

## Minutes

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

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland (temporary proxy pending college elections), Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, JoAnn Hertz, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read  
Absent: Cara Esplin  
Guests: Katy Kole De Peralta (History Dept.)

### 1. Introductions and Announcements

Shropshire introduced Katy DiPeraulta as a guest observer from the History Department, and Joanne Tokle replacing Margaret Johnson as the Academic Affairs representative. Most attendees were returning members so introductions were skipped. Name placards identified those sitting at the table. Shropshire reminded everyone GERC meets the second and fourth Tuesdays of each month, with additional meetings as necessary.

### 2. Minutes – none, all were approved

### 3. Ratification of replacement faculty representatives on State Gen Ed Disciplinary Groups:

- a. Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing (Obj. 4): **Tom Klein** to replace Alan Johnson
- b. Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing (Obj. 6): **Gesine Hearn** to replace Kevin Marsh
- c. Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing (Obj. 6): **Erin Rasmussen** to replace Michelle Brumley

Motion to approve the replacement representatives as listed above: Skidmore/Wilson Holland clarified these are the state-wide groups that meet once a year to define the learning outcomes for the GEM Objectives 1 through 6. The groups meet in October this year. **Approved** unanimously.

### 4. Elect a committee Secretary to take meeting minutes in collaboration with Catherine Jim Skidmore volunteered. **Approved** unanimously.

Wilson confirmed he will attend this Thursday's UCC meeting as GERC's liaison this week.

Shropshire briefly explained what has transpired in the past few years in this process of revamping and assessing ISU's Gen Ed Program and courses, transitioning from the original 12 Goals to 9 Objectives. In 2013-14 GERC began reviewing each gen ed course to ensure it met the criteria for the ISU Objective in which it was placed. In April of 2014, the SBOE created its new General Education Matriculation (GEM) program with specific learning outcomes mandated for Objectives 1 through 6. So in 2014-15 GERC re-reviewed each approved gen ed course to verify it met the new state-mandated outcomes. In 2015-16 GERC created its assessment process and began the task of reviewing and approving assessment plans for each gen ed course. This year GERC will finish reviewing and approving the last of the assessment plans, as departments begin submitting their first assessment reports this fall. Some assessment plans have yet to be submitted. Over the summer,

History faculty wrote and submitted a few plans, and those are posted on Google Docs ready for GERC to review. Shropshire asked members to spend some time over the next two weeks to peruse those plans and post their comments and suggestions. Be aware there may be multiple versions in existence; be sure GERC and the department each have and are working on the same version. Eliminate all duplicates or non-GERC versions. Skidmore suggested History get one plan approved and use it as a template for their subsequent plans.

Departments will be responsible for safeguarding the confidentiality of student data they collect. GERC only wants the aggregated results. Departments may find it valuable to know how well students in each section are doing relative to other sections so the department can address any problems that might be revealed.

5. [Assessment Plans](#) -- deferred until next meeting
6. [WICHE Interstate Passport](#) update - construction of a hypothetical Passport Block  
ISU and North Idaho College are participating in a preliminary review of the WICHE Passport program which would enable statewide articulation of gen ed courses. Holland explained his group compared the Passport learning outcomes to the GEM and ISU outcomes, looking to see how well they align. Holland created a spreadsheet summarizing which of ISU's outcomes were sufficient to meet the Passport outcomes. ISU does not need to submit its Block to WICHE until spring so there is no rush. He will incorporate departments' input into his spreadsheet and will bring it to GERC for discussion. Some of the questions to consider are:
  - a. Who should contribute input to this task?
  - b. Is it appropriate for this work to take place during summer?
  - c. What practices in Block construction would best equip GERC to eventually evaluate participation in the Passport program and consider official adoption of said Block?
7. Other Council's Information Items –
  - a. Faculty Senate: Policy drafts were sent for faculty review and comment over the summer. GERC and faculty have more opportunity to review and provide feedback. Senate will be working on these policies this semester.
    - i. [Academic Freedom](#) policy
    - ii. [Five-Year Review Process](#)
    - iii. [Promotion and Tenure](#) policy
    - iv. [Faculty Sabbatical Leave](#) policy
8. Adjourn: 3:30 p.m.

Next meeting in three weeks, on September 13, 2016.

Approved by GERC: February 28, 2017  
Accepted by UCC: March 2, 2017 via email ballot  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: March 13, 2017

# Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 13 September 2016  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring (temporary proxy for Arts & Letters), Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, JoAnn Hertz, Sarah Mead, Bob Houghton (UCC), Catherine Read  
Guests: ISU faculty reps on State Gen Ed Discipline Groups:  
Jim DiSanza (Obj 2), Bob Fisher (Obj 3), Tom Klein (Obj 4), Eddie Tatar (Obj 5), Gesine Hearn (Obj 6), Erin Rasmussen (Obj 6)  
Excused: Hal Hellwig, Lydia Wilkes, Dewayne Derryberry, Diana Livingston-Friedley

1. Introductions and Announcements  
Shropshire opened the meeting and everyone introduced themselves.
2. Minutes for August 23, 2016 – *will vote by email*
3. Discussion with ISU faculty representatives on State Gen Ed Disciplinary Groups:
  - a. Written Communication (Obj 1): Hal Hellwig and Lydia Wilkes
  - b. Oral Communication (Obj 2): Jim DiSanza
  - c. Mathematical Ways of Knowing (Obj 3): Bob Fisher
  - d. Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing (Obj. 4): Tom Klein and Diana Livingston-Friedley
  - e. Scientific Ways of Knowing (Obj 5): Eddie Tatar and Andy Holland
  - f. Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing (Obj. 6): Gesine Hearn and Erin Rasmussen

At the upcoming meeting in October, Holland said all the delegates will be sharing examples of assessment instruments their institutions are using to assess gen ed courses and learning outcomes, and show how their departments are using the data to improve their gen ed course offerings. They will also discuss shortcomings of the learning outcomes and ways of better aligning outcomes with the actual purpose of gen ed courses in a student's education. The Discipline Groups can recommend changes for the State Board to consider implementing in the GEM program. The guests left the meeting at this point.

4. HONS 1101 (3 credits) equivalency dilemma with ENGL 1101/1102 (6 credits) for Obj 1 (6 credits)  
HONS 1101 is equivalent to ENGL 1102, but is only 3 credits, whereas Objective 1 requires 6 credits. Members discussed of various ways the Honors Program could resolve this discrepancy. The easiest way would be to add ENGL 1101 or equivalent as a prerequisite to HONS 1101. Shropshire will contact the Honors director and let her know the Honors Program needs to submit a proposal this fall to resolve this matter for next catalog year.
5. Course Proposals
  - a. [ENGL 2257 & 2258 Revision](#): discuss proposal to change Objective from Obj 4 to Obj 9  
This is the first time such a request has been made. Mead explained that from the Registrar's perspective, once a course loses its 'gen-edness', it requires a new course number so there is no confusion over different catalog years regarding which courses fulfill gen ed Objectives and which do not. This request is further complicated because it would move a course out of the State's GEM program, so it would no longer be transferable across the state as gen ed credits unless it is part of the entire block of 36 gen ed credits.

Wolper noted that course numbering must consider not only the **content** of the course itself, it has to consider the **context** in which that course fits into the wider world of transcript credits, gen ed

and graduation requirements, and transferability. GERC will treat this as a proposal to delete one course and create a new course, which will require a UCC proposal as well.

Something that is not well known by the campus community is that Banner's course numbering system is not limited to (using Sophomore level courses as an example) course numbers 22xx, it can also handle 21xx, 23xx, etc. all the way up to 29xx for.

b. Discussion regarding process for removing a course from Gen Ed program.

Members discussed the current process whereby only the GERC chair reviews all UCC proposals that affect gen ed courses, and that person determines whether a separate GERC proposal is required. Holland pointed out GERC discussed this last year, and in their October 13, 2015 meeting (per Minutes) they decided a UCC proposal would be required, and the course would have to be renumbered. It is most important that the process be clear and simple. Discussion. Since GERC as a committee has purview over, and is responsible for, ISU's Gen Ed Program, several members opined the entire committee should be involved in all decisions for adding to, or removing courses from, the Gen Ed program. Decisions should be documented in GERC's minutes to provide a formal record.

**MOTION:** to require a brief formal proposal be submitted to GERC for approval whenever proposing removing a course from the Gen Ed program. **Motion passed** with one abstention. Shropshire and Read will bring a draft for consideration next meeting.

6. Assessment Plans

Brief discussion ensued regarding whether GERC's review of assessment plans has been overly rigorous. GERC's feedback has helped guide departments to focus on assessing the gen ed outcomes which is the purpose of this assessment piece, rather than assessing the course. Once departments start to implement their plans and see where the weaknesses are, they will naturally come to own their plans and make the necessary changes to improve.

HIST 2251 Assessment Plan, Objective 9:

Department needs to specify exactly which assignments they will be collecting to assess the outcomes. Skidmore will follow up with the department.

For the benefit of new members, Shropshire gave a quick summary of what GERC has been doing and looking for in assessment plans.

7. Other Council's Information Items –

a. Faculty Senate: Policy drafts posted as Google Docs for GERC to review and comment:

- i. [Academic Freedom](#) policy
- ii. [Five-Year Review Process](#)
- iii. [Promotion and Tenure](#) policy
- iv. [Faculty Sabbatical Leave](#) policy

b. [Council Minutes](#) – information-sharing items

- i. UCC Minutes for **August 25, 2016**
- ii. Research Council Minutes for **February 19, 2016** and **April 15, 2016**

8. Adjourn: 4:32 p.m.

Approved by GERC: September 29, 2016 via email vote  
Accepted by UCC: October 31, 2016 via email vote  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 8, 2017

## Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 27 September 2016  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring (temporary proxy for Arts & Letters), Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, JoAnn Hertz, Sarah Mead, Bob Houghton (UCC), Catherine Read  
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes for **September 13, 2016** were subsequently approved via email on September 29, 2016.
3. Formal process and Form (or new section on current Proposal Form) for withdrawing a course from the Gen Ed Program
  - a. CHEM 1101 – Chemistry requests removing it from Objective 5
  - b. HIST 2291 – History requests removing it from Objective 8

Motion to **approve the removal** of both these courses from the Gen Ed Program, with the understanding that they will need new course numbers and corresponding UCC proposals.  
**Approved** unanimously.

*[Subsequent to this meeting, the History Department withdrew their request to remove HIST 2291 from the Gen Ed Program, opting to keep it as an Objective 8 course.]*

Discussion. Regarding a new form and process, suggestion was to simply modify the existing GERC proposal form. The information needed would be the course number, course title, objective, and a brief rationale for removing it from the Gen Ed Program. The form should also make it clear that a new course number would have to be assigned, and a full UCC catalog change proposal will be required. Shropshire and Read will come up with a draft for consideration in the next meeting.

#### 4. Assessment Plans

##### **HONS 1101 Assessment Plan – Objective 1**

Discussion. The sample assignments each assess multiple outcomes, but do not correspond to the outcome assessment schedule which would make reporting problematic. Not much substance for assessing Outcome 3. Outcome 7 is missing, needs to be added to this plan.

**Remanded for revisions.**

##### **HONS 1102 Assessment Plan – Objective 4**

Motion to approve.

**Approved.**

##### **ART 1101 Assessment Plan – Objective 4**

No new revisions, no response from department yet.

**CSD 1151 / 1151L Assessment Plan – Objective 4**

Discussion. Outcome 5 is not met by this course, since it is neither an art nor a performance class. Unclear what the minimum proficiency level is for this plan.  
Motion to conditionally approve, pending clarification of minimum proficiency threshold for each.

**Conditionally approved.**

**CSD 1152 / 1152L Assessment Plan – Objective 4**

Same problem as CSD 1151 / 1151L.

Motion to **conditionally approve both CSD 1151/1151L and 1152/1152L**, pending clarification of the minimum proficiency threshold for each.

**Conditionally approved.**

**FREN 1101 / 1102 Assessment Plan – Objective 4**

Discussion. Council noted again that foreign languages do not fit well into the SBOE learning outcomes for this objective, and that the department may encounter some difficulties when implementing this assessment plan, which they will have to work out.

Motion to approve.

**Approved.**

**PHYS course Assessment Plans -- Objective 5**

No new revisions for any of the course plans.

**HIST 1101 / 1102 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

Discussion. The History department will use this assessment plan as a model for their other Gen Ed courses if GERC finds it acceptable. The only reservation might be with scheduling assessment once every 5 years instead of every year; GERC is okay with that, but the State may prefer more frequent assessment. GERC would like Selena Grace to attend a future meeting to give some guidance regarding expectations.

Motion to approve.

**Approved.**

**EDUC 1101 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

Discussion: plan was recently revised. Still needs final exam questions specifically mapped to 4 of the 5 Outcomes, and include more information about what kind of reports will be required.

