approved** (8 in favor/1 abstention)

- ii. Discussion of borderline and problematic plans
 - c. Course Proposals -- none
6. Communicating expectations for Spring assessment implementation
- a. General policies for the retention of student work throughout assessment. (see Academic Affairs Q & A document)
 - b. Expectations for detail of reporting in Fall 2016 – what info will have to be included
 - c. What is the procedure for amending assessment plans and approval for those plans?
 - d. What is the procedure if a group does not get an assessment plan in?
 - What we can do is report that we have not received a plan
 - e. Any other important clarifications GERC should deliver, or policy GERC needs to set before Spring?
 - Communicate remanded plans back to area representatives – let them know this needs to be in by December 8th
7. Remaining meeting schedule before Spring semester begins
8. Adjourn: 4:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 23, 2016
 Accepted by UCC: February 25, 2016
 Accepted by Provost/Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 8 December 2015
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen,
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Bob Houghton (UCC), Lori Austill, Jacque Baergen, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read
Excused: Mitch Berry
Absent: Teresa Casey
Guests: none

1. Announcements
2. Minutes from **November 10th, 2015** – will approve via email
3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items
 - a. UCC Minutes for **November 5, 2015, November 12, 2015** and **November 19, 2015**
No issues from UCC minutes
4. Incoming Assessment Plans & Proposals
 - ENGL 1101 status report
working on this and waiting on dept. vote for approval to send to us.

Assessment Plans

Motions to approve plans

ENGL 1102

Motion to approve/second

6 approved/2 abstentions

Discussion: (ask to edit out HONS 1101 and ENGL 1101)

COMM 1101

Motion to approve/second

7 approved/1 abstention

TGE 1140

Move to approve/second

6 approved/2 abstention

ART 2210/CMP 2250

Move to approve/second

7 approved/1 abstention

JAPN 1101/1102

Qualified motion pending removal from Objective #5

6 approved/2 abstention

NTD 2239

Move to approve/second

6 approve/2 abstention

ANTH 1110
Move to approve/second
7 approve/1 abstention

ECON 1100, 2201, and 2202
Move to approve/second
6 approve/2 abstention

POLS 1101
Move to approve/second
7 approve/1 abstention

TGE 1150
Move to approve/second
6 approve/1 abstention

POLS 2202
Move to approve/second
6 approve/1 abstention

CMLT 2207/2208/2209
Move to approve/second
7 approve/1 abstention

EDUC 2204
Move to approve/second
7 approve/1 abstention

Discussion of borderline and problematic plans

HONS 1101
Postponed for further review and clarification

ANTH/SHOS 1101 and 1102
Must revise to meet objective #4
SPAN 1101/1102
Need a rubric example to assess outcomes (not leaning on ACTFL outcomes)

GERM 1101/1102
Need a rubric example to assess outcomes (not leaning on ACTFL outcomes)

BIOL 1101/1101L
In progress

PHYS
No alignment with the instruments and outcomes

PSYC 1101
Postponed for further review and clarification

SOC 1102
Postponed for further review and clarification

HIST 1120

Postponed for further review

CSD 2210

Postponed for further review

5. Final Gen Ed List for 2016-17 Catalog - for approval by email (subsequently approved Dec. 11, 2015)
6. Communicating expectations for Spring assessment implementation
 - a. General policies for the retention of student work throughout assessment. (see Academic Affairs Q & A document)
 - b. Expectations for detail of reporting in Fall 2016 – what info will have to be included
 - c. What is the procedure for amending assessment plans?
 - d. Any other important clarifications GERC should deliver, or policy GERC needs to set before Spring?
7. GERC plans for before and during Spring
 - a. Gen Ed Assessment -- Faculty Training
What are the training/development needs for faculty in terms of gen ed assessment. and what would be effective ways of delivering that training? Karen Appleby will bring GERC's ideas and recommendations to Selena Grace for incorporation into her assessment training activities in spring.
8. Report from Dec. 3-4 SBOE Gen-Ed Discipline Group Summit (time permitting)
 - a. Issues raised in discipline groups and state GEM committee
 - i. Discipline groups may reject courses approved by institutions? Unconventional offerings should be prepared to defend worthiness via assessment.
 - ii. Some outcomes may be revised to be more specific in order to exclude unconventional options.
 - iii. Objective 5 may change from 4/5 to 4/4 for lecture only courses, 5/5 for labs.
 - iv. Should the state financially encourage GEM dual credit courses specifically?
 - v. Multiple institutions offer course release for major assessment responsibilities.
 - vi. Only BSU has a complete assessment plan at this time:
 1. <http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/university-learning-outcomes/assess/>
 - vii. Others?

Future plans for coordination of GERC with discipline representatives

Adjourn: 5:00 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 24, 2016 by email vote
Accepted by UCC: February 25, 2016
Accepted by Provost/Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016

APPENDIX

*Final Gen Ed Course List for 2016-17 Undergraduate Catalog
as approved by GERC on Dec. 11, 2016*

General Education

The General Education Program

The General Education program at Idaho State University prepares students to be life-long, independent learners and active, culturally aware participants in diverse local, national, and global communities. As the foundation for all further studies, General Education promotes comprehensive literacy - including effective communication, mathematical, and technological skills; reasoning and creativity; and information literacy - and a broad knowledge base in the liberal arts.

General Skills and Abilities

Through completing the General Education program, students will be able to:

- Communicate effectively and clearly in standard written and spoken language;
- Use mathematical language and quantitative reasoning effectively;
- Think logically, critically, and creatively; and
- Locate relevant sources and use them critically and responsibly.

General Education Requirements: The Nine Objectives

All students must complete a minimum of 36 credits from the nine Core Objective areas as outlined below. All students must meet Objectives 1 through 6, Objective 9 and choose to meet either Objective 7 or 8.

If a student does not meet the minimum credits required (36) once all 9 Core Objective areas have been met, the student must complete additional coursework from any of the outlined Core Objective areas to meet the 36 credit minimum.

Objective 1, Written Communication:

Minimum of one (1) course. (3 credits)

Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate the following competencies:

- Use flexible writing process strategies to generate, develop, revise, edit, and proofread texts.
- Adopt strategies and genre appropriate to the rhetorical situation.
- Use inquiry-based strategies to conduct research that explores multiple and diverse ideas and perspectives, appropriate to the rhetorical context.

- Use rhetorically appropriate strategies to evaluate, represent, and respond to the ideas and research of others.
- Address readers' biases and assumptions with well-developed evidence-based reasoning.
- Use appropriate conventions for integrating, citing, and documenting source material as well as for surface-level language and style.

Courses that satisfy Objective 1:

Note: ENGL 1101 will likely need to be added to this Objective, but no Gen Ed proposal has been submitted to GERC as yet, as of Dec. 8, 2015

ENGL 1102	Critical Reading and Writing ¹	3
HONS 1101	Honors Humanities I ¹	3

¹ Must obtain a minimum grade of C- or better.

Objective 2, Oral Communication:

Minimum of one (1) course. (2 credits minimum)

Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate at least five (5) of the following competencies.

