Agenda

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

1. Announcements -- none

2. Minutes from February 9, 2016 and April 26, 2016

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

4. Adjourn

Future Business

A. Check assessment plan examples to make sure they still match format and meet current expectations. Are there more that should be added, or more resources we should link?
B. Honors students' completion of Objective 1 - add ENGL 1101 prereq to HONS 1101?
C. Should we tighten the statement describing the purpose of gen ed assessment? Many fear that it will be used to find fault with faculty or aggressively restrict course offerings; would a statement to the contrary allay these fears and/or avert these outcomes?
D. Acceptable grade threshold for Gen Ed courses - currently D except ENGL 1102, where it is C - should this be standardized? (mixed policies across state pose transfer issues; Passport also requires C or better)
E. What happens to transfers from the quarter system who have taken two classes in an objective, but not earned 6 credits in that objective? Currently they may make up the credit difference in any general education coursework.
F. Should institutionally designated gen ed credits transfer as gen ed regardless of alignment of institutionally designated objectives between schools?
G. Should test credit count towards general education requirements? In most cases it does, although tests do not necessarily address gen ed objectives. How about transfer credits from non-state schools that match program goals, but not gen ed?
H. What is the best procedure for nomination and approval of reps to state gen ed groups?
I. Revisit bylaws in light of new state definitions and assessment plan.
J. Relationship of Gen Ed assessment to IEAC work.
K. Should we formulate and assess program outcomes for Gen Ed (critical thinking, etc.) [CWI is doing this.]'
L. Report from 2015 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