**Remanded for further revisions.**

**IS 2203 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

New revisions received. Discussion. Proficiency threshold specified.

Motion to approve.

**Approved.**

**PSYC 1101 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

Discussion. Conditions were fulfilled.

Motion to approve revised plan.

**Approved.**

**SOC 1101 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

**SOC 1102 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

**SOC 2248 Assessment Plan – Objective 7**

New revisions received. Discussion. Need clarification on how the department intends to quantify student achievement of the outcomes for assessment reporting purposes.

All three plans were **remanded for further revisions.**

5. Other Council's Information Items –

a. Faculty Senate: Policy drafts for GERC's review and comment - due Oct. 7

1. [Academic Freedom](#) policy
2. [Five-Year Review Process](#)
3. [Promotion and Tenure](#) policy
4. [Faculty Sabbatical Leave](#) policy

b. Council Minutes – information-sharing items  
None this week

6. New Course Proposals – for discussion next time

**HE 2200** – check with Chris Hunt, the Associate Registrar, whether a UCC proposal is needed for adding an existing course to the Gen Ed Program.

Chris' answer: No UCC proposal is required.

7. Adjourn: 4:36 p.m.

Approved by GERC: January 25, 2017 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: January 26, 2017

Accepted by Academic Affairs: January 31, 2017

# Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 11 October 2016  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Lori Austill, Joanne Tokle, JoAnn Hertz, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read  
Absent: Bob Houghton (UCC)  
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes – *will vote by email*
3. Formal process and Form (or new section on current Proposal Form) for withdrawing a course from the Gen Ed Program.  
Shropshire and Wilson met earlier today with UCC leadership and the Associate Registrar to discuss how this process would work, using the current UCC proposal process. A separate UCC proposal will be required for each course requested to be removed from the Gen Ed Program. The chair of GERC reviews each UCC proposal as part of the Impact Responses, and will bring all proposed Gen Ed course removals to GERC for discussion and vote by GERC. Still unclear is a mechanism for ensuring GERC as a whole **does** see each proposal and considers whether to approve the removal or not.

GERC does have the authority to remove Gen Ed courses from the Gen Ed Program, even against the affected department's wishes, if GERC deems such removal is warranted. In such cases, GERC would initiate the necessary UCC proposal and be the Proposal Originator.

Proposed instructions to be posted on GERC's website:

***[Existing content from left navigation bar on GERC web site is in black; additions are in red.]***

Gen Ed Course Proposal & Assessment Plan Info

→ Proposal Form & Instructions

→ Proposal to remove a course from Gen Ed program

[Text to appear on linked page] Effective 10/11/2016, if you wish to propose removal of a course from the General Education program, please note the following:

1. A course number change will be required by the UCC.
2. If approved, the proposal will take effect in the catalog year following that in which the proposal is processed.
3. To initiate a proposal, a proposal originator should complete an Online Proposal Request Form as directed on the UCC web page here. A separate UCC proposal should be submitted for each course proposed for removal from the Gen Ed program.

→ Gen Ed Info, Rubrics and Sample Proposals

Motion to approve the new website text above: Holland/Holmes.

**Approved.**

Status update:

- A UCC proposal is in the works for removing CHEM 1101 from the Gen Ed Program, as approved by GERC in their last meeting.

- History Department is awaiting word from GERC on how to proceed with its request to remove HIST 2291 from the Gen Ed Program, which was also approved by GERC in their last meeting. Shropshire will contact the chair of History once GERC's website has been updated with this new information.

#### 4. New Gen Ed Course Proposals & Assessment Plans

##### a. Obj 1: ENGL 1102 prerequisite adjustments

English Department is proposing a minimum passing grade of C- be required for the ENGL 1101/1101P prerequisites to ENGL 1102.

Motion to approve: Holland/Skidmore

**Approved.**

##### b. New Obj 8: LLIB 1125 Intro to Health Information Research

Discussion. Course is designed for students in health care related programs, though other students could take it. Question was whether the course would be broad enough for Gen Eds? Assessment Plan needs clarification regarding the rubric and proficiency threshold.

**Remanded for revisions to both the Course Proposal and Assessment Plan sections.**

##### c. New Obj 8: HE 2200 Promoting Wellness

Discussion. This course was proposed a couple of years ago as an Objective 6 course, but was denied by GERC and Provost. Course was re-thought, proposal was rewritten, and the new course is now being proposed for Objective 8. Good course, but the instruments are not quite aligned with the learning outcomes. Course needs to be clearly focused on teaching students how to find, evaluate, and make use of health information.

**Remanded for revisions to both the Course Proposal and Assessment Plan sections.**

##### d. New Obj 9: IS 2270 World Regional Geography and Cultures

Discussion. History has a similar course that will likely be discontinued if this new course is approved and implemented. Assessment Plan needs to include specific assessment instruments and how they align with the learning outcomes.

**Remanded for revisions to both the Course Proposal and Assessment Plan sections.**

##### e. New Obj 9: CSD 2257 Deaf Culture and Community

Discussion. Revisions to the course portion have answered previous concerns. The assessment instruments need to be more closely tied to the learning outcomes of the Objective, not to the course itself.

**Remanded for revisions to the Assessment Plan section.**

##### f. New Obj 9: SCPY 1001 Psychology of Diversity and Learning in Schools

Discussion. The course as described does not appear give students in-depth investigation and fostering understanding of a culture different than their own, but instead is a general exploration of categories of diversity in schools. The assessment plan should tie more closely to the learning outcomes, especially Outcome 1.

**Remanded for revisions to both the Course Proposal and Assessment Plan sections.**

#### 5. Assessment Plans

##### a. **PHYS course Assessment Plans – Objective 5**

Still no revisions received yet. Holland has contacted the chair several times, no response.

b. **FREN 2201/2202 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

Discussion. Minor concern that mapping to the accreditation outcomes could overshadow assessing the Gen Ed Objective outcomes, but that should sort itself out during the reporting process. GERC should monitor the submitted reports with this in mind.

Motion to approve: Skidmore/Holland

**Approved** unanimously.

c. **ANTH/SHOS 2201/2202 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

Discussion. Need clarification on how the Outcome 3 instruments align with the learning outcome.

**Remanded for revisions.**

d. **Remaining Language Courses – Objective 9**

No revisions nor responses received yet.

e. **CSD 2201 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

Revisions received. Discussion. Rubric outcomes need to match the Objective learning outcomes. Okay to assess the objectives of the course itself as long as the plan clearly delineates how and by which portions the Gen Ed learning outcomes will be assessed.

**Remanded for revisions.**

f. **HIST 2201 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

No assessment plan has ever been submitted as yet.

g. **HIST 2249 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

Motion to approve: Holmes/Holland

**Approved** unanimously.

h. **HIST 2251 / 2252 / 2254 / 2255 – Assessment Plans – Objective 9**

Motion to approve: Holland/Wilson

**Approved** unanimously.

i. **SOC 2201 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

New revisions received. Discussion. Threshold question was resolved. The rubric criteria needs to be aligned with the Objective learning outcomes.

**Remanded for revisions.**

6. Other Council's Information Items –

a. Council Minutes – information-sharing items

None this week

For next meeting, two new course proposals just received for consideration:

- HIST 1101 History in Film – Objective 7
- HIST 2241 History of World Religions – Objective 4

**7. Adjourn: 4:26 p.m.**

Approved by GERC: January 25, 2017 via email ballot

Accepted by UCC: January 26, 2017

Accepted by Academic Affairs: January 31, 2017

## Minutes

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

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Lori Austill, Bob Houghton (UCC), Joanne Tokle, JoAnn Hertz, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read  
Guests: none

### 1. Announcements

- The new instructions for removing a course from the Gen Ed Program are now posted on GERC's website.
- As chair of GERC, Shropshire has been asked to present GERC's assessment work and the preliminary status of the first round of Gen Ed Assessment Reporting (due Nov. 1) to the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Steering Committee (IEAC) on December 16, 2016. The IEAC will use GERC's work as a significant portion of their report on ISU's assessment activities to NWCCU accreditors. Shropshire will also need to report this information to UCC. GERC will have a chance to review and comment on her report before she presents it to IEAC or UCC. She will send a reminder and status update to chairs and deans beforehand.

### 2. Minutes – *will vote by email*

3. Formal process and Form (or new section on current Proposal Form) for withdrawing a course from the Gen Ed Program –  
The link and instructions are now posted on GERC's website.

### 4. New Gen Ed Course Proposals & Assessment Plans

Two categories of GERC's concerns:

- 1) Does the course fit the Objective and the overall purpose of general education? Is the course too specific to a particular discipline to serve effectively as a general education course for any student who takes it?
- 2) Do the rubrics to be used truly assess the Objective's learning outcomes, or do they assess course assignments and the course itself?

Philosophical questions GERC should discuss at some point: How focused on a single discipline should students be in their coursework? Does each Gen Ed course contribute to the Gen Ed Program as a whole?

- a. New Obj 8: [LLIB 1125 Intro to Health Information Research](#)  
Discussion. Will the skillsets learned in this course adequately transfer across to other disciplines? Why is this course so different from LLIB 1115?  
**Tabled.**
- b. New Obj 8: [HE 2200 Promoting Wellness](#)  
Revisions not ready for consideration yet.
- c. New Obj 9: [IS 2270 World Regional Geography and Cultures](#)  
No new revisions.

- d. New Obj 9: [CSD 2257 Deaf Culture and Community](#)  
New revisions received. Still needs more focus on how deaf community and culture compares to other cultures, fits into broader context. Some previous concerns not yet addressed. Assess the learning outcomes, not the course assignments.  
**Remanded for revisions.**
- e. New Obj 9: [SCPY 1001 Psychology of Diversity and Learning in Schools](#)  
Revisions not ready for consideration yet.

5. Assessment Plans

- a. **SOC 2201 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**  
New revisions received. Discussion. Needs to assess the Objective learning outcomes, not the course. Each outcome needs to be assessed separately.  
**Remanded for further revisions.**
- b. **CSD 1151 / 1151L Assessment Plan – Objective 4**  
New revisions received. Discussion. Rubric needs minimum acceptability threshold, among a few other things.  
**Remanded for further revisions.**
- c. **HONS 1101 Assessment Plan – Objective 1**  
New revisions received. Discussion. Rubric clusters the learning outcomes together, which is not useful for assessing each outcome separately. Outcome 3 is still not being adequately assessed in this plan. Outcome 7 still not included in the assignments, though it has been added to the list.  
**Remanded for further revisions.**
- d. **EDUC 1110 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**  
New revisions received. Discussion. Still some comments yet to be addressed.  
**Remanded for further revisions.**

6. Other Council's Information Items –

- a. Council Minutes – information-sharing items  
None this week

One more meeting before UCC's catalog deadline for new course proposals.

7. Adjourn: 4:23 p.m.

Approved by GERC: January 25, 2017 via email ballot  
Accepted by UCC: January 26, 2017  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: January 31, 2017

## Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 8 November 2016  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Joanne Togle, JoAnn Hertz, Catherine Read  
Absent: Shu-Yuan Lin, Cara Esplin; Lori Austill, Bob Houghton (UCC), Sarah Mead,  
Guests: none

### 1. Announcements

Additional GERC meeting will be held in one week, on November 15, 2016, at 2:30 as usual.

### 2. Minutes – *will vote by email*

### 3. New Gen Ed Course Proposals & Assessment Plans

#### a. New Obj 8: [LLIB 1125 Intro to Health Information Research](#)

Library withdrew this new Gen Ed proposal.

#### b. New Obj 8: [HE 2200 Promoting Wellness](#)

New revisions received. Discussion. Still some problems with how assessment tools align with the Objective outcomes, rather than with the course assignments. Unclear much was the course changed to focus more on information literacy rather than the previous iteration of the proposal for Objective 7. The course itself is good and has a lot of value for students' general education, but it doesn't fit well into the current Objectives. GERC may revisit Objectives 7, 8, and 9 sometime in the near future, and perhaps consider a 10<sup>th</sup> Objective.

Motion to approve: Skidmore/Wolper

Motion **failed**. (2 for, 5 opposed)

#### c. New Obj 9: [IS 2270 World Regional Geography and Cultures](#)

No new revisions.

#### d. New Obj 9: [CSD 2257 Deaf Culture and Community](#)

New revisions received. Discussion. Plan now shows how most of the outcomes are being assessed, but still a few minor clarifications are needed.

Motion to conditionally approve, pending clarification of the second assessment rubric to match the first and third rubrics: Holland/Wilson.

**Conditionally approved.**

*Clarification was received via email during the meeting.*

Motion to fully approve as amended:

**Approved as amended.**

#### e. New Obj 9: [SCPY 1001 Psychology of Diversity and Learning in Schools](#)

New revisions received. Discussion. The assessment plan needs individual summation of the learning outcomes.