- Research, discover, and develop information resources and structure verbal messages to increase knowledge and understanding.
- Research, discover, and develop evidence-based reasoning and persuasive appeals for influencing attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.
- Understand interpersonal rules, roles, and strategies in varied contexts.
- Effectively listen and adapt verbal messages to the personal, ideological, and emotional perspectives of the audience.
- Employ effective verbal and nonverbal behaviors that support communication goals.
- Effectively recognize and critically evaluate the reasoning, evidence, and communication strategies of self and others.

One course satisfies the objective:

COMM 1101	Principles of Speech	3
---------------------------	----------------------	---

Objective 3, Mathematical Ways of Knowing:

Minimum of one (1) course. (3 credits)

Upon completion of a course in this category, a student is able to demonstrate the following competencies.

- Read, interpret, and communicate mathematical concepts.
- Represent and interpret information/data.
- Select, execute and explain appropriate strategies/procedures when solving mathematical problems.
- Apply quantitative reasoning to draw and support appropriate conclusions.

Courses that satisfy Objective 3:

MATH 1123	Mathematics in Modern Society	3
MATH 1127	The Language of Mathematics	3
MATH 1130	Finite Mathematics	3
MATH 1153	Introduction to Statistics	3
MATH 1160	Applied Calculus	3
MATH 1170	Calculus I	4
MATH 2256	Structure of Arithmetic for Elementary School Teachers	3
MATH 2257	Structure of Geometry and Probability for Elementary School Teachers	3
MGT 2216	Business Statistics	3
RCET 1372	Calculus for Advanced Electronics	4
TGE 1140	<u>Survey of Applied Mathematics</u>	

For further information about mathematics prerequisites and placement, see [Placement in Mathematics](#).

Objective 4, Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing:

Minimum of two (2) courses. (6 credits.) Courses must be selected from **two different categories**: Humanities, Fine Arts, or Foreign Language.

Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate at least five (5) of the following competencies.

- Recognize and describe humanistic, historical, or artistic works within problems and patterns of the human experience.
- Distinguish and apply terminologies, methodologies, processes, epistemologies, and traditions specific to the discipline(s).
- Perceive and understand formal, conceptual, and technical elements specific to the discipline.
- Analyze, evaluate, and interpret texts, objects, events, or ideas in their cultural, intellectual or historical contexts.
- Interpret artistic and/or humanistic works through the creation of art or performance.
- Develop critical perspectives or arguments about the subject matter, grounded in evidence-based analysis.
- Demonstrate self-reflection, intellectual elasticity, widened perspective, and respect for diverse viewpoints.

Courses that satisfy Objective 4:

Humanities

ENGL 1110	Introduction to Literature	3
ENGL 1115	Major Themes in Literature	3
ENGL 1126	Art of Film I	3
ENGL 2257	Survey of World Literature I Beginnings through 16th Century	3
ENGL 2258	Survey of World Literature II 17th Century to Present	3
HONS 1102	Honors Humanities II	3
PHIL 1101	Introduction to Philosophy	3
PHIL 1103	Introduction to Ethics	3
TGE 1257	Applied Ethics in Technology	3

Fine Arts

ART 1100	Introduction to Art	3
ART 1101	Survey of Art History I	3
ART 1102	Survey of Art History II	3
ART 2210/CMP 2250	History and Appreciation of Photography	3
DANC 1105	Survey of Dance	3
DANC 2205	Dance in the Modern Era	3
MUSC 1100	Introduction to Music	3
MUSC 1106	American Music	3
MUSC 1108	The World of Music	4
MUSC 1109	Survey of Jazz	3
THEA 1101	Survey of Theatre	3

Foreign Languages

ANTH/SHOS 1101	Elementary Shoshoni I	4
ANTH/SHOS 1102	Elementary Shoshoni II	4
ARBC 1101	Elementary Arabic I	4
ARBC 1102	Elementary Arabic II	4
CHNS 1101	Elementary Chinese I	4
CHNS 1102	Elementary Chinese II	4
CSD 1151	American Sign Language I	3
CSD 1152	American Sign Language II	3
FREN 1101	Elementary French I	4
FREN 1102	Elementary French II	4
GERM 1101	Elementary German I	4
GERM 1102	Elementary German II	4

JAPN 1101	Elementary Japanese I	4
JAPN 1102	Elementary Japanese II	4
LANG 1101	Elementary Foreign Language I	4
LANG 1102	Elementary Foreign Language II	4
LATN 1101	Elementary Latin I	4
LATN 1102	Elementary Latin II	4
RUSS 1101	Elementary Russian I	4
RUSS 1102	Elementary Russian II	4
SPAN 1101	Elementary Spanish I	4
SPAN 1102	Elementary Spanish II	4

Objective 5, Scientific Ways of Knowing:

Minimum of two (2) lecture courses and one (1) laboratory. (7 credits) Courses must be selected from **two different course prefixes**.

Upon completion of a course in this category, a student is able to demonstrate at least four (4) of the following competencies.

- Apply foundational knowledge and models of a natural or physical science to analyze and/or predict phenomena.
- Understand the scientific method and apply scientific reasoning to critically evaluate arguments.
- Interpret and communicate scientific information via written, spoken and/or visual representations.
- Describe the relevance of specific scientific principles to the human experience.
- Form and test a hypothesis in the laboratory or field using discipline-specific tools and techniques for data collection and/or analysis.

Courses that satisfy Objective 5:

BIOL 1100 & 1100L	Concepts Biology Human Concerns and Concepts Biology Human Concerns Lab (designed for non-science, non-health related majors) ^L	4
BIOL 1101 & 1101L	Biology I and Biology I Lab (designed for students preparing for majors in science, pre-medical fields, and health related professions) ^L	4
CHEM 1100	Architecture of Matter ^L	4
CHEM 1101	Introduction to General Chemistry **	3
** Note: Chemistry voted to withdraw this course from Gen Ed program, but no formal action has been taken to do so, as of Dec. 8, 2015.		
CHEM 1102 & CHEM 1103	Introduction to Organic and Biochemistry and Introduction to General Organic and Biochemistry Laboratory ^L	4
CHEM 1111	General Chemistry I	5

& 1111L	and General Chemistry I Lab ^L	
CHEM 1112	General Chemistry II	4
& 1112L	and General Chemistry II Lab ^L	
GEOL 1100	The Dynamic Earth	
& 1100L	and The Dynamic Earth Lab (this is the lab for students in Geoscience majors) ^L	4
GEOL 1101	Physical Geology	
& 1101L	and Physical Geology Lab ^L	4
GEOL 1110	Physical Geology for Scientists Laboratory ^L	1
NTD 2239	Nutrition	3
PHYS 1100	Essentials of Physics ^L	4
PHYS 1101	Elements of Physics	
& 1101L	and Elements of Physics Laboratory ^L	4
PHYS 1111	General Physics	3
PHYS 1112	General Physics II	3
PHYS 1113	General Physics I Laboratory ^L	1
PHYS 1114	General Physics II Laboratory ^L	1
PHYS 1152	Descriptive Astronomy	3
PHYS 1153	Descriptive Astronomy Laboratory ^L	1
PHYS 2211	Engineering Physics I	4
PHYS 2212	Engineering Physics II	4
PHYS 2213	Engineering Physics I Laboratory ^L	1
PHYS 2214	Engineering Physics II Laboratory ^L	1

L Courses with an L notation will apply to Objective 5 as a Laboratory Experience

GEOL 1115 and 1115L taken prior to Fall 2013 may also be used toward Objective 5.