Motion to approve the Course Proposal portion only: Letzring/Holland

**SCPY 1001 was approved as a new Objective 9 Gen Ed course.**

Motion to conditionally approve this Assessment Plan:

**Assessment Plan was conditionally approved.**

4. [Assessment Plans](#) -- deferred until next week.

5. Other Council's Information Items –

a. Council Minutes – information-sharing items

UCC Minutes for:

[September 1](#), [September 15](#), [September 22](#), [September 29](#) and [November 3, 2016](#)

b. Faculty Senate

Faculty Open Forum will be held this coming **Monday, Nov. 14 at 3:30-5:00 p.m** in the SUB Ballroom. Announcements went out today; please encourage your colleagues to attend.

Shropshire mentioned Vince Miller in Institutional Research has completed a trial run of the Gen Ed Assessment Reporting program and encountered some problems. There were a lot of blank spaces where information should have appeared. He is fixing the glitches. GERC decided to extend the Assessment Reporting deadline to November 18 instead of November 1.

6. Adjourn: 4:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC: January 25, 2017 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: January 26, 2017

Accepted by Academic Affairs: January 31, 2017

## Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 15 November 2016  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301  
**3:30-5:00 p.m.**

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, JoAnn Hertz, Bob Houghton (UCC), Sarah Mead, Catherine Read  
Absent: Lori Austill  
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none

2. Minutes – *will vote by email*

3. New Gen Ed Course Proposals & Assessment Plans

a. New Obj 7: [HIST 1100 History in Film](#)

Recommendation to UCC: course description should more explicitly emphasize the critical thinking component to this class to ensure potential dual credit or transfer courses contain sufficient critical thinking and writing to meet the Objective. *The course description in the corresponding UCC proposal was subsequently changed in response to GERC's suggestion.*

Motion to approve course proposal and assessment plan: Holland/Wilson

Unanimously **approved** both course and assessment plan.

b. New Obj 9: [IS 2270 World Regional Geography and Cultures](#)

This course is almost identical to HIST 2249 World Regional Geography, which is an Objective 9 Gen Ed course. The ultimate intent is to move this course from the History department to Global Studies, but not to delete the History course until this new course is in the catalog and being offered by the Global Studies department. The corresponding History and Global Studies UCC proposals were stopped and revised by the Arts & Letters Dean's office. If both HIST 2249 and IS 2270 end up on the books simultaneously, it will be a matter for UCC to resolve, either as cross-listing, or considering equivalent, or deleting one of the courses. The assessment plan does not address culture and diversity as much as it might to meet the objective.

Motion to approve the course proposal, but not the assessment plan: Skidmore/Holmes

**Approved**, with 2 opposed. The Assessment Plan was not approved.

4. Other Business

a. UCC Executive Committee report

Houghton reported the UCC encourages GERC to exercise its purview over general education and consider making formal recommendations to the SBOE as needed for changes and improvements to the General Education program and assessment. Shropshire said GERC also is supposed to submit a report to ISU's Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee every summer.

b. GERC's meeting structure changes

Shropshire mentioned her intention for next semester to spend some time each meeting working on the accumulated overarching "future business" items, and using the second half of meetings to continue reviewing the remaining assessment plans. She plans to have her draft report to the IEAC ready for council members to review next meeting on December 6.

c. Standardizing GERC's submission process

Currently there is no coherent process for submitting course proposals and assessment plans to GERC. Everything comes in haphazardly, in formats ranging from Word documents, .pdf files, or Google Docs owned by persons other than GERC's administrative staff. Several versions of assessment plans exist for the same course, and it is not clear which ones are the most recent and correct. Consider how to standardize submissions so that Read can immediately differentiate those emails from the dozens she receives.

Brand-new assessment plans or course proposals should be submitted as Word documents, so that Read can upload them into Google Docs owned by GERC. If another entity creates the Google Doc, that owner would have to transfer ownership to [gercmail@isu.edu](mailto:gercmail@isu.edu). All submissions need to be accompanied by an email explicitly stating "Submitting to GERC" or some such subject line.

Four revised Assessment Plans have come in from Sociology as new Word documents, which if simply uploaded, would lose all record of comments from GERC and the edits made on the original Google Doc.

Next meeting is Tuesday, December 6, 2017.

5. Adjourn: 4:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 28, 2017  
Accepted by UCC: March 2, 2017 via email ballot  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: March 13, 2017

# Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 6 December 2016  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, JoAnn Hertz, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read  
Absent: Lori Austill, Bob Houghton (UCC)  
Guests: none

1. Announcements
2. Minutes – *will vote by email*
3. [Assessment Plans](#)
  - a. **SOC 2201 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**  
Discussion of changes, adequately address previous concerns.  
Motion to unconditionally approve: Holland/Olsen  
**Approved** with 1 abstention. (8-0-1)
  - b. **SOC 1101 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**  
Motion to approve: Holland/Letzring  
**Approved** unanimously (9-0-0)
  - c. **SOC 2248 Assessment Plan – Objective 7**  
Motion to approve: Letzring/Holland  
**Approved** unanimously (9-0-0)
  - d. **SOC 1102 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**  
Motion to approve: Holmes/Wilson  
**Approved** unanimously (9-0-0)
  - e. **CMP 2205 Assessment Plan – Objective 7**  
Motion to approve: Holmes/Olsen  
**Approved** unanimously (9-0-0)
  - f. **CSD 1151/1151L and CSD 1152/1152L Assessment Plans – Objective 4**  
Changes addressed the concerns, so both plans now **approved** unconditionally:

The plans for CHNS 1101/1102 for Objective 4, RUSS 2201/2202 for Objective 9 and SHOS 2201/2202 appear to have been revised and ready for GERC to review next meeting.

Still have not received any updated plans from Physics. No response to numerous emails and contact attempts from GERC since the initial submissions over the summer.

4. [Draft report](#) to Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee (IEAC)  
This is Shropshire's initial draft; she deliberately avoided specifics about the assessment reports that have been filed since GERC's role in this process is administrative, not analytical. She welcomed members' input and suggestions. Tokle said IEAC is mostly interested in GERC's progress on this assessment project. The report is due in January, instead of December as

originally scheduled. Discussion. Some filers submitted one report for multiple courses, instead of one report per course as instructed. Suggestion to either pre-populate the Qualtrics reporting form with a drop-down course list, or to limit the number of characters allowed to five. Also beneficial to reiterate the November 1 due date is for the entire year, not restricted to the fall semester. The structure is now in place, but still working out the kinks. There are some complications with cross-listed courses that need to be figured out as well, to make sure all iterations are assessed and reported.

For GERC's report to IEAC a suggestion was made to include a graphical timeline to demonstrate the tight timeframe, showing the overlap between the creation and implementation of this assessment project. Also mention in the report there are still some assessment plans that have not yet been submitted for GERC's review, one and a half years past the submission deadline. The Early College Program gen ed courses need to be included in departments' assessment data. Several departments want to use course grades to assess their courses, but grades are based on other criteria than just the Objective Learning Outcomes, so cannot be used. Some tweaks were made to GERC's role as described.

Motion to approve the changes to the General Education Assessment Plan Revision document: Holland/Letzring

**Approved** unanimously (9-0-0)

5. Other Council's Information Items – none

6. Adjourn: 4:30 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 28, 2017  
Accepted by UCC: March 2, 2017 via email ballot  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: March 13, 2017

## Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 10 January 2017  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair),  
Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, JoAnn Hertz, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read  
Excused: Bob Houghton (UCC)  
Absent: Cara Esplin, Lori Austill  
Guests: none

### 1. Announcements

Shropshire presented GERC's report to the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee (IEAC) today. She conveyed the thanks to GERC members from the Executive Vice President and Provost Laura Woodworth-Ney for all their hard work.

### 2. Minutes – *will vote by email*

### 3. Update re: CHEM 1101 and IS 2270

#### **CHEM 1101 Introduction to General Chemistry**

Chemistry department's catalog change proposal to withdraw CHEM 1101 from the General Education Program was approved by UCC, but was denied by Academic Affairs. CHEM 1101 will remain an Objective 5 Gen Ed course for at least one more year. GERC members requested the explanatory Memo ([Appendix](#)) be attached to these minutes as documentation of the rationale behind Academic Affairs' decision. The lab originally associated with this course was removed several years ago to accommodate the College of Technology programs that use this course in an effort to better address their specific needs. MATH 1108 is the only math pre-requisite for CHEM 1101. All other CHEM 1101 courses at ISU's sister institutions do require a lab. **Members recommended GERC continue to keep an eye on this situation as it develops.**

#### **IS 2270 World Regional Geography and Cultures**

GERC approved IS 2270 as a new Objective 9 course, but has not yet approved the assessment plan. However, the corresponding catalog UCC Proposal #50 creating this new course was tabled by UCC for further clarification and corrections. Therefore, this new course will not be included in the 2017-18 Undergraduate Catalog or General Education Course List.

### 4. Assessment Plans

#### **a. HONS 1101 Revised Assessment Plan – Objective 1**

Revised to add the 7<sup>th</sup> learning outcome added by SBOE and to address outcome 3. GERC's concerns were dealt with in the revisions.

Motion to approve: Holland/Skidmore

**Approved.**

#### **b. ARBC 1101 and ARBC 1102 Assessment Plans – Objective 4**

#### **c. CHNS 1101/1102 Assessment Plan – Objective 4**

Motion to approve all foreign language Assessment Plans for Objective 4. Wolper Friendly amendment to approve ARBC 1101, ARBC 1102, and CHNS 1101/1102 Assessment Plans. Skidmore/Olsen

**Approved** unanimously.

**d. CSD 2210 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

This course has not been taught for a couple of semesters so this plan has not been updated. Olsen will follow up with the department.

**e. ANTH/SHOS 2201/2202 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

Motion to approve: Skidmore/Lin

**Approved.**

**f. EDUC 1110 Revised Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

No new revisions yet.

5. Process. Next steps on Assessment Plans

Still no plans submitted for LANG 1101/1102, ARBC 2201/2202, LATN 2201/2202 and GEOL 1108. GERC should consider removing LATN 2201/2202 from Objective 9 Culture and Diversity since the Latin language and culture no longer are practiced. PHYS plans have still not been updated since original submission. Several HIST assessment plans have been submitted but not yet processed. There still appears to be quite a bit of confusion between course grading and course assessment. Shropshire will communicate with the appropriate department chairs and deans.

Shropshire said some concerns arose during the assessment reporting last November that GERC should be aware of and respond to:

- Some of the high school teachers in the Early College Program are not participating, for indeterminate reasons. It is up to the affected departments to ensure participation, but GERC could provide a written explanation that may help alleviate misconceptions.
  - All sections of a gen ed course are to be taught with appropriate rigor
  - All sections of a gen ed course are to be included in the representative sampling for assessment, including Early College, online, 8-week or other condensed sessions, summer sessions, etc.
- In some cases, one assessment report was submitted for multiple courses, which is contrary to the explicit instructions.
  - The assessment process is supposed to generate actionable data by identifying potential problems with a specific course or particular section of a course. That cannot happen if the data is conflated.
  - A drop-down menu in the report form requiring selection of one course may prevent this from happening in the future.
- Some confusion regarding which academic year was being assessed and reported.
  - The intent was to ask for all assessment results for the past academic year:
    - i.e., by November 2017 submit the data collected for 2016-17 academic year.

Submission process for proposals and assessment plans to GERC needs to be standardized and better controlled. Eliminate multiple copies so there is no confusion over which is the valid document. All changes should be easily identifiable, and proposers should not resolve any margin comments so GERC can see for themselves whether revisions adequately satisfy their concerns. Once GERC has approved an assessment plan, Read should be the only Editor of the document. GERC members, plan originators and departments should have Comment access, and everyone else should have View Only access.

6. Final Gen Ed Course List

Read will compile the final list of gen ed courses approved by GERC for the 2017-18 Undergraduate Catalog. She will provide the list to GERC for their review and approval in the next couple of weeks.

Adjourn: 4:03 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 28, 2017  
Accepted by UCC: March 2, 2017 via email ballot  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: March 13, 2017

## APPENDIX

### MEMO

To: University Curriculum Council  
GERC  
Dr. Rene Rodriguez, Chair, Chemistry  
Dr. Lyle Castle, Dean, COSE  
Dr. Laura Woodworth-Ney, Provost and EVP

From: Joanne Togle, Interim AVP, Academic Affairs

Date: January 17, 2017

Re: CHEM 1101

Although UCC and GERC voted to remove CHEM 1101 as a Gen Ed course, Academic Affairs has determined that CHEM 1101 should remain a Gen Ed for AY 2017/18. We ask that Chemistry revisit its assessment of CHEM 1101 to see if the outcomes can be met by applying a broader interpretation. Chemistry will notify UCC, GERC, and Academic Affairs as to how they will evaluate the student outcomes. If the evaluation of a broader interpretation does not result in CHEM 1101 meeting the Gen Ed outcomes, Academic Affairs would request that Chemistry evaluate CHEM 1101 to determine what curriculum changes could be made to accomplish the intended outcome.