Objective 6, Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing:

Minimum of two (2) courses. (6 credits) Courses must be selected from **two different course prefixes**.

Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate at least four (4) of the following competencies.

- Demonstrate knowledge of the theoretical and conceptual frameworks of a particular Social Science discipline.
- Develop an understanding of self and the world by examining the dynamic interaction of individuals, groups, and societies as they shape and are shaped by history, culture, institutions, and ideas.
- Utilize Social Science approaches, such as research methods, inquiry, or problem-solving, to examine the variety of perspectives about human experiences.
- Evaluate how reasoning, history, or culture informs and guides individual, civic, or global decisions.

- Understand and appreciate similarities and differences among and between individuals, cultures, or societies across space and time.

Courses satisfying Objective 6:

ANTH 1100	General Anthropology	3
ECON 1100	Economic Issues	3
ECON 2201	Principles of Macroeconomics	3
ECON 2202	Principles of Microeconomics	3
EDUC 1110	Education and Schooling in the U.S.	3
HIST 1101	Foundations of Europe	3
HIST 1102	Modern Europe	3
HIST 1111	US History I to 1865	3
HIST 1112	US History II 1865 to present	3
IS 2203	Introduction to International Organizations	3
POLS 1101	Introduction to United States Government	3
PSYC 1101	Introduction to General Psychology	3
SOC 1101	Introduction to Sociology	3
SOC 1102	Social Problems	3
TGE 1150	<u>Applied Social Sciences in the Workplace</u>	

Objective 7, Critical Thinking:

Minimum of one (1) course from either Objective 7 or Objective 8. (3 credits)

Critical thinking is defined as the ability to think analytically, critically, creatively, and reflectively to make informed and logical judgements, draw reasoned and meaningful conclusions, and apply ideas to new contexts. Courses satisfying this Objective must include active learning.

Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate the following competencies.

- Formulate/frame problems and analyze how others do so;
- Recognize and apply appropriate practices for analyzing ambiguous problems;
- Identify and apply relevant information for problem solving;
- Create, analyze, and evaluate/interpret diverse perspectives and solutions;
- Establish a reasoned framework for drawing conclusions and/or recommending solutions; and
- Effectively articulate the results of a thinking process.

Courses satisfying Objective 7:

ANTH/ENGL/LANG 1107	Nature of Language	3
-------------------------------------	--------------------	---

CS 1181	Computer Science and Programming I	3
CMP 2205	<u>Argumentation</u>	
GEOL 1107	<u>Real Monsters</u>	
HIST 1118	US History and Culture	3
HIST 1120	Global History Since 1500	3
INFO 1181	Informatics and Programming I	3
PHIL 2201	Introduction to Logic	3
PHIL 2250	Contemporary Moral Problems	3
POLS 2202	Introduction to Politics Critical Thinking and Analysis	3
SOC 2248	Critical Analysis of Social Diversity	3
THEA 1118	Oral Interpretation of Literature	3
THEA 2251	Fundamentals of Acting	3

Objective 8, Information Literacy:

Minimum of one (1) course from either Objective 7 or Objective 8. (3 credits)

Information literacy is defined as the ability to recognize when information is needed and to locate, evaluate, and use information effectively. Courses satisfying this Objective must involve hands-on practice for students rather than merely the presentation of theoretical principles.

Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate the following competencies.

- Determine the nature and extent of the information/data needed to accomplish a specific purpose;
- Identify sources and gather information/data effectively and efficiently;
- Evaluate credibility of sources and information/data;
- Understand the economics, ethical, legal, and social issues surrounding the creation, collection, and use of information/data; and
- Use information/data effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

Courses satisfying Objective 8:

ACAD 1111	University Inquiry	3
CMP 2203	Media Literacy	3
FIN 1115	Personal Finance	3
GEOL 1108	Exploring Data and Information **	3
	<i>** Note: Geosciences stated it has no plans to offer this course in the immediate future; no assessment plan generated yet, as of Dec. 8, 2015</i>	
HIST 2291	The Historian's Craft	3
INFO 1101	Digital Information Literacy	3
LLIB 1115	Introduction to Information Research	3

Objective 9, Cultural Diversity:

Minimum of one (1) course.* (3 credits)

Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate the following competencies.

- Identify the defining characteristics of culturally diverse communities in regional, national, or global contexts;
- Describe the influence of cultural attributes such as ability, age, class, epistemology, ethnicity, gender, language, nationality, politics, or religion inherent in different cultures or communities; and
- Apply knowledge of diverse cultures to address contemporary or historical issues.

Courses satisfying Objective 9:

ANTH/SHOS 2201	Intermediate Shoshoni I	4
ANTH/SHOS 2202	Intermediate Shoshoni II	4
ANTH/ENGL 2212	Introduction to Folklore and Oral Tradition	3
ANTH 2237	Peoples and Cultures of the Old World	3
ANTH 2238	Peoples and Cultures of the New World	3
ANTH 2239	Latino Peoples and Cultures	3
ARBC 2201	Intermediate Arabic I	4
ARBC 2202	Intermediate Arabic II	4
CHNS 2201	Intermediate Chinese I	4
CHNS 2202	Intermediate Chinese II	4
CMLT 2207	Contemporary European Culture	3
CMLT 2208	Cultures of the Spanish Speaking World	3
CMLT 2209	Cultures of East Asia	3
CSD 2210	Human Communication, Differences, and Disorders through Literature and Media	3
EDUC 2204	Families Community Culture	3
ENGL 2210	American Cultural Studies	3
FREN 2201	Intermediate French I	4
FREN 2202	Intermediate French II	4
GERM 2201	Intermediate German I	4
GERM 2202	Intermediate German II	4
HIST 2201	Women In U.S. History	3
HIST 2249	World Regional Geography	3
HIST 2251	Latin America	3

<u>HIST 2252</u>	East Asian History	3
<u>HIST 2254</u>	Middle Eastern Civilization	3
<u>HIST 2255</u>	African History and Culture	3
<u>IS 2202</u>	The World Today: Introduction to Global Issues	3
<u>JAPN 2201</u>	Intermediate Japanese I	4
<u>JAPN 2202</u>	Intermediate Japanese II	4
<u>LATN 2201</u>	Intermediate Latin I	4
<u>LATN 2202</u>	Intermediate Latin II	4
<u>PHIL 2210</u>	Introduction to Asian Philosophies	3
<u>RUSS 2201</u>	Intermediate Russian I	4
<u>RUSS 2202</u>	Intermediate Russian II	4
<u>SOC 2201</u>	Introduction to Gender and Sexuality Studies	3
<u>SPAN 2201</u>	Intermediate Spanish I	4
<u>SPAN 2202</u>	Intermediate Spanish II	4

*Credit by CLEP or other language exam does not fulfill Objective 9, the Cultural Diversity Objective.