We ask that CHEM 1101 remain a Gen Ed for the next academic year for two reasons. First, it is a GEM course that is taken by a number of students. If CHEM 1101 is not a Gen Ed for our students, they are at a disadvantage compared to students at other Idaho institutions. For example, a student could take CHEM 1101 at BSU and transfer it here and have it count as a Gen Ed; a student taking CHEM 1101 here, however, could not. Second, the Respiratory Therapy program relies on CHEM 1101 to partially fulfill Objective 5. If Respiratory Therapy students have to take CHEM 1111 instead, their math requirement will increase to meet CHEM 1111 prerequisites, which would add additional credits to a program that is already has more credits than their accreditors deem optimal. This is partially as a result of the credit requirements associated with Gen Ed.

Academic Affairs appreciates the thoughtful consideration of this issue shown by all parties involved, including Chemistry, UCC, and GERC, and we wish to thank you for the time and energy you invested in your deliberations. However, we ask that you continue to work to find a way to retain CHEM 1101 as a General Education course.

## Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 31 January 2017  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Lori Austill, Bob Houghton (UCC), Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Catherine Read  
Excused: JoAnn Hertz  
Guests: none

### 1. Announcements

Tokle announced changes to Read's job duties. She still will continue working with UCC and GERC, but will move to the Administration building to Room 104 and report to Tokle. Faculty Senate meetings will be handled by Connie Tillotson. UCC and GERC will now meet in Academic Affairs' Conference Room 102 after today's meeting. For emails, use [uccmail@isu.edu](mailto:uccmail@isu.edu) and [gercmail@isu.edu](mailto:gercmail@isu.edu), as appropriate. Read's phone number remains the same as it always has been.

### 2. Minutes – *will vote by email*

### 3. [Assessment Plans](#) – *deferred until later in the meeting.*

### 4. Objective 1 – minimum grade requirement for the whole Objective?

#### a. Email excerpt from Sarah Mead:

“The English proposal added the grade minimum [of C- or better] for ENGL 1101 [or ENGL 1101P] as a prerequisite to ENGL 1102, but the HONS 1101 course proposal did not [specify a minimum grade requirement].

I think the question on the table for GERC is now that Objective 1 has a 6 credit requirement, with the addition of ENGL 1101, does Objective 1 itself have a grade minimum for all courses listed?”

Much discussion of two questions:

- 1) Should HONS 1101 require minimum grade for ENGL 1101/1101P as C- to match ENGL 1102 prereq requirements?

**Yes.** It will require UCC proposal ASAP to get into 2017-18 catalog!  
Shropshire and Houghton will contact the Honors Program and if they agree, Houghton will shepherd a proposal through the UCC process in the next week or so.

- 2) Should C- be required to fulfill Objective 1?

**No.** Some programs in the College of Technology (e.g., Automotive Technology) would be adversely affected.

### 5. Removal of courses from Gen Ed Program:

Need to clarify a mechanism for ensuring GERC as a whole **does** see each UCC Proposal and considers whether to approve the removal or not. UCC suggests GERC's website to refer to SBOE's website of listed courses offered by all institutions on Objectives 1 thru 6: <http://coursetransfer.idaho.gov/> so proposal originators can quickly look up the transfer

impact. Current process should be adequate with all the different eyes viewing the proposal for impacts. GERC chair will be responsible for bringing such proposals to GERC for review, but others will help keep an eye out, too. Change GERC's website to add the blurbs and transfer link.

6. Additions to UCC's questions to Selena Grace about gen ed assessment: 1/17/17 email Joanne to Sandi:
  - a. "UCC had questions about Gen Ed assessment, like how often, what does SBOE require, what does NWCCU require, etc, and Selena offered to answer whatever questions you may have. She asked for a list of specific questions that she could address."
  - b. In addition, Darren Blagburn has asked if Assessment Plan Reports could be due Oct 1<sup>st</sup> instead of Nov 1<sup>st</sup>. That would help with ISU's mid-cycle accreditation report.  
**Difficult:** UCC and GERC proposals/assessment plans are due Sept 20<sup>th</sup>, so it would be difficult to meet an October 1 assessment reporting deadline, too. Some human interpretation of the data mass will be required.

Discussion. Departments retain lots of latitude in deciding their own assessment schedules. Flowchart and gen ed course assessment process are posted on GERC's website for reference. Shropshire has a modification she would like Holland to make to the flowchart.

- Current gen ed assessment process only requires each course and objective learning outcome be reviewed every 5-year period, not necessarily annually.
- Objective Review Committees (ORCs) will meet every 5 years to review the reports for each course and learning outcome in their particular Objective.
- ORCs will start meeting in 2018-19.

Shropshire asked members to send specific questions for Selena to Joanne Tokle or Read.

### **From Future Business list**

- a. (C) 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)  
Holland said that as of October 2016 the State Discipline Groups decided to leave minimum grades for issuing gen ed credit up to each individual institution. For instance, Gen Ed credit received at BSU or CSI would transfer to ISU or U of I, regardless of minimum grade requirements at each particular institution.
- b. (D) 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.  
State Discipline Groups decided to leave it up to each institution. Mead explained the Registrar's Office is requiring transfer students from quarter systems who are missing fractions of credits from the SBOE-mandated number of Objective credits to take one additional Gen Ed course to meet the 36 credit requirement.

Motion to endorse the current Registrar policy with respect to students transferring in with partial credits in the gen ed curriculum: Holland/Wilson.

Discussion. There is no written policy of this practice, however. It is built into DegreeWorks.

Motion **tabled**, pending review of a written policy from Registrar's Office to ensure the practice is written down and should appear in the Undergraduate Catalog for clarification.

- c. (E) Should institutionally designated gen ed credits transfer as gen ed regardless of alignment of institutionally designated objectives between schools?  
*Deferred until a subsequent meeting.*

7. Assessment Plans.

Some courses have multiple versions of assessment plans. Members will review them and identify the correct versions for Read to process.

a. **CSD 2210 revised Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

Revisions have been entered into the plan document. Learning outcomes are now addressed in the rubric, though not specifically mapped out. Grading sheet still does not show how data will be produced for Outcomes #2 and #3; they are lumped together, but the originator will discover the difficulty once she submits the assessment report. Olsen will pass on to the originator GERC's suggestion to add another line to the rubric to separate Outcomes #2 and #3.

Motion to approve: Holmes/Holland

**Approved.**

b. **EDUC 1110 revised Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

GERC's concerns were addressed. One minor correction made.

Motion to approve: Letzring/Holland

**Approved.**

c. **SCPY 1001 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

Members need to more carefully review the changes made since conditional approval last November. Concern raised about relying on course grade for assessment purposes.

**Tabled.**

8. Other Council's Information Items – None this week

Final Gen Ed list still needs clarification whether Objective 1 as a whole should have minimum grade requirement of C-, or just the ENGL 1102 and HONS 1101 courses.

Next meeting will be on February 14, 2017 in the new location, ADMIN 102.

Adjourn: 4:20

Approved by GERC: March 8, 2017 via email ballot  
Accepted by UCC: March 9, 2017 via email ballot  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: March 27, 2017

# Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 14 February 2017  
Academic Affairs Conference Room Admin 102  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin,  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Lori Austill, JoAnn Hertz (for Susanne Forrest),  
Excused: Bob Houghton (UCC), Catherine Read  
Absent: Janette Olsen  
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes – will vote by email

### 3. [Assessment Plans](#)

#### a. **HIST 1111 and 1112 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

Issue of prerequisites on gen ed courses. Students come in unprepared, especially in English, so take ENGL 1101P. Consider requiring ENGL 1101 and maybe ENGL 1102 as prerequisites so students have better chance of succeeding in their subsequent classes? Problems: some students take gen eds as dual enrollment (Early College Program). May be hard to sequence gen ed courses; students may avoid courses with prerequisites. Up to departments to set prereqs. SBOE discourages prereqs on gen ed courses, idea is gen eds should be open to everyone. GERC could consider making some formal observation regarding the Early College Program and how it pertains to GERC and gen eds. Departments must have the authority to control their dual enrollment courses and who teaches them, including the vetting process of both teachers and students in the course. Another possibility might be to establish ENGL 1101/1102 as pre-reqs to a particular Objective, so students must take ENGL 1102 before being allowed to take an Objective 4 course, for instance. However that could cause some difficulty for students in scheduling their classes. *Keep the comments on the assessment plan so History department can see them, do not resolve them.*

Motion to approve: Holland, Letzring

**Approved**, with 1 opposed and no abstentions.

#### b. **HIST 1118 and 1120 Assessment Plan – Objective 6**

Sample work is not clearly aligned with Objective competencies. *Keep the comments on the assessment plan so History department can see them, do not resolve them.*

Motion to approve: Skidmore/Letzring

**Approved**, with 1 opposed and no abstentions.

#### c. **HIST 2291 Assessment Plan – Objective 8**

*Keep the comments on the assessment plan so History department can see them, do not resolve them.*

Motion to approve: Wilson/Holland

**Approved**, with 1 opposed and no abstentions.

#### d. **SCPY 1001 Assessment Plan – Objective 9**

Plan had been conditionally approved by GERC previously. Discussion. Revisions

simplify the distillation of assessment data by eliminating the percentage breakdowns and replacing them with a simple grid evaluating the outcomes and compiling them into a single score. Question about how data collected by the indirect measures will be tabulated; GERC will not likely be concerned with it, but it could yield useful information for the department internally. Since the plan was already **conditionally approved**, no need to approve it again.

#### Unsubmitted Assessment Plans

Shropshire reported the chair of Global Studies and Languages said he will follow up with the faculty members working on their remaining assessment plans. Still no response received from Physics, so Shropshire will now contact the Dean of Science & Engineering.

#### 4. HONS 1101 – Objective 1

A catalog change proposal was submitted to, and approved, by Undergraduate Curriculum Council (UCC) establishing ENGL 1101 as a pre-requisite with a minimum grade requirement of C- for HONS 1101.

#### 5. GEOL 1108 – Objective 8

Geology plans to withdraw this course from the Gen Ed program and will follow the protocol recently established by GERC and UCC. No assessment plan will be needed for this course if it is to be removed. Tokle reported the State Board of Education has no procedures or restrictions on removing courses from the Gen Ed Program; they leave it up to the individual institutions to devise their own conventions. In response to Wilson's query, GERC members confirmed the GERC chair will be responsible for ensuring GERC as a whole reviews and determines the fate of UCC proposals seeking to remove a course(s) from the Gen Ed Program.

#### 6. Darren Blagburn's request for 10/1/ assessment report submission deadline.

Tokle has an assessment training workshop with the North West accreditors coming up in a couple of weeks and should have more information about reporting deadlines when she returns from that training. An October 1 deadline is very close to UCC's and GERC's September 20 deadline for proposal and assessment plan submissions, so could cause a workload problem for the councils.

#### 7. Passport Program

Holland reminded members that ISU is considering whether to participate in the new interstate gen ed transfer Initiative created by WICHE and known as the Interstate Passport Program. Last spring his group compared the Passport Gen Ed outcomes against ISU's outcomes to identify what additional requirements ISU's gen ed courses would have to satisfy in order to be included in a Passport Block. The group solicited input from departments which Holland used to draft a potential Passport Block, trying to align it as closely as possible with ISU's own gen ed curriculum. He asked GERC members review the draft documents he developed for discussion next meeting. GERC only needs to figure out what a potential Passport Block should look like, if ISU were to decide to participate in the program. ISU has until the end of this spring semester to submit their proposed Passport Block to WICHE.

#### 8. Items from future business list

##### Transfer credits dilemma

Mead asked members to consider removing the reference to credit requirements from the individual Objectives in the catalog gen ed course list (i.e., Objective 1 (~~6 credits~~), etc.), as it used to be prior to the 2015-16 catalog. This would help solve problems with quarter system transfer credits. This will be discussed further at the next meeting after members have a chance to read Mead's memo explaining the problem.

#### Objective review cycle

Discussion. The state has no restrictions on the frequency for assessing objective outcomes, as long as all are reviewed at least every 5 years. There should be some way of ensuring departments are adhering to their planned review cycles. The expectation is that departments will submit reports every year, regardless of whether any outcomes are being assessed that year or not. Simply check the box indicating the outcome is not being assessed for that year. GERC might need to remind departments of the yearly reporting expectation.

#### Test credit for gen ed courses

Students who have taken Advanced Placement (AP) courses in high school are given credit for meeting the Gen Ed Objectives for those courses. However, those students are not assessed on the state competencies for the Objectives for which they are receiving Gen Ed credit. In the sciences, for example, AP courses only test for mastery of technical content of that subject, which is only one of the five required outcomes. This problem may also apply to students receiving credit for COMPASS or ALEKS exams. Even though AP scores have proven to be more reliable measures of student success than Early College, there still is an inherent inequality and lower standard for AP test credit, since Early College courses are included in the gen ed assessment procedures, but AP courses are not. This is a hole in the gen ed assessment program that GERC should formally note for the record. Programs have some sort of assessment for their graduating students. Discussion whether GERC consider asking for some sort of regular accounting from the State Discipline Groups. Togle attends the statewide meetings, and she volunteered to garner information and report back to GERC

#### 9. Council Minutes – information-sharing items

None this week

Adjourn: 3:48 p.m.

Approved by GERC: March 8, 2017 via email ballot

Accepted by UCC: March 9, 2017 via email ballot

Accepted by Academic Affairs : March 28, 2017

## Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 28 February 2017  
Academic Affairs Conference Room Admin 102  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Lori Austill, JoAnn Hertz (for Susanne Forrest), Catherine Read  
Excused: Cara Esplin, Bob Houghton (UCC)  
Guests: none

### 1. Announcements

GERC's final list of Gen Ed courses for the 2017-18 catalog was approved by UCC and Academic Affairs.

### 2. Minutes – [August 23, 2016](#), [November 15, 2016](#), [December 6, 2016](#), [January 10, 2017](#)

Motion to approve all four sets: Skidmore/Holland.

**Approved** unanimously, except for 1 abstention for August 23 minutes

### 3. [Updated state competencies to GEM Objective 2: Oral Communication](#) – approve for 2017-18 undergraduate catalog.

Email dated 2/24/2017 from Joanne Tokle:

“The SBOE recently approved changes to the learning competencies for Gen Ed Objective 2, which were the result of recommendations made by the discipline group. I have attached an updated Gen Ed document that Michelle Steffens sent this morning. The changes that were made are on the top of page 3.

“Jim DiSanza worked hard with the discipline group to get these changes approved. He will also work on updating documents for GERC.”

Motion to accept the state-mandated changes to Objective 2 ([Appendix A](#)) for inclusion in the upcoming 2017-18 catalog: Holland/Holmes

**Accepted** with 1 abstention.

### 4. Recommendation from Office of the Registrar – Sarah Mead ([Appendix C](#))

Consider removing the individual Objective credit requirements from the catalog Gen Ed course listing, e.g.: “Minimum of two (2) courses. ~~(6 credits)~~”

Mead explained this proposed change would help students coming in from institutions on quarter systems whose transfers credits fall slightly short of required credits for each Objective, for example 2.66 credits rather than 3.0 credits. Discussion. The credit requirements for each Objective are State-mandated, so could be problematic to delete them.

Instead of deleting the number of required credits from each Objective, members posed the following clarifying statement to be included in the undergraduate catalog:

#### Transfer Credits

A student whose transfer credit meets a specific Objective's course requirement but falls no more than one credit short of meeting the credit requirement for that Objective will be deemed to have satisfied the Objective. (A student missing more than one credit relative to an Objective's requirement must complete additional coursework specific to that

Objective.) If a student does not meet the minimum credits required (36) once all ~~9~~ **nine 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.

Motion to approve the above text for inclusion in the 2017-18 catalog replacing the second paragraph under the heading “General Education Requirements” on the General Education page: Letzring/Holland  
**Approved** unanimously.

*Revised text below was subsequently approved by GERC via email the next day, on Wednesday, March 1, 2017 ([Appendix B](#)):*

## 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.

### Transfer Credits

A student with transfer credits that meet a specific Objective’s course requirement but fall no more than one credit short of meeting its credit requirement will be deemed to have satisfied the Objective. (A student missing more than one credit in an Objective must complete additional coursework specific to that Objective.)

If a student has satisfied all nine Objectives but does not meet the total minimum credits required requirement for general education (36), ~~once all nine 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.

Passport Program – Andy Holland

- a. [Interstate Passport Fall 2016 Background](#)
- b. [ISU Passport Block Construction Input](#)
- c. [Passport Block draft](#)

Holland explained his work in analyzing and mapping ISU’s gen ed courses against the Passport Program’s required outcomes. Some departments have not responded to his inquiries about their courses, so some adjustments will likely be needed to this initial draft. Discussion. Members had a favorable impression at first scan of Holland’s proposed Passport Block of gen ed courses. However, they had reservations about the wisdom of having ISU join this program, concerns about whether rigor could be adequately ensured. ISU would need to closely monitor rigor and students’ scholastic success over time. Holland reported quite a few other universities and colleges considering the Passport Program are also hesitant to participate. Shropshire suggested members spend a couple of weeks reviewing and absorbing this information with an eye toward voting on the draft in their next meeting.

## 5. [Assessment Plans](#)

Shropshire noted there are three categories of assessment plans still to be approved:

**Physics** – She contacted the college dean, who said he would contact the department chair and would request him to contact Holland. Hopefully those plans will be submitted soon.

**Art** – the college Associate Dean informed her the chair of Art is out on medical leave and gave her the name of another faculty member to contact about the plans.

**Languages** – RUSS 2201/2202 assessment plan has been revised and should be ready for GERC to review. The department chair has said he will follow up with the originators of the remaining plans.

6. Darren Blagburn's request for 10/1/ assessment report submission deadline.  
Joanne Tokle will have more information next meeting after her trip to Seattle for the NWCCU mid-cycle accreditation workshop.
7. Items from future business list –  
Next year's committee Officers  
Shropshire requested members begin considering whom to nominate for next year's Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary. The membership roster with term expiration dates is posted on GERC's website. Colleges will soon be notified of vacating council seats so they can start their election process for replacements.
8. Council Minutes – information-sharing items  
None this week

Next meeting is in two weeks, on **Tuesday, March 14, 2017 at 2:30 p.m.** in the Academic Affairs Conference Room 102.

Adjourn: 4:23 p.m.

Approved by GERC: March 8, 2017 via email ballot  
Accepted by UCC: March 9, 2017 via email ballot  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: March 27, 2017

## APPENDIX A

**Idaho State Board of Education**  
**GOVERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES**  
**SECTION: III. POSTSECONDARY AFFAIRS**  
**SUBSECTION: N. Statewide General Education**

**February 2017**

- ...
4. GEM courses in each area shall include the following competencies.  
...
  - b. Oral Communication: Upon completion of a course in this category, students are able to demonstrate ~~at least five (5) of~~ the following competencies.
    - i. Research, discover, and develop information resources and structure spoken verbal messages to increase knowledge and understanding.
    - ii. Research, discover, and develop evidence-based reasoning and persuasive appeals for ethically influencing attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.
    - ~~iii. Understand interpersonal rules, roles, and strategies in varied contexts.~~

- iii. ~~Effectively listen and adapt~~ spoken verbal messages to the diverse personal, ideological, and emotional needs of individuals, groups, or contexts.  
~~perspectives of the audience.~~
- iv. Employ effective spoken verbal and nonverbal behaviors that support communication goals and illustrate self-efficacy.
- v. ~~Listen in order to~~ Effectively recognize and critically evaluate the reasoning, evidence, and communication strategies of self and others.
- vi. Understand key theories, perspectives, principles, and concepts in the Communication discipline, as applied to oral communication

## APPENDIX B

### 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.

##### Transfer Credits

A student with transfer credits that meet a specific Objective's course requirement but fall no more than one credit short of meeting its credit requirement will be deemed to have satisfied the Objective. (A student missing more than one credit in an Objective must complete additional coursework specific to that Objective.)

If a student has satisfied all nine Objectives but does not meet the total minimum credits ~~required~~ requirement for general education (36), ~~once all nine 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.

*Above is GERC's solution to the Registrar's suggestion below, in Appendix C:*

## APPENDIX C

### Memorandum

To: Sandra Shropshire General Education Committee Chair

Cc: General Education Committee

From: Sarah Mead

Date: 2/14/17

Re: Objective area credit requirement

Dear GERC,

The Office of the Registrar would like the General Education Requirements Committee (GERC) to consider removing the minimum credit requirement added to each Objective area within the General Education Objective structure (this change to the catalog was effective catalog year 2015/16). Prior to this change, the Objectives were listed with course requirements along with an overarching minimum credit threshold for the ISU general education program.

In the 2015/16 catalog credit requirements were added to each Objective area 1-9. This change impacts students who transfer to ISU under an out of state quarter credit system. As a business practice, under the guidance of Academic Affairs, our office has automatically waived partial credit requirement within a specific general education Objective, as long as the course (or courses) was within one credit hour.

It is the recommendation of the Office of the Registrar to ask GERC to consider moving the ISU General Education Objective structure back to a course based system rather than a credit and course based structure. This will allow clarity at the catalog level for students who transfer to ISU under a different credit hour system.

Thank you for considering this recommendation.

Best Regards,

Sarah Mead

## Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 14 March 2017  
Academic Affairs Conference Room Admin 102  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin,  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Lori Austill, Catherine Read  
Excused: Janette Olsen; Bob Houghton (UCC), Susanne Forrest  
Guests: Margaret Johnson (Academic Affairs)

### 1. Announcements

Approved by UCC and Academic Affairs for publishing in the 2017-18 catalog:

- GERC's final list of Gen Ed courses
- Revised competencies for Objective 2 (State-mandated)
- Clarification Statement for Transfer Credits

Next GERC meeting, March 28, will be held in **Faculty Senate's Conference Room REND 301**.

2. Minutes for **January 31, 2017, February 14, 2017** and **February 28, 2017** were all approved by GERC via email on March 8, 2017, and accepted by UCC by email on March 10, 2017. Now caught up and current on Minutes for this committee.

### 3. Passport Program – Andy Holland and Margaret Johnson

- [Interstate Passport Fall 2016 Background](#)
- [ISU Passport Block Construction Input](#)

The hypothetical Passport Block was created to satisfy requirements of the grant, which ends in May. If GERC approves this Block, Academic Affairs will forward it to WICHE with the caveat it does not constitute a commitment that ISU will participate in the Passport Program.

Holland reported WICHE has scheduled a conference call next week to discuss whether to change the current policy of requiring both a Physical Science course and a Life Science course in the Gen Ed Programs. He will forward any comments or suggestions GERC may have to the WICHE committee for consideration.

Holland will get feedback from the Registrar on how difficult it would be to implement the Block. The Provost will be briefed on the pros and cons of going ahead this Block, and she will likely also talk with North Idaho College to get their perspective as they, too, participated in this exercise. From there it might progress to a discussion at the statewide Provosts' group. If ISU decides to join the Passport Program, GERC would be asked to revisit this hypothetical Block to ensure it fits with SBOE Gen Ed policy requirements, and to update and refine the Passport Block. ISU currently does not have any courses in the *Teamwork and Values* category. The other major difficulty for students, especially in Engineering and physical science majors, is if they were required to take Biology or Nutrition to satisfy the Life Sciences, thereby adding another 3-4 credits to their already heavy course load.

If the Passport Program is implemented, SBOE will need to address the 36-credit Gen Ed requirement, since it is possible for students to transfer in with fewer than 36 credits.

GERC will need to be involved in the university decision-making process, and endorse whatever

decision ISU makes in the future regarding whether to participate in the Passport Program.

- c. Passport Block draft – attached as [Appendix A](#)

**Motion:** GERC endorses this draft Passport Block (Skidmore/Letzring) Appendix

**Amendment:** Endorse this as a draft Passport Block with the understanding that GERC reserves the right to revisit the draft in the event that ISU decides to participate in or join the Passport Program. (Holland; amendment accepted by Skidmore and Letzring)

**Approved** unanimously.

Margaret Johnson left the meeting at this point.

4. Update from Academic Affairs –

Joanne Tokle attended NWCCU accreditation workshop in Seattle. She distributed a handout from the assessment workshop to GERC members and asked them to look at Standards 4.A and 4.B and the Rubrics ([Appendix B](#)) to see how GERC's process fits in with the requirements.

ISU is in Year 3 of the 7-year cycle, so it is called the Mid-Cycle Review. The purpose is to make sure ISU is on track in preparing for its 7-Year Report. Part of the review is focused on learning outcomes and assessment of those outcomes. The accreditors will be looking for:

- Evidence that assessment data is collected regularly
- Really measuring what should be measuring
- How assessment results are disseminated to constituents
- Evidence that the data collected is readily available for faculty to review and is actually being used for planning and making improvements

In its work thus far, GERC has taken the view that it is GERC's role to create a structure and mechanism for departments to report their results via the report submission process, but it is up to the departments to do their own reviews, decide upon and implement changes, etc. GERC will need to decide how it plans to disseminate its information its university constituents, once it defines who those constituents are. Intent is to post the approved Assessment Plans on GERC's website where ISU community can view them. The assessment reports themselves and their results should be more selectively disseminated. Moodle would be one possible way of managing the summarized data internally.

- a. *Darren Blagburn's request for 10/1 assessment report submission deadline.*

Tokle will be working on her section of the Mid-Cycle Review Report this summer explaining what progress has been made, and what is being planned. No reason to change the due date for submitting assessment reports. Gen Ed Program and one other program with specialized accreditation will be used as ISU's examples for the Mid-Cycle Review Report.