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 12 January 2015
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:35 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen,
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read
Excused: none
Absent: Teresa Casey, Mitch Berry; Bob Houghton (UCC), Lori Austill, Jacque Baergen
Guests: Selena Grace (telecom), Jim DiSanza

1. Announcements
2. Academic Affairs assessment training initiatives (Selena Grace)

Assessment Training
Needs – Gen Ed. Learning Outcomes
Will have training information by next meeting
3. Minutes from **November 10, 2015** and **December 8, 2015** – deferred to later
4. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items - none
5. 2016-2017 Catalog Changes

- a. ENGL 1101 as Gen Ed Course ([Appendix 1](#))

Move to approve: Skidmore; Second: Appleby
Approved: 6
Opposed: 0
Abstention: 1

- b. Written Comm change in III.N -- Additional Learning Outcome added by SBOE:

- [Read, interpret, and communicate key concepts in writing and rhetoric.](#)

Move to approve: Skidmore; Second: Shropshire
Approved: 6
Opposed: 0
Abstention: 1

6. GERC Officers for Fall 2016/Spring 2017 - nominations?
Looking for nominations for next year's officers, elections to be held next meeting.
7. GERC role in establishing authority over gen ed courses? Conflicting Arts & Letters/Student Success Center (SSC) views regarding English courses offered through the Bengal Bridge program (SSC)
 - "In light of GERC's responsibility to oversee the General Education program, we affirm that departments have the authority to approve the course content, scheduling, staffing, and assessment of their General Education and may specifically delegate this approval."

Move to Table until next time (Wolper)/Second (Shropshire)

Approve: 4

Opposed: 3

Abstention: 1

Motion carries

Adjourn: 4:36 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 24, 2016 by email vote

Accepted by UCC: February 25, 2016

Accepted by Provost/Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016

APPENDIX

ENGL 1101 & 1102 Course Proposal and additional SBOE Learning Outcome

January 11, 2016

To: Andrew Holland, Chair, GERC

From: Jennifer Eastman Attebery, Chair; and Hal Hellwig, Composition Director; Department of English and Philosophy

Subject: Objective One, Written Communications: Six-Credit Sequence

GERC requested the following proposal:

Objective One includes English 1101 and 1102 as a six-credit sequence.

Prior iterations of Objective One at ISU included the requirement of completion of English 1102 *only* in order to fulfill this objective, making the credit for Objective One variable (usually three credits). It was assumed that English 1101 would be a prerequisite course for English 1102.

Other institutions in Idaho required both courses as a sequence, with six credits assigned to the objective. The State Board of Education prefers uniformity in terms of how institutions treat Objective One, Written Communications, so that transfer issues will be minimized. In discussions at a state-wide meeting (the General Education Summit of 2014), ISU's composition/rhetoric representatives agreed to a six-credit sequence of courses, English 1101 (and/or 1101P, though that might entail an additional credit for some students), and 1102. Later conversations with the SBOE incorporated additional language drawing attention to rhetorical techniques used in writing in order to emphasize the course as a composition/rhetoric course.

Currently, the learning objectives for the six-credit sequence are the following:

1. Use flexible writing process strategies to generate, develop, revise, edit, and proofread texts.
2. Adopt strategies and genre appropriate to the rhetorical situation.
3. Use inquiry-based strategies to conduct research that explores multiple and diverse ideas and perspectives, appropriate to the rhetorical context.
4. Use rhetorical strategies/modes of discourse to evaluate, represent, and respond to the ideas and research of others
5. Address readers' biases and assumptions with well-developed evidence-based reasoning.
6. Use conventions for integrating, citing, and documenting source material as well as for surface-level language and style.

[7. Read, interpret, and communicate key concepts in writing and rhetoric.](#)

ENGL1101 English Composition addresses objectives 1-7 only in part; i.e., not fully developing all seven. A sample syllabus for English 1101 might well include the following description of the assignments that will help students achieve these learning objectives:

"This course focuses on the practice and development of college-level writing skills. You will write a number of assigned essays and you will read, discuss, and analyze the writing of others. You will begin to look at writing as a process, which involves pre-writing, drafting, giving and receiving feedback, revising, and editing. You will be introduced to a variety of writing styles, essay types, and themes. The readings and writing assignments will sharpen your critical thinking skills, which will help you in all your classes. You will also work on developing thesis statements, using appropriate rhetorical strategies for various purposes and audiences, review the conventions of standard written English, practice summarizing, paraphrasing and quoting, learn to document sources, and conduct basic library research. Your writing will be a direct product of your critical thought; the more you read, the more well-reasoned your writing will become.

By the end of this course, students should be able to

- 1) actively read articles from a range of popular and academic sources [Obj 3, 4, 7];
- 2) write clear, accurate, and thorough essays [Obj 1, 5, 6];
- 3) write within the conventions of several kinds of college-level writing assignments [Obj 1, 2, 3, 4, 6];
- 4) use MLA style citation, a standard form of academic documentation [Obj 6]. "

ENGL1102 Critical Reading and Writing addresses objectives 1-7 more fully, consolidating students' achievement of these skills and knowledge. The new objective 7, key concepts in writing and rhetoric, is addressed at several points, as indicated below. A sample syllabus for English 1102 might well include the following description of these learning objectives (throughout, each is referenced in brackets):

You'll read essays from a variety of fields and write papers using source materials [Obj 4, 6]. You'll discuss readings, write rough drafts and share them with your classmates [Obj 1, 4, 7]. You'll focus on understanding and communicating ideas with others by way of traditional communication tools and those provided by Moodle [Obj 1, 4, 6]. You'll compose prose essays based on your analysis of your anthology of readings; you'll learn how to synthesize and evaluate sources; you'll focus and document these sources appropriately for a variety of academic audiences [Obj 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7].

You should be able to revise and proofread your own written work, as well as the work of other writers [Obj 1, 6]; improve your competence in using sentences that demonstrate emphasis, coherence, and clarity [Obj 1, 6]; allow you to develop your ability to tailor your essays (style and structure) for a variety of audiences, occasions, and purposes [Obj 2, 3, 5]; show you a number of style options [Obj 1, 2, 4, 6]; develop your ability to carry out systematic library research [Obj 3, 4]; develop your reading skills, so that you can evaluate argumentative and expository prose from a variety of academic disciplines [Obj 3, 4, 7]; provide greater skills at synthesizing materials from complementary and contradictory sources [Obj 3, 4, 5]; give you an enhanced ability to integrate primary and secondary source material into essays that show your thesis (or theses) with coherence and focus [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]; develop your ability to argue well, to construct sound propositions, to present relevant evidence to support your argument, to use rhetorical strategies and techniques of organization appropriate to your argument [Obj 2, 5, 7]; and, finally, to make you aware of various documentation systems, providing conventions suitable to various academic disciplines [Obj 6].

A current course description from one of our instructors includes the following statements that provide an operational context for the new learning objective (item 7. above), specifically for the additional 1-credit of English 1101P, italics used for emphasis:

- To learn fundamental academic essay-writing skills, including consideration of audience and purpose, thesis development, unity and organization, support of claims through examples, and a variety of *rhetorical strategies*.
- *To learn rudimentary textual analysis techniques both for written and visual material*
- To explore the writing process: generating ideas, drafting, revising, and editing.
- To read, analyze, and evaluate a variety of peer and published texts as the basis for expanding academic literacy, and to improve analytical and critical reading and thinking skills
- To engage effectively in collaborative activities, including peer editing groups and student-teacher conferences.