5. Nominations for Officers for FY2017-18

Eligible members:

Jim Skidmore, Andy Holland, Jon Holmes, Matt Wilson, Sandi Shropshire, Cara Esplin

Terms expiring this semester:

Tera Letzring (mid-term replacement, eligible for 2<sup>nd</sup> term)

Shu-Yuan Lin (mid-term replacement, eligible for 2<sup>nd</sup> term)

Jim Wolper (eligible for 2<sup>nd</sup> term)

Janette Olsen (eligible for 2<sup>nd</sup> term)

Review of the duties of GERC's officers. The chair and vice chair occasionally get called into other meetings to present GERC's work and perspectives. The vice chair attends UCC meetings at least twice a month to help coordinate the two councils' efforts. Secretary could take over

more of the communication duties, such as writing memos to departments. It is also helpful when the other officers or a couple of the council members read and provide input on communication drafts before they are finalized and sent out. Suggest to change officer elections to fall instead of waiting until spring. Would make it easier to arrange schedules and courseloads to accommodate committee responsibilities.

GERC's workload and responsibilities have substantially increased in the past three years, and are not anticipated to ease up any time soon. Skidmore was not in a position to be chair next year, but was willing to serve as chair in 2018-19. Discussion. Consider shifting workload responsibilities more equitably among the officers. Shropshire was willing to serve another year as chair, if need be.

**Nomination:** Matt Wilson as Chair: Lin/Holland. Matt was willing to serve but is not tenure-track, which members felt is not optimal for this particular committee.

**Nomination:** Sandi Shropshire as Chair: Skidmore/Wilson. Wilson's second was with the caveat that workload sharing be seriously considered.

**Vote Results:** Sandi Shropshire was elected as Chair again for 2017-18.

**Nomination:** Matt Wilson as Vice Chair: Shropshire/Holland.

**Nomination:** Jim Skidmore as Vice Chair: Letzring/Shropshire

**Vote Results:** Jim Skidmore was elected as Vice Chair for 2017-18.

**Nomination:** Jon Holmes as Secretary: Wilson/Shropshire

**Nomination:** Cara Esplin as Secretary: Letzring/Wilson

**Vote Results:** Cara Esplin was elected as Secretary for 2017-18

## 6. Assessment Plans

### a. Motions to approve plans

#### 1) [RUSS 2201/2202](#)

Revisions received follow the format of other language course assessment plans that were approved. Still a little concern that the described activities of the course meet the gen ed outcomes, but the examples to be assessed are less clear that they assess the outcomes.

**Motion** to approve: Skidmore/Wolper.

**Approved** unanimously.

Start drafting a memo now that reminds departments they need to assess the gen ed objective outcomes using the instruments they describe in their plans. In doing so, some departments could realize they might need to adjust their assessment instruments to better align them with the outcomes. Using course grades is not sufficient, since grades measure more than the gen ed outcomes. Memo should be ready to send out right after spring break to several departments.

## 7. Items from future business list – not discussed.

## 8. Council Minutes – information-sharing items

None this week

Adjourn: 4:04 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 8, 2017 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: May 9, 2017 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 19, 2017

APPENDIX A

Hypothetical Draft Passport Block

**Draft Interstate Passport Block for GERC Appraisal, February 2017**

To earn an Interstate Passport credential, students would complete a total of 36 credits, with grades of C or better, across all of the courses listed below. These credits must include one or more classes in each of nine categories:

**Written Communication:** Two of the following:

ENGL 1101
ENGL 1102
HONS 1101

**Oral Communication:** One of the following

COMM 1101
-----------

**Quantitative Reasoning:** One of the following:

MATH 1123	MATH 2256
MATH 1127	MATH 2257
MATH 1130	MGT 2216
MATH 1153	RCET 1372
MATH 1160	TGE 1140
MATH 1170	

**Creative Expression:** Two of the following, including courses from two different groups.

A.	B.
ENGL 1110	ART 1100
ENGL 1115	ART 1101
ENGL 1126	ART 1102
ENGL 2257	ART 2210/CMP 2250
ENGL 2258	DANC 1105
HONS 1102	DANC 2205
PHIL 1101	MUSC 1100
PHIL 1103	MUSC 1106
	MUSC 1108
	MUSC 1109
	THEA 1101
	TGE 1257

C.	
ANTH/SHOS 1101	JAPN 1101
ANTH/SHOS 1102	JAPN 1102
ARBC 1101	LANG 1101
ARBC 1102	LANG 1102
CHNS 1101	LATN 1101
CHNS 1102	LATN 1102
CSD 1151	RUSS 1101
CSD 1152	RUSS 1102
FREN 1101	SPAN 1101
FREN 1102	SPAN 1102
GERM 1101	
GERM 1102	

**Comment [1]:** Satisfying all categories at ISU would currently require at least 37 credits.

**Comment [2]:** This threshold is required by WICHE, and differs from ISU's D requirement for all classes outside Objective 1.

**Comment [3]:** Same requirement as ISU Objective 1.

**Comment [4]:** Same requirement as ISU Objective 2.

**Comment [5]:** Same requirement as ISU Objective 3.

**Comment [6]:** Designed to mimic ISU Objective 4's "two courses from two different categories" structure, and preserves ISU's category assignments **except for TGE 1257**. The "engage in the creative process" PLO is most questionable in this category. All courses listed in groups A and C satisfy a loose interpretation considering all long-form writing to be a creative process. Most of the arts did not offer input, but can still contribute toward most other outcomes. **TGE 1257 does not satisfy the creative process PLO, so it was moved to the Arts category to ensure that all students complete one course including that outcome. Its re-categorization is problematic – it may be better to remove it.**

**Comment [7]:** This is a sensible way of constructing this part of it. I would just note here that it is indeed a "very" loose reading of the "creative expression" PLO that allows courses in A. and C. here to meet it.

**Natural Science:** Two of the following, including **both** one from column A and one from column B.

**A. Life Sciences**

<i>BIOL 1100&amp;L</i>
<i>BIOL 1101&amp;L</i>
<i>NTD 2239</i>

**B. Physical Sciences**

<i>CHEM 1100</i>	PHYS 1100
<b>CHEM 1101</b>	PHYS 1101 & L
<i>CHEM 1102&amp;1103</i>	PHYS 1111 & 1113
<i>*CHEM 1111&amp;L</i>	PHYS 1112 & 1114
<i>*CHEM 1112&amp;L</i>	PHYS 1152 & 1153
GEOL 1100&L	PHYS 2211 & 2213
GEOL 1101&L	PHYS 2212 & 2214
GEOL 1110	

**Comment [8]:** ISU's Objective 5 simply requires two courses, including one lab, in two different prefixes. The more specific split imposed here satisfies WICHE's demand for both life and physical science. Also, BIOL and NTD satisfy all outcomes, so GEOL and PHYS courses can be included for their contribution to other outcomes even though they did not respond.

**Society and the Individual:** Two of the following, including **at least one course in column A**, and no more than one course in a given prefix.

**A.**

<i>ANTH 1100</i>
<i>HIST 1101</i>
<i>HIST 1102</i>
<i>HIST 1111</i>
<i>HIST 1112</i>
<i>*POLS 1101</i>
<i>TGE 1150</i>

**B.**

<b>PSYC 1101</b>
ECON 1100
ECON 2201
ECON 2202
EDUC 1110
IS 2203
SOC 1101
SOC 1102

**Comment [9]:** ISU's Objective 6 requires two courses with two different prefixes. PSYC 1101 does not claim to meet the society-specific PLO, and other category B courses did not respond, but they can be included as supplemental breadth courses in this category to mirror ISU's requirement.

**Critical Thinking:** One of the following:

<i>ANTH/ENGL/LANG 1107</i>
<i>HIST 1118</i>
<i>HIST 1120</i>
<i>PHIL 2201</i>
<i>PHIL 2250</i>
<i>*POLS 2202</i>

**Comment [10]:** This category (analogous to Objective 7) requires only one course, so several courses that didn't provide input or could not meet all outcomes are excluded here: CS/INFO 1181 (no treatment of bias), CMP 2205, GEOL 1107, SOC 2248, THEA 1181, THEA 2251 (no responses).

**Human Cultures:** One of the following:

**Comment [11]:** Includes all Objective 9 courses except EDUC 2204, ENGL 2210, and SOC 2201, which did not provide input.

<i>ANTH/SHOS 2201</i>	<i>CHNS 2201</i>	<i>GERM 2201</i>	<i>IS 2202</i>	<i>SPAN 2201</i>
<i>ANTH/SHOS 2202</i>	<i>CHNS 2202</i>	<i>GERM 2202</i>	<i>JAPN 2201</i>	<i>SPAN 2202</i>
<i>ANTH/ENGL 2212</i>	<i>CMLT 2207</i>	<i>HIST 2201</i>	<i>JAPN 2202</i>	
<i>ANTH 2237</i>	<i>CMLT 2208</i>	<i>HIST 2249</i>	<i>LATN 2201</i>	
<i>ANTH 2238</i>	<i>CMLT 2209</i>	<i>HIST 2251</i>	<i>LATN 2202</i>	
<i>ANTH 2239</i>	<i>CSD 2210</i>	<i>HIST 2252</i>	<i>PHIL 2210</i>	
<i>ARBC 2201</i>	<i>FREN 2201</i>	<i>HIST 2254</i>	<i>RUSS 2201</i>	
<i>ARBC 2202</i>	<i>FREN 2202</i>	<i>HIST 2255</i>	<i>RUSS 2202</i>	

**Teamwork and Values:** One of the following. (Note that all these courses simultaneously satisfy requirements in other categories.)

**Comment [12]:** This category has no analogue at ISU. All departments were invited to suggest gen ed or lower division courses satisfying these outcomes, and these were the only respondents.

<i>*CHEM 1111L (Natural Science)</i>
<i>*CHEM 1112L (Natural Science)</i>
<i>*POLS 1101 (Society and Individual)</i>
<i>*POLS 2202 (Critical Thinking)</i>

**Electives**

**Comment [13]:** These courses would only be useful to transfer students who received fewer credits at their original institutions than are awarded at ISU for the same courses. The courses listed here either did not respond with input, do not meet all the PLO's within their category, or satisfy ISU Objective 8, which has no analogue in Passport.

If the specific categories above are satisfied by less than 36 credits of general education coursework, additional credits toward this total can be earned from any other courses above or any of the following:

<i>(from Obj. 7)</i>	<i>(from Obj. 8)</i>	<i>(from Obj. 9)</i>
<i>CS/INFO 1181</i>	<i>ACAD 1111</i>	<i>EDUC 2204</i>
<i>CMP 2205</i>	<i>CMP 2203</i>	<i>ENGL 2210</i>
<i>GEOL 1107</i>	<i>FIN 1115</i>	<i>SOC 2201</i>
<i>SOC 2248</i>	<i>GEOL 1108</i>	
<i>THEA 1181</i>	<i>HIST 2291</i>	
<i>THEA 2251</i>	<i>INFO 1101</i>	
	<i>LLIB 1115</i>	

**GREEN Italics:** meets all PLOs. **BLACK:** does not meet all PLOs.

**GREY:** no input. Meets at least some PLOs.

\*Courses that count towards more than one category.

### **Input Process:**

GERC mapped the PLOs to ISU general education outcomes in Spring 2016, and found that most PLOs were already implied within the ISU curriculum. All participating departments were asked to confirm these alignments and respond to 1-3 specific questions regarding remaining PLOs in June 2016, and an open informational meeting (attended by 10 departmental representatives) was held in July 2016. The input process was described to GERC representatives in September 2016, and additional reminders were issued to department chairs and other general education representatives in October and December 2016. All input as of February 2017 can be viewed [here](#).

### **Alignment with ISU General Education Program**

The Passport Block was designed to mirror the ISU general education requirements as closely as possible to minimize the additional planning required to complete Passport. All courses were drawn from those currently in ISU's general education curriculum. Some courses (in black or grey) were included in the block because they count toward ISU's program and contribute to some PLOs in a category, even though they may not fully satisfy all PLOs in that category.

As constructed, any completed Passport block not including TGE 1257 would fully satisfy ISU's general education requirements. Depending on grades and on course choices in ISU Objectives 5, 6, and 7/8, a complete ISU general education curriculum might or might not constitute a complete Passport Block. (Up to three additional classes might be necessary for students who earned grades of C or better in all applicable general education coursework.)

### **Primary Obstacles to Students Earning the Interstate Passport Credential**

- Passport requires a C rather than a D grade threshold.
- Passport has more specific natural science requirements, including one category with 3 courses.
  - Only 4 classes, including two with math prerequisites, satisfy the Teamwork and Values category.
- Passport currently has more restrictive social science requirements.
- 15 courses that count toward ISU general education requirements do not contribute to Passport.