Further information about Learning Objective 7

At the most recent Summit for General Education, the Written Communications discipline-specific group discussed the ways that item 7. can be used in a course. Instructors can use traditional forms of rhetoric (for example, showing students a list of rhetorical terms found in writing, Richard Lanham's *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*) or use additional forms of rhetoric, such as visual rhetoric and multimodal forms of rhetoric (see *Position Statement on Multimodal Literacies*, National Council of Teachers of English, website).

English 1102 would take the statements about rhetorical concerns from the above syllabus description for English 1101P and develop at length the discussion, the coverage, and the assignments that would attend to the new learning objective (item 7.). Our instructors in English 1102 have training in composition and rhetoric, so the new learning objective is a welcome addition to Objective One. A student in English 1101 might well learn the importance of headings, use of visual aids, and modes of persuasive techniques (ethos, pathos, and logos, in basic formulations), and then in English 1102 continue to develop these skills with argumentative skills (Toulmin, Rogerian, or other forms of logic, with attention to rhetorical techniques), as well as using digital forms of communication (visual, aural, or multimodal).

In accord with other institutions in Idaho, the Department of English and Philosophy at ISU agrees that English 1101 and English 1102 comprise a sequence of courses that fulfill Objective One, Written Communications. Placement (such as AP, dual enrollment, or ACT/SAT test scores) might well allow students to bypass English 1101, but the department still considers Objective One to be normally fulfilled by taking the two courses as a sequence. Further, the department recognizes the significance of the new language for learning objective 7., and has begun the process of implementing the additional emphasis on rhetoric as a important function of the writing process.

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 26 January 2016
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Kate Reedy, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen,
Ex-officio: Mary Hofle (UCC), Margaret Johnson, Laura McKenzie (for Sarah Mead), Jacque Baergen, Catherine Read
Excused: Mitch Berry
Absent: Lori Austill
Guests: Jim DiSanza, Bruce Savage

1. Announcements

Members introduced themselves for the benefit of two new members, Kate Reedy (replacing Teresa Casey) and Laura McKenzie filling in for Sarah Mead.

2. Minutes from **November 10, 2015, December 8, 2015, January 12, 2016** – will be voted upon by email.

3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items - none

4. Tabled Motion: "In light of GERC's responsibility to oversee the General Education program, we affirm that departments have the authority to approve the course content, scheduling, staffing, and assessment of their General Education courses and may specifically delegate this approval."

Motion to revisit: Skidmore; Second: Appleby

Approved: 8

Opposed: 0

Abstention: 4

New wording: "GERC affirms that departments have the authority to approve the course content and quality, course structure and meeting pattern, faculty expertise, and assessment of their General Education courses. Departments may specifically delegate this authority via a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)."

Move to approve: 7

Opposed: 1

Abstention: 1

5. Engineering requests a waiver to temporarily redistribute three credits in the Objective 7/8/9 requirements to other gen ed areas. Engineering programs currently require at least 124 credits; long term plan is to streamline with courses that integrate gen ed and ABET requirements. Related: would GERC be receptive to course-specific Objective 2 classes?

Problem: Engineering students do take ENGL 1101, but would it be possible to exclude it as a specific program requirement to keep the program within ISU's parameters? ABET requirements total 66-70 credits, and must be reflected in the major requirements. Students are often unprepared in math and English, so have to take an extra 1 or 2 years before they are up to speed in the basic skills necessary to succeed in the program.

Discussion centered on the importance of a well-rounded education, and the reality is some programs are more intensively rigorous than others and have more requirements that must be met. GERC has authority to redistribute credit requirements in Obj 7, 8 & 9 on its own, but any adjustments or waivers to Obj 1 thru 6 would require SBOE approval, and are more set in stone by the SBOE Discipline Groups. Longer term solution would be to revamp Obj 7, 8 and 9; immediate dilemma is whether GERC grant some short-term waiver for Engineering programs .

GERC is willing to consider this exception with a written proposal. If there is a course that would qualify for one of these objectives, GERC would be willing to consider it as a Gen Ed course.

6. GERC Officers for Fall 2016/Spring 2017

Chair – Sandi Shropshire: (8) in favor (1) abstention

Vice Chair – Matt Wilson: (8) in favor (1) abstention

Secretary not elected

7. Assessment Plans – Work with constituents to help them get their plans submitted.

8. Members authorized setting up a new email account for GERC business.

9. Adjourn: 5:03 p.m.

Approved by GERC:

April 12, 2016

Accepted by UCC:

April 14, 2016 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs:

June 7, 2016

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 09 February 2016
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Kate Reedy, Jon Holmes, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen, Maria Ortiz
Ex-officio: Jacque Baergen, Laura McKenzie (for Sarah Mead), Catherine Read
Excused: Karen Appleby, Margaret Johnson
Absent: Lori Austill
Guest: none

1. Announcements

- Welcome to Maria Ortiz, the new ASISU rep. Members introduced themselves.
- New email for all things GERC: gercmail@isu.edu
- GERC will meet on the 5th Tuesday in March, since the 4th Tuesday is during Spring Break.
- Business to complete this semester:
 - Finish approving assessment plans,
 - decide how to collect assessment reports starting this fall
 - revisit Objectives 7, 8 and 9
 - ISU's potential participation in the WICHE Passport interstate gen ed transfer program
 - Shropshire and Holland are scheduled to take a training workshop in this program

2. Minutes – deferred for later

3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items -- none

4. Assessment Plans

- a. Motions to approve plans
 - HONS 1101
 - need to change the outcomes listed to match GEM outcomes
 - compile the pieces into one document
 - ENGL 1101
 - have not received an assessment plan as yet
 - ART 1100
 - amend the plan to state it assesses Outcome #2 instead of Outcome #5
 - **Approved as amended**
 - ART 1101, 1102
 - department still working on plan, compiling examples
 - Objective 4 Performing Arts courses (MUSC, THEA, DANC)
 - Outcome #5 is not met, delete from plan
 - do not rely on “webquest” as assessment tool
 - amend plan to require exam analysis be used as assessment tool during each cycle
 - **Approved as amended**

- SPAN 1101-1102
 - recent revisions answered GERC's questions and concerns
 - **Approved as-is**
 - JAPN 1101-1102
 - amended to delete Outcome #5, unnecessary and irrelevant to this course
 - **Approved as amended**
 - GERM 1101-1102
 - courses do not create art, so need to change which outcomes will be assessed
 - need to specifically address SBOE outcomes
 - **Remanded** for further revisions
 - CSD 1151-1152
 - **Remanded** for further revisions
 - BIOL plans are being revised, Holland has talked to the author and she knows what is needed
 - PHYS department is in flux with their recent combining with several other departments, Holland is following up with them to get these done
 - EDUC 1110
 - still lacks correlation between prompts and reporting of outcomes
 - also needs to define threshold of satisfactory student performance
 - **Remanded** for further revisions
 - HIST still has not submitted plans as yet, is not responding to any of GERC's requests
 - IS 2203 plan is unchanged, Skidmore will follow up
 - PSYC 1101
 - Outcomes being assessed do not match SBOE outcomes, shifted away from original intent
 - **Remanded** for further revisions
 - SOC 1101-1102
 - **Conditionally approved**, pending clarification of 80% question
 - HIST 1120
 - still awaiting minimum level of competency specified, fine other than that
 - **Remanded**
 - SOC 2248
 - needs examples
 - still need to specify competency thresholds for outcomes
 - **Remanded** for further revisions
 - THEA 1118 & 2251
 - clarify context of questions as relevant to outcomes
 - **Remanded** for further revisions
5. Next steps in assessment master plan refinement – for next meeting, think about:
- a. Expectations for detail of reporting in Fall 2016 – what info will have to be included?
 - b. How will annual reports be collected?

c. What is the procedure for amending assessment plans?