### **Challenges to Constructing the Passport Block**

- The Creative Expression category includes the PLO "Engage in a creative process through experimentation, reflection, tolerance for failure, and revision." Because many of ISU's gen ed courses in the arts emphasize analysis and appreciation rather than creation, this was satisfied only by a broad interpretation of this PLO to encompass all long-form writing.
- The Natural Sciences category includes a lengthy list of PLOs regarding details of the scientific method and scientific ethics. While these are included in the curricula of those science classes that

responded to inquiries, they would make assessment of the PLOs prohibitively cumbersome if such activity were required.

- The Society and the Individual category includes several PLOs related to framing and responding to a research problem with data analysis and writing. Large general education sections in the social sciences are rarely structured to do this, so this block depends on courses in writing, math and natural science categories to deliver these outcomes outside the specific social science context. The social justice PLO is also more reliably satisfied by courses in the human cultures category.
- Some critical thinking courses did not satisfy the PLOs related to assumptions and information quality, and could not be included in this specific category in the block. They are still included as electives to fulfill the overall credit total, although at present no credits beyond those required to fulfill all specific categories would be needed by students who complete all classes at ISU.
- Only two departments indicated that their courses might satisfy PLOs in Passport's Teamwork and Values category, and two of those courses carry a significant math prerequisite, so this small category currently represents a significant bottleneck to earning Passport credentials.
- Most likely due to fatigue with the recent changes to ISU's own general education program, a number of departments never responded to repeated requests for input, and their classes are only included in categories where other courses are known to fully satisfy the PLOs. Based on the other input received, most of these courses could likely be included more fully in the block if their departments were to provide input regarding their content. The general education courses with no natural home category in this block are those in ISU Objective 8, which has no analogue in Passport.

**Pros and Cons of Possible Modifications:**

Written communication could easily be reduced to 3 credits to exclude ENGL 1101, which would reduce the credit total but have no impact on actual student experience.

The Creative Expression and Society and Individual requirements could be reduced to one class each, as a significant number of the courses in each category individually meet all PLOs. This would remove 20 courses from the lists of those partially satisfying these categories, but students could be asked to fill the freed 6 credits from any of ISU's general education courses, including these 20 and the 15 gen ed classes currently available only as electives. This would be more inclusive of ISU's current general education courses, but less rigorous in social science and humanities than ISU's own general education requirements. Such an approach would make it possible to complete a Passport Block without completing ISU's internal general education requirements.

## APPENDIX B

- 3.B.3 Core theme planning is informed by the collection of appropriately defined data that are analyzed and used to evaluate accomplishment of core theme objectives. Planning for programs and services is informed by the collection of appropriately defined data that are used to evaluate achievement of the goals or intended outcomes of those programs and services.

### Standard Four – Effectiveness and Improvement

The institution regularly and systematically collects data related to clearly defined indicators of achievement, analyzes those data, and formulates evidence-based evaluations of the achievement of core theme objectives. It demonstrates clearly defined procedures for evaluating the integration and significance of institutional planning, the allocation of resources, and the application of capacity in its activities for achieving the intended outcomes of its programs and services and for achieving its core theme objectives. The institution disseminates assessment results to its constituencies and uses those results to effect improvement.

#### 4.A Assessment

- 4.A.1 The institution engages in ongoing systematic collection and analysis of meaningful, assessable, and verifiable data—quantitative and/or qualitative, as appropriate to its indicators of achievement—as the basis for evaluating the accomplishment of its core theme objectives.
- 4.A.2 The institution engages in an effective system of evaluation of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered, to evaluate achievement of clearly identified program goals or intended outcomes. Faculty have a primary role in the evaluation of educational programs and services.
- 4.A.3 The institution documents, through an effective, regular, and comprehensive system of assessment of student achievement, that students who complete its educational courses, programs, and degrees, wherever offered and however delivered, achieve identified course, program, and degree learning outcomes. Faculty with teaching responsibilities are responsible for evaluating student achievement of clearly identified learning outcomes.
- 4.A.4 The institution evaluates holistically the alignment, correlation, and integration of programs and services with respect to accomplishment of core theme objectives.
- 4.A.5 The institution evaluates holistically the alignment, correlation, and integration of planning, resources, capacity, practices, and assessment with respect to achievement of the goals or intended outcomes of its programs or services, wherever offered and however delivered.
- 4.A.6 The institution regularly reviews its assessment processes to ensure they appraise authentic achievements and yield meaningful results that lead to improvement.

#### 4.B Improvement

- 4.B.1 Results of core theme assessments and results of assessments of programs and services are:  
a) based on meaningful institutionally identified indicators of achievement; b) used for improvement by informing planning, decision making, and allocation of resources and capacity; and c) made available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner.

- 4.B.2 The institution uses the results of its assessment of student learning to inform academic and learning-support planning and practices that lead to enhancement of student learning achievements. Results of student learning assessments are made available to appropriate constituencies in a timely manner.

#### **Standard Five – Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability**

Based on its definition of mission fulfillment and informed by the results of its analysis of accomplishment of its core theme objectives, the institution develops and publishes evidence-based evaluations regarding the extent to which it is fulfilling its mission. The institution regularly monitors its internal and external environments to determine how and to what degree changing circumstances may impact its mission and its ability to fulfill that mission. It demonstrates that it is capable of adapting, when necessary, its mission, core themes, programs, and services to accommodate changing and emerging needs, trends, and influences to ensure enduring institutional relevancy, productivity, viability, and sustainability.

#### **5.A Mission Fulfillment**

- 5.A.1 The institution engages in regular, systematic, participatory, self-reflective, and evidence-based assessment of its accomplishments.
- 5.A.2 Based on its definition of mission fulfillment, the institution uses assessment results to make determinations of quality, effectiveness, and mission fulfillment and communicates its conclusions to appropriate constituencies and the public.

#### **5.B Adaptation and Sustainability**

- 5.B.1 Within the context of its mission and characteristics, the institution evaluates regularly the adequacy of its resources, capacity, and effectiveness of operations to document its ongoing potential to fulfill its mission, accomplish its core theme objectives, and achieve the goals or intended outcomes of its programs and services, wherever offered and however delivered.
- 5.B.2 The institution documents and evaluates regularly its cycle of planning, practices, resource allocation, application of institutional capacity, and assessment of results to ensure their adequacy, alignment, and effectiveness. It uses the results of its evaluation to make changes, as necessary, for improvement.
- 5.B.3 The institution monitors its internal and external environments to identify current and emerging patterns, trends, and expectations. Through its governance system it uses those findings to assess its strategic position, define its future direction, and review and revise, as necessary, its mission, core themes, core theme objectives, goals or intended outcomes of its programs and services, and indicators of achievement.

	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
Core Theme planning guides selection of programs and services	Minimal evidence that plans inform selection	Evidence that planning intermittently informs some selection	Evidence that planning guides program and service selection	Evidence of ongoing systematic use of planning in selection of programs and services
Core Theme planning is informed by data collection and analysis	Minimal evidence that CT planning is informed by data collection and analysis	Evidence that planning is intermittently informed by data	Evidence that planning is informed by data	Evidence of ongoing and systematic use of data in planning
Institution engages in ongoing collection and analysis of assessment data	Minimal evidence of assessment data collection and analysis	Intermittent collection of evidence and some analysis	Regular collection of assessment data and regular analysis	Regular collection and analysis of assessment data and evidence of data-informed improvement
Institution engages in evaluation of programs and services	Minimal evidence	Evidence of intermittent evaluation of programs and services	Evidence that programs are periodically evaluated	Evidence of ongoing and systematic program evaluation
Institution documents student learning in courses, programs and degrees	Minimal evidence	Evidence of intermittent documentation of student learning in courses, programs and degrees	Evidence that student learning in courses, programs and degrees is documented periodically	Evidence of ongoing and systematic documentation of student learning in courses, programs and degrees
Faculty are responsible for evaluating Student Learning Outcomes	Minimal evidence	Some evidence that some programs rely on faculty	Evidence that faculty are responsible in most programs	Evidence that faculty are responsible in all programs
Institution regularly reviews assessment plan and process	Minimal evidence	Some evidence of intermittent review	Evidence of regular review	Evidence of ongoing and systematic review
Results of Core Theme assessments are used for improvement	Minimal evidence	Evidence of intermittent use	Evidence of regular use	Evidence of ongoing and systematic use
Results of Core Theme assessments are made available to constituencies	Minimal evidence	Evidence of intermittent availability	Evidence of regular availability	Evidence of ongoing and systematic availability
Results of student learning outcomes are used to inform academic planning	Minimal evidence	Evidence of intermittent use of student learning outcomes assessment for academic planning	Evidence that the majority of programs use student learning outcomes assessment for academic planning	Evidence that the majority of programs engage in ongoing and systematic use of student learning outcomes assessment for planning
Results of student learning outcomes are made available to constituencies	Minimal evidence	Evidence of intermittent availability	Evidence of regular availability	Evidence of ongoing and systematic availability

**NWCCU | RUBRIC FOR EVALUATING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT PLAN AND PROGRESS**

Criterion	Initial	Emerging	Developed	Highly Developed
<b>Assessment Planning</b>	No formal assessment plan	Relies on intermittent planning	Clear regular plan	Clear multi-year plan with several years of implementation
<b>Assessable Outcomes</b>	Non-specific outcomes. Do not state student learning outcomes	Most outcomes indicate how students demonstrate learning	Each outcome describes student demonstration of learning	Outcomes describe demonstration of student learning. Outcomes used for improvement.
<b>Assessment Implementation</b>	Not clear that assessment data is collected	Evidence collected Faculty have discussed relevant criteria for reviewing	Evidence is collected and faculty use relevant criteria	Evidence collected, criteria determined and faculty discuss multiple sets of data. Data is used.
<b>Alignment</b>	No clear relationship between outcomes and curriculum	Some alignment between curriculum and outcomes	Clear alignment between curriculum and outcomes	Curriculum, grading and support services are aligned with outcomes
<b>Valid Results</b>	Little to no evidence that measures are valid	Majority of measures are valid	Valid measures in regular use	Multi-year use of valid measures
<b>Reliable Results</b>	No process to check for inter-rater reliability	Faculty preparing inter-rater reliability	Faculty check for inter-rater reliability	Multi-year use of process and evidence of good inter-rater reliability
<b>Annual Feedback on Assessment Efforts</b>	No person or committee provides feedback to departments on quality of their assessment plan	Occasional feedback by person or committee	Annual feedback by person or committee. Departments use feedback.	Annual feedback, departmental use and institutional support.
<b>Results are Used</b>	Results for outcomes are collected but not discussed.	Results collected, discussed but not used.	Results collected, discussed and used.	Results collected, discussed, used and evidence to confirm that changes lead to improved learning
<b>Planning and Budgeting</b>	Outcomes not integrated into planning and budget	Attempts at aligning outcomes and planning and budget	Alignment of outcomes and planning and budget occurs informally	Alignment of outcomes and planning is systematic and intentional

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 28 March 2017  
**Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen, Lucus Christoffersen (for Cara Esplin)  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Spencer Jardine (for Bob Houghton, UCC), Lori Austill, JoAnn Hertz (for Susanne Forrest), Catherine Read  
Excused: Tera Letzring  
Absent: Jim Skidmore, Sarah Mead  
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes for **March 14, 2017** – *will be voted upon via email*
3. Update from Academic Affairs
  - Tokle reported the Registrar confirmed GERC's recommendation from Feb. 17, 2017 for handling transfer credits aligns with what the other institutions are doing. The Provost approved the recommendation, and the policy is included in the 2017-18 catalog.
  - Tokle will be attending the State Gen Ed representatives' meeting in Boise on June 2; let her know the concerns GERC has about gen ed and she will bring them up at the state meeting.
  - Accreditation, Assessment and Academic Program Review (AAAPR) subcommittee is working on the accreditation Mid-Cycle Review Report, and is using Gen Ed and Pharmacy as their assessment examples in the report. The committee wants an update on the status of GERC's work and the plans for next steps in gen ed assessment at their next meeting on April 25 at 9:00 a.m.
4. Assessment Plans
  - a. Unapproved Assessment Plans status:

Shropshire reported she has contacted the relevant deans, and associate deans of the non-responsive departments, still no progress. Initial assessment plan submissions were received in Fall 2015, but no further work despite GERC's repeated efforts to get cooperation. Discussion on what the next steps should be. Council decided to send a formal letter up GERC's chain of command to UCC and Academic Affairs/Provost describing GERC's efforts and the lack of cooperation from the pertinent departments (ART, PHYS, and a few LANG courses) on finishing up the remaining plans.
5. Items from Future Business list
  - a. Devise method of distributed review of comments (Future Business Item A)
    - 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?

Discussion. Matt, Andy, Jon, Sandi and Catherine will meet as a subgroup on April 11 to resolve all the moot comments in the approved assessment plans. Other GERC members may attend if they wish, optional for them. That will be the only agenda item for next meeting.