6. Adjourn: 4:53 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 4, 2016 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: May 5, 2016 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 23 February 2016
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Kate Reedy, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen, Maria Ortiz
Ex-officio: Jacque Baergen, Margaret Johnson, Justin Thorpe (UCC), Catherine Read
Excused: Laura McKenzie
Absent: Lori Austill
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none

2. Experiential Portfolios for General Education Requirements (Margaret Johnson)

Johnson reported on workgroup's efforts regarding experiential learning, granting course credit for work or volunteer experience. Students would have to petition for credit and submit a portfolio. Departments would decide whether to approve or deny all petitions for experiential credit. Departments might also be able to require an exam in addition to the portfolio, but that remains to be worked out. The working group's recommendations will go to Academic Standards Committee for consideration.

3. Minutes from **November 10, 2015**

- a) Move to approve.
- b) Approved: 7
- c) Opposed: 0
- d) Abstention: 1

4. Final revisions to Gen Ed Course List for 2016-17 Catalog with Jan. 11 additions - formal approval

- a) Catalog Copy Changes Objective #1
- b) Change catalog copy to: "Minimum of 2 courses" "6 credits required" and "upon completion of the courses..."
- c) ENGL 1101 (3 credits)
- d) ENGL 1102 (3 credits)
- e) HONS 1101 (3 credits)
 - i) Move to approve as edited: Shropshire, Second: Appleby
 - ii) Approved: 9
 - iii) Opposed: 0
 - iv) Abstention: 0

5. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items

- a. UCC Minutes for **February 14, 2016**

6. Assessment Plans (Objectives 8-9)

1) **Objective 8:**

- a) GEOL 1108 (yet to be submitted)
- b) HIST 2291 (yet to be submitted)

2) Objective 9:

- a) ANTH 2237
 - i) Move to approve: Shropshire Second: Appleby
 - a. Approved: 9
 - b. Opposed: 0
 - c. Abstain: 1

- b) ANTH 2238
 - i) Move to approve: Shropshire Second: Appleby
 - a. Approved: 9
 - b. Opposed: 0
 - c. Abstain: 1

- c) ANTH 2239
 - i) Move to approve: Shropshire Second: Appleby
 - a. Approved: 9
 - b. Opposed: 0
 - c. Abstain: 1

- d) SOC 2201
 - i) Move to conditionally approve: Wilson, Second: Reedy
 - a. Approved: 9
 - b. Opposed: 0
 - c. Abstain: 1

- e) CSD 2210
 - i) Remanded for revisions

- f) SPAN 2201/2202
 - i) Move to approve: Holmes, Second: Shropshire
 - a. Approved: 9
 - b. Opposed: 0
 - c. Abstain: 1

Note: Direct other languages to SPAN 2201/2202 as an example assessment plan

7. Next steps in assessment master plan refinement

- a) Editing process – Once plans have been approved, *Editing* capabilities will only be provided to Catherine. Only *Suggesting* access will be provided to plan authors for plan amendments.

Expectations for detail of reporting in Fall 2016 – what info will have to be included?

- a) How will annual reports be collected?
- b) What is the procedure for amending assessment plans?
 - o [Draft reporting form](#)

8. Form updates

- a) Need to include information on both direct and indirect assessments

NEXT MEETING AGENDA:

- 1. Revise [assessment plan template](#) to better communicate expectations?

2. Revise [Gen Ed Course Proposal form](#) to account for existence of separate assessment plans
3. Revisit institutionally designated gen ed areas - Objectives 7, 8, 9 (time permitting)
 - a. Is (7 or 8) + 9 the best distribution of the six credits in these objectives?
 - b. How can we better accommodate program-specific courses in these areas?
 - c. Should outcomes be revised, objectives combined, objective added?
4. Report from Dec. 3-4 SBOE Gen-Ed Discipline Group Summit (time permitting)
 - a. Issues raised in discipline groups and state GEM committee
 - i. Discipline groups may reject courses approved by institutions? Unconventional offerings should be prepared to defend worthiness via assessment.
 - ii. Some outcomes may be revised to be more specific in order to exclude unconventional options.
 - iii. Objective 5 may change from 4/5 to 4/4 for lecture only courses, 5/5 for labs.
 - iv. Should the state financially encourage GEM dual credit courses specifically, as opposed to all dual credit courses?
 - v. Multiple institutions offer course release for major assessment responsibilities.
 - vi. Only BSU has a complete assessment plan at this time: <http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/university-learning-outcomes/assess/>
 - vii. Others?
 - b. Future plans for coordination of GERC with discipline representatives

9. Adjourn: 4:42 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 12, 2016
 Accepted by UCC: April 14, 2016 via email vote
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 08 March 2016
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-4:25 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Kate Reedy, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen
Ex-officio: Lori Austill, Jacque Baergen, Margaret Johnson, Laura McKenzie (for Sarah Mead), Catherine Read
Excused: Maria Ortiz, Mary Hofle (UCC)
Guests: none

1. Announcements

2. Presenter: Karen Appleby

- Assessment Workshops for ISU faculty
- Two-day workshops will be provided through the Office of Academic Affairs
- Assessment coordinators for all colleges have been contacted and will identify key faculty who may want to attend
- Please feel free to pass this on to others who may want to attend these workshops
- RSVP to Cali Bell by March 21 for March 31-April 1 workshop
- RSVP to Cali Bell by May 2 for May 16-17 workshop

3. Minutes

- Minutes will be approved via email

4. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items -- none

5. Form updates –

- a. Language for course assessment plan amendment process
 - Add paragraph for maintenance, access, modification, and location of documents
- b. Modifications to [Assessment Plan Template](#)
- c. Modifications to [Gen Ed Course Proposal form](#)
 - Separate into Part A and Part B
 - Include Objectives and Outcomes
- d. GERC will be the Office of Record for all Gen Ed Assessment plans

6. Fall 2016 Assessment reporting procedures

- a. Review modified [draft reporting form](#)
- b. Institutional Research input (Qualtrics)

7. Revisit institutionally designated gen ed areas - Objectives 7, 8, 9

- a. Is (7 or 8) + 9 the best distribution of the six credits in these objectives?

- b. Should we / how can we better accommodate program-specific courses in these areas?
 - Possibility of an Objective #2 course that could meet the needs of a specific program
 - Andy will communicate - not much room in 7, 8, and 9 (open to interpreting 7 more broadly, but this is not a time to revise these objectives). We are open to considering a course for Obj. #2, but it must meet Gen. Ed. Competencies for this objective (to include depth of communication content, theory, and application)
- c. Should outcomes be revised, objectives combined, objective added?

8. Introduction to [WICHE Interstate Passport](#) program

- Large scale transfer/articulation agreement
- Interstate Passport “Block” would transfer to institutions as complete Gen. Ed.
- Credit requirements – not specified
- Action item: Evaluate Passport block
 - Review passport learning outcomes against our own
 - Look at these outcomes, where is there overlap? Where is there discrepancy?
 - Create a GERC template for this work
- Do we want to participate in this program?

9. Assessment Plans – members were asked to review their constituents’ assessment plans in preparation for discussion next meeting.

10. Adjourn: 4:25 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 12, 2016
Accepted by UCC: April 14, 2016 via email vote
Accepted by Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 29 March 2016
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-5:00 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen, Jordan Withers
Ex-officio: Jacque Baergen, Laura McKenzie (for Sarah Mead), Catherine Read
Excused: Kate Reedy; Margaret Johnson, Mary Hofle (UCC)
Absent: Lori Austill

1. Announcements - None
2. Minutes from - None
3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items
 - a. UCC Minutes - None
4. Updates to forms

- a. Combined [Gen Ed Course Proposal / Assessment Plan form](#)

Motion to approve content in Gen Ed Course Proposal/Assessment Plan:

Moved: Shropshire; Second: Wilson

Favor: 7 Opposed: 0 Abstention: 1

- b. Language regarding form management and revision (included in document above)

Motion to approve as an amendment to our Gen. Ed. Plan:

Moved: Holmes; Second: Skidmore

Favor: 7 Opposed: 0 Abstention: 1

5. [WICHE Interstate Passport](#) business

- a. Report findings regarding [alignment of ISU and Passport learning outcomes](#)
- b. Identify areas of concern where

- i) Passport students don't meet ISU expectations
- ii) ISU gen ed *outcomes* do not address PLOs
- iii) ISU gen ed *course curriculum* does not address PLOs

- Objective #1:
 - PLOs seem to match ENGL 1101, but do not address all ENGL 1102 expectations.
 - Not worried about outgoing students, but worried about incoming students meeting our objectives relative to this PLO.
- Objective #2:
 - PLOs do not meet research requirements.
 - Not worried about outgoing students, but worried about incoming students meeting our objectives relative to this PLO.

- Objective #3:
 - Although these PLOs do not align with our outcomes, they are not in conflict with our outcomes.
 - Not worried about incoming students, but worried about outgoing students meeting this PLO.
- Objective #4:
 - Consult individual departments if courses meet PLOs or not.
 - PLOs meet 6/7 of ISU objective and, therefore, adequate for ISU requirement.
 - 6 credits are required for ISU in Obj. #4 (two in A, B, and C). How does this work with the passport system?
 - Incoming students likely to have met GEM Outcomes
- Objective #5
 - Consult individuals departments if courses meet PLOs or not.
 - Ethics outcome in this objective area is not addressed by any of our outcomes. However, there are courses that satisfy this.
 - While we do not encompass all elements of PLOs, our courses certainly cover the “spirit” of the PLOs and are covered in our courses.
- Objective #6
 - Concern: focus on the interpretation and evaluation of one’s own perspective vs. that of others
 - Some course alignment with PLOs, but not many
 - Incoming students will meet GEM, outgoing students may not.
- Objective #7
 - ISU meets PLOs, but PLOs may not meet all ISU objectives
 - Passport would meet
- Objective #8
 - Passport would meet
- Objective #9
 - ISU is missing 5th PLO (“respect, sensitivity, empathy”)
 - Passport would meet ISU objectives

There are some courses that would fit well with Passport block, even though they are not, nor would be, ISU gen ed courses. This would be possible, but could cause some issues with advising.

c. Input regarding construction of passport block - who? when? how?

ISU needs to submit a draft Passport block to WICHE sometime this fall. Ultimately it will be up to GERC to decide how that block is constructed and ratified, though other people may be involved in developing the transfer articulation details over the summer. Currently, it is up to departments to decide what does and does not count, and the Registrar’s Office follows those instructions.

6. Assessment Plans – on tap for next meeting

7. Adjourn: 4:52 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 12, 2016
 Accepted by UCC: April 14, 2016 via email vote
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 12 April 2016
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30-5:06 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Kate Reedy, Jon Holmes, Karen Appleby, Sandi Shropshire, Andy Holland (Chair), Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen
Ex-officio: Lori Austill, Jacque Baergen, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read
Excused: Jim Wolper; Margaret Johnson, Mary Hofle (UCC)
Absent: Jordan Withers

Announcements -- none

1. Minutes from January 26, 2016; February 23, 2016; March 8, 2016; March 29, 2016
 - o Motion to approve all: Shropshire/Appleyby
 - o **Approved:** Unanimous
2. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items
 - a. UCC Minutes for February 18, 2016 and February 25, 2016
 - b. Faculty Senate Minutes for October 26, 2015, November 16, 2015 and March 14, 2016
 - c. Academic Standards Committee Minutes for April 1, 2016
3. Bylaws cleanup
 - Include representation of Student Success Center (combine with Library).
 - Modify purpose language for grammar, consistency with current review responsibilities.
 - o **Tabled** for voting until next meeting
4. Assessment plan cleanup
 - All future assessment plans will be part of new gen ed course proposals.
 - Assessment reports will be filed online.
 - o Motion to approve changes to the Assessment Plan: Shropshire/Skidmore
 - o **Approved:** 7
 - o **Opposed:** 0
 - o **Abstention:** 1
5. Fall 2016 Assessment reporting procedures - Google or Qualtrics?
 - o Reviewed Qualtrics Survey format – committee is open to using this.
 - Institutional Research Office will manage and house the form and data collected.
 - Still need to figure out how to restrict access to ISU employees and limit submissions to one per course per year.
6. Assessment Plans
 - a. Motions to approve plans
 - o **ENGL 1101**
 - Discussion: Assessment plan not required by GERC because it is the first part of a sequence of courses that meet the Gen. Ed. Objective (ENGL 1101/1102) and the outcomes are assessed in that second course.
 - Motion to approve that the plan for **ENGL 1102** assesses the whole series:
Olsen/Skidmore
Approved: 6
Opposed: 0

Abstention: 2

- **HONS 1101**
Discussion: Need instruments that map course objectives to GEM outcomes
REMANDED for updating
 - **HONS 1102 – Revised Assessment Plan**
Discussion: Needs to indicate which assignments map to GEM outcomes, stated threshold of student achievement, and sample paper or assignment subjects that will be used for assessment.
REMANDED for updating
 - **ART 1101/1102**
Discussion: Need relevant examples that will be used for assessment. Please send a reminder that we only have one meeting left!
REMANDED for updating
 - **ANTH/SHOS 1101-1102**
Move to approve: Skidmore/Holmes
Approve: 7
Opposed: 0
Abstention: 1
 - **GERM 1101/1102**
Move to approve: Wilson/Skidmore
Approve: 7
Opposed: 0
Abstention: 1
 - **BIOL 1100/1100L and 1101/1101L**
Move to approve: Olsen/Shropshire
Approve: 7
Opposed: 0
Abstention: 1
- b. Discussion of borderline and problematic plans, and status reports on unapproved plans
- PHYS and PSYC assessment plans are under way.
 - Critique: No definition of “satisfactory” given. Rubric may not be best way of evaluating courses. However, narrative reports would not be as useful to GERC, nor for reporting to SBOE and NWCCU. ISU needs to know what percentage of students are learning what they are supposed to in each outcome.
 - Suggestion to post exemplary assessment plans on GERC’s website for reference.