Still need to identify those plans that are good examples, try to do during cleanup session next meeting.
    - B. 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?

Discussion. This is a curricular quality assurance issue, but can too easily be used against faculty, especially non-tenured faculty. Need to emphasize this is a structured assessment process, focused specifically on what is best for students. Point of this assessment is to capture, analyze and retain data; determine whether desired outcomes are being met; and figure out and implement ways of improving student learning. Members made suggestions for rephrasing the website information.

**Motion** to approve the revised website wording as shown below (Wolper, Wilson):

... General Education helps instill students with the personal and civic responsibilities of good citizenship. General Education prepares graduates as adaptive, life-long learners" (III.N).

In keeping with increasing global expectations of outcomes-based assessment in higher education and among accrediting bodies, the General Education Requirements Committee has designed a formal assessment process for the General Education Program at ISU.

#### **Goals of General Education Assessment**

This General Education Assessment Plan describes two subjects of assessment: the achievement of general education learning outcomes in each general education course, and the effectiveness of the general education objectives and program overall. Assessment is performed to support the ultimate goal of improving student learning by refining individual courses in the general education program and the program as a whole. The plan outlined below is intended to guide this process while preserving the autonomy of departments to evaluate their own courses.

**Motion approved** unanimously. GERC's website will be updated accordingly.

- C. 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.)

Much discussion. Makes sense for individual programs to require minimum grades but maybe not so much for all gen ed courses. A student who struggles in one gen ed area but does well in everything else should not be discouraged. That is different than a student who gets Ds in all gen ed courses. Perhaps consider a minimum average. No clear consensus reached, good arguments can be made for various viewpoints.

- D. 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.

GERC approved a recommendation on 2/28/17; accepted by UCC and Assoc. Deans but was awaiting word from Registrar Laura McKenzie who took it to the Council of Registrar's for input. As Tolke mentioned in her announcements above, ***this recommendation has been fully approved and implemented into the undergraduate catalog.***

Shropshire will make the presentation to the AAAPR subcommittee. She also will write a letter to UCC/Acad. Affairs re: delinquent assessment plans. Next meeting on April 11 will be the small subgroup for cleaning up approved assessment plans. Full group will meet again on April 25.

Adjourn: 4:10 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 8, 2017 via email vote  
Accepted by UCC: May 9, 2017 via email vote  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 19, 2017

# Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday 25 April 2017

Academic Affairs Conference Room ADMIN 301

2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Tera Letzring, Jon Holmes, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Jim Wolper, Matt Wilson, Janette Olsen  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read  
Excused: Cara Esplin  
Absent: Lori Austill, Bob Houghton (UCC), Sarah Mead  
Guests: none

## 1. Announcements --

Shropshire recognized those members rotating off the council: Lin, Wolper, Letzring and Olsen. Many thanks to each of them for their service.

As decided last meeting, Sandi Shropshire, Matt Wilson, Jon Holmes, Andy Holland and Catherine Read met as a subgroup on April 11, 2015. No meeting notes were taken. They reviewed and resolved all the moot comments on the approved assessment plans, and added a few more comments where needed to clarify concerns. They also made a few changes to the cover summary sheet which Read and Shropshire developed. Read will clean up formatting and add the cover sheet to each approved plan, create archive records and publish the approved plans on GERC's website where the ISU community can find and view them.

## 2. Minutes for **March 14, 2017** and **March 28, 2017** – *will be voted upon via email*

## 3. Update from Academic Affairs –

Tokle added her thanks on behalf of Academic Affairs for all their work supporting students. Special thanks to Shropshire as chair for her additional work and attending other meetings. GERC chair has been included as a member of the University Assessment Committee, which meets again tomorrow. The Assessment committee is working to gather information from each college, program, and unit regarding what assessment activities they do.

## 4. Assessment Plans

### a. Motions to approve plans

#### **Objective 4**

#### **Missing: ART 1101, 1102**

Skidmore has been working with a faculty member in ART to try to get assessment plans finished up. Not that person's responsibility, but will see about getting them done.

#### **Foreign Languages**

Note that students transferring in ISU and receiving credit for these languages are not being assessed on their gen ed outcomes. The same assessment gap exists for students with Advanced Placement courses.

The department needs to ensure similarity of assessment amongst all language courses, and continuity from year to year across time. Course grades assess more elements than just the Objective's learning outcomes, so should not be used in gen ed assessment.

#### [LANG 1101/1102](#)

**Motion:** to approve the assessment plan, with GERC's comments.

**Approved** unanimously.

#### [LATN 1101/1102](#)

**Motion:** to approve the assessment plan, with GERC's comments.

**Approved** unanimously.

[RUSS 1101/1102](#)

**Motion:** to approve the assessment plan, with GERC's comments.

**Approved** unanimously.

**Objective 9**

Alignment of third Objective outcome with ACTFL in Objective 9 Language plans is a little problematic in the plans, but GERC is focused on the assessment instruments themselves, not in how well the Objective learning outcomes match the ACTFL outcomes.

[ARBC 2201/2202](#), [LATN 2201/2202](#), [RUSS 2201/2202](#)

**Motion:** to approve all three of these assessment plans, with GERC's comments.

**Approved** unanimously.

[CHNS 2201/2202](#)

Concern about method of sampling; needs to include all sections and modalities of the course. Clarify minimum acceptable level of proficiency. Does not address diversity within the Chinese culture or as compared to other cultures.

**Remanded** for further revisions.

That leaves only the two ART courses, this CHNS course, and all the PHYS courses that do not have approved assessment plans yet.

The council reviewed the cover sheet created to differentiate officially approved assessment plans from any other versions that might exist. The purpose is to prevent confusion and duplication when departments want to update their approved plans. The approved plans will be posted as Google Docs on GERC's website once the archive records are created. The ISU community will be able to view all the assessment plans. GERC members will have commenting access. The relevant department chairs, plan authors or other duly designated faculty will have commenting/suggesting access for their own plans, which will allow them to see and address GERC's comments as they make modifications. Only GERC's administrative assistant will have editing access to protect the integrity of the plans. Comments will be 'Resolved' by GERC as the concerns are addressed, yet preserving the historical record.

- 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?

5. [Year-End Report](#)

A few editing suggestions were incorporated into the report.

**Motion:** to approve the Year-End Report as amended ([Appendix A](#)) with an accompanying memo ([Appendix B](#)) to be forwarded to UCC and Academic Affairs.

**Approved** unanimously.

6. Other

**Takeaways:**

- Ensure GERC's comments that pertain to multiple assessment plans are added to those plans.
- Confirm when the first round of Objective Review Committees (ORCs) are scheduled to be convened and notify the relevant departments.
- Send reminder notices to all departments they need to retain their assessment instruments and data for use by the ORCs.
- Letter regarding GERC's efforts pertaining to, and the status of, Physics assessment plans.

Adjourn: **3: 56 p.m.**

Approved by GERC: May 8, 2017 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: May 9, 2017 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 19, 2017

## APPENDIX A

### Summary of GERC AY 2016/17 Activity for University Curriculum Council

4-25-2017

Chair: Sandra Shropshire (Library); Vice-Chair: Matt Wilson (Technology); Secretary: Jim Skidmore (Arts and Letters—Fine Arts and Humanities)

GERC typically met twice monthly during the academic year.

All representatives were seated this year.

#### Assessment Plans

- Total Gen Ed approved courses (April 2017): 166
- Total Gen Ed course assessment plan proposals submitted (April 2017): 165
  - The assessment plan not submitted is for a course intended to be withdrawn from the gen ed program.
- Total Gen Ed course assessment plan proposals approved (4/17): 149
- Thirteen of the unapproved assessment plans are from the Physics department. They were remanded to the department with comments in October 2015. Several subsequent requests by different GERC Chairs in AY 15/16 and 16/17 to prompt resubmission have produced no results. The matter was referred to Interim Dean, Lyle Castle via email February 15, 2017 and, to GERC's knowledge, remains unresolved.
- GERC has been in communication with the Art department concerning its two unapproved assessment plans and is reasonably confident that these can be brought to an approved state by the end of Spring 2017 or early in the Fall 2017 semester.

#### Assessment Reporting

- First Year Report Results
  - Reporting submitted for 81 Gen Ed courses.
  - Observations gleaned from submitter comments on specific questions
    - **Q24** - Additional comments regarding learning outcome achievement data:
      - Need for clarity on assessment reporting for slash/cross-listed courses
      - Need for clarity on time period for reporting viz time period for assessment
    - **Q34** - Summarize key findings from review of direct and/or indirect assessment materials (instruments)...
      - Inclusion of ECP instructors and instruments in process a problem
    - **Q35** - Summarize any steps taken or planned in response to assessment results.
      - Better guidance given to Gen Ed course instructors
      - Changes in data collection
      - Changes in assessment instruments needed
    - **Q33** - Outline the process by which assessment materials were reviewed.
      - Some desire to use course grade as metric
      - ECP implications: how to collect data, how to include instructors in process
      - For some, assessment data collection began in Fall 2016
- Next Steps
  - Continue process of considering and revising all unapproved plans
  - Clarify process with regard to comments received, other observations
  - Identify and post exemplars
  - Determine results distribution process
  - Undertake Objective Review for Objectives 1 and 2 in Spring 2018

Other GERC matters considered, discussed or acted upon during AY17:

- Awareness of ISU's WICHE Passport study progress. Preliminary plan prepared by Andy Holland endorsed by GERC.
- Awareness of ISU's representatives on the six state disciplinary groups
- Worked with the two departments teaching Objective One courses to address the SBOE approved addition of Outcome Seven to Objective One. Necessary adjustment for Honors course made; adjustment to the English course pending.
- In consultation with UCC and the Registrar's Office, established a new process for the removal of a general education course from the program. Procedure is posted on GERC webpage. In response to a department's question, GERC also determined that a proposal to reassign an existing general education course to a different objective would require a withdrawal and resubmit process, in addition to a renumbering of the newly reassigned course.
- Refined the process of course proposal and assessment plan submission and subsequent modification for proposal authors and for GERC members.
- Monitored the first cycle of assessment reporting for general education courses in November 2016
- Presented reporting results and the current status of general education assessment to IEAC (Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee) in January 2017
- Requested and received clarification on the extent and nature of general education assessment findings that are expected by NWCCU and by the Idaho SBOE.
- Discussed upcoming Objective Review process, currently set to begin in Fall 2018
- Notified of SBOE-approved change in Outcome for Objective Two, for which ISU offers one course. Verified that the affected department, i.e., Communication, Media and Persuasion, had addressed this change in its previously approved assessment plan.
- In consultation with the Registrar's Office, created and approved clarified catalog language pertaining to students who transfer credits from another institution with intent that they apply toward the general education program at ISU.
- GERC assigned a seat on ISU's newly formed Assessment Committee. First meeting: April 17, 2017
- GERC to report to the Fall 2017 accreditation visit preparation group April 26, 2017

## APPENDIX B

### Memo to accompany GERC's 2017 Year-End Report

To: Mary Hofle, Chair, University Curriculum Council  
From: Sandra Shropshire, Chair, General Education Requirements Committee  
Re: Memo to Accompany Summary of GERC AY16/17 Activity  
Date: 4-25-17

Dear Mary:

The Summary of GERC AY 16/17 Activity, which has been approved by GERC, provides the UCC with an accounting of GERC's work for the academic year that is drawing to a close. It is a credit to its members that the Committee has made significant strides this year toward the creation and implementation of a university-wide assessment process for the university's gen ed program.

GERC has worked steadily throughout the 15/16 and 16/17 years to review the assessment plans for each gen ed course offered at ISU for congruence with the General Education Assessment plan approved in Spring 2015. This plan prescribed AY 16/17 as the implementation year for all assessment plans for gen ed courses. Accordingly, GERC has consulted with departments on needed revisions, as warranted, and as of today, has approved 149 of the plans for ISU's 166 gen ed courses. I commend our colleagues in the departments for their cooperation and their work toward this end.

GERC has been unable to achieve a similar outcome, however, with the Physics department, which offers thirteen gen ed courses. The assessment plans for this group of courses were considered by GERC during the Fall 2015 semester and remanded with comments. Since then, Andy Holland, GERC Chair in AY 15/16, and I, as Chair in AY 16/17, have communicated with the department Chair in order to elicit a response to GERC comments.

These efforts were made in an attempt to help shape plans that could ultimately receive GERC approval. Additionally, I understand that similar, more informal efforts have been made by interested individuals familiar with the situation. I regret to inform you that none of these efforts has resulted in movement on this issue, and in February 2017, I referred the matter to COSE Interim Dean, Lyle Castle, via an email. At this point, I believe that GERC has taken every step that is within its scope of responsibility to resolve the issue.

I note that there are three assessment plans from two other departments, Art, and Global Studies and Languages, that remain unapproved. GERC remains in contact with these departments and has every reason to believe that these courses can be brought to approval within