7. Adjourn: 5:10 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 26, 2016

Accepted by UCC: April 29, 2016 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 26 April 2016
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
2:30- 5:05 p.m.

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes from **April 12, 2016**
 - Move for approval: Skidmore/Shropshire
 - Approved: 10
 - Opposed: 0
 - Abstention: 0
3. Other Council's Minutes -- Information Items
 - Faculty Senate Minutes from **March 28, 2016**
4. Proposed revisions to GERC bylaws:

Article II – Purpose

~~The GERC considers all policies related to the University's General Education program and issues recommendations regarding these policies to the UCC. The purpose of the GERC is to consider all policies that relate to the University's general education requirements and to issue recommendations regarding these policies to the UCC.~~ The GERC is responsible for reviewing all proposed changes to the general education curriculum, approving the appointment of ISU representatives to external bodies with jurisdiction over that curriculum, and establishing and overseeing the process by which the Objectives and courses that compose ISU's general education program are assessed. The GERC may also issue recommendations regarding other general education issues brought to its attention.

Article III Section A - Committee Composition

The GERC consists of 16 members: 11 voting members and 5 non-voting members.

There are eleven (11) voting Members:

- two (2) from the College of Arts and Letters:
 - one (1) from Fine Arts & Humanities departments, and
 - one (1) from Social Science departments;
- two (2) from the College of Science and Engineering:
 - one (1) from Engineering, Mathematics, and Physics, and
 - one (1) from Biological Sciences, Chemistry, and Geosciences;
- two (2) from the Division of Health Sciences;
- one (1) from the College of Business;
- one (1) from the College of Education;
- one (1) from the College of Technology;
- one (1) from the University Library and the Student Success Center, and
- one (1) from ASISU

Article IV Section C - Duties of the Officers

The Chair calls meetings, sets agendas, presides over meetings, delegates responsibilities among members, and provides a report of the GERC's activities to the UCC and other appropriate parties. The Vice Chair serves in the absence of the Chair, and attends UCC meetings (Thursday afternoons 3:00-5:00 p.m.) as needed, at least once a month, and reports highlights back to the GERC. The Secretary records and distributes minutes of the GERC meetings in collaboration with the committee's administrative assistant.

Article VII - Business Items

The GERC receives business items from the UCC, [and may take up additional business at the discretion of the Chair](#). Business not completed by the end of Spring semester will be continued in the following Fall.

Motion to approve the bylaws revisions: Holmes/Skidmore

- Approved: 9
- Opposed: 0
- Abstention: 1

5. Select GERC executive secretary for F16-S17 academic year?
Will revisit this in the first meeting of the Fall 2016 semester

6. [Revised Qualtrics reporting form](#)

- Most suggestions were implemented - hosted by IR, produces email receipt
- Option to explain non-standard data?
- Should access link reside on BengalWeb (IR channel)? Yes

Motion to approve this as our annual assessment reporting tool: Holmes/Wolper

- Approved: 6
- Opposed: 0
- Abstention: 1

Holland will send out an email to chairs, Deans, and Directors with a link to this document and open it for live use by the end of May.

7. Assessment Plans

Discussion: What is the process of reporting if a department does not submit an assessment plan? GERC Chair will send an email to those listed as contacts and cc: Deans and Academic Affairs if assessment plans have not been submitted. Put language into this email indicating what will happen if plans are not submitted. Andy will send specific emails to chairs of the programs under which these courses are offered and then a separate email to Deans and Academic Affairs.

For plans in which revisions have been requested, Holland will send an email letting them know that we are still waiting for revisions.

EDUC 1110

- No new revisions

IS 2203

- No new revisions

PSYC 1101

Move to approve as long as they define where the threshold of student competency is.
Olsen/Shropshire

- **Approved:** 9
- Opposed: 0
- Abstention: 1

ANTH 1107

Move to approve: Holmes/Shropshire

- **Approved:** 8
- **Opposed:** 0
- **Abstention:** 2

HIST 1120

- Remanded for revisions
 - Need a better assignment example to highlight how outcomes are assessed specifically in Outcome #1 and a defined threshold of student competency

SOC 2248

- Remanded for revisions:
 - Needs to be reviewed on a 5-year vs. a 6-year schedule
 - Examples should map to specific outcomes or how they will be used to produce discrete data for outcomes

THEA 1118 and 2251

Move to approve: Wolper/Holmes

- **Approved:** 6
- **Opposed:** 1
- **Abstention:** 2

CMP 2205

- Remanded for revisions
 - Attach a rubric for the in class debate assignment
 - Need a defined threshold of student competency

CSD 2210

- No new revisions

HIST 2255

- No new revisions

SHOS/ANTH 2201

- Remanded for completion revisions

SHOS/ANTH 2202

- Remanded for completion revisions

GERM 2201-2202

Move to approve: Shropshire/Appleby

- **Approved:** 8
- **Opposed:** 0
- **Abstention:** 1

FREN 2201/2202

- No new revisions

JAPN 2201/2202

Move to approve: Appleby/Wolper

- **Approved:** 8
- **Opposed:** 0
- **Abstention:** 1

RUSS 1101/1102 & 2201/2201

- No new revisions

ARBC 1101-1102, 2201-2202, LANG 1101-1102

- No new revisions

8. WICHE Interstate Passport business –

Holland has constructed a hypothetical Passport Block Spreadsheet to align ISU Outcomes to WICHE Outcomes. He will send this information to department chairs to assess how courses align and schedule a summer meeting with chairs to address these questions and seek their input. There is a workshop training session scheduled for June 7. GERC will not have to do much on this until ISU has decided whether or not to participate in this program. GERC will review and vote whether to approve any report or proposed Passport Block that goes to WICHE. Holland has seen North Idaho College's proposed Passport Block, and could provide it to GERC members as an informational item if they are interested.

9. Adjourn: 5:05 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 4, 2016 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: May 5, 2016 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 3 May 2016
Electronic Meeting via Google Docs and Email

1. Announcements -- none

2. Council approved its Minutes from **February 9, 2016, April 26, 2016** and **May 3, 2016** via email vote.

3. Other Council's Information Items
 - a. Faculty Senate: Policy drafts for faculty review and comment over the summer:
 - **Academic Freedom** policy
 - **Five-Year Review** Process
 - **Promotion and Tenure** policy
 - **Faculty Sabbatical Leave** policy

Adjourn: 10:15 a.m.

Approved by GERC: May 4, 2016 via email vote
Accepted by UCC: May 5, 2016 via email vote
Accepted by Academic Affairs: June 7, 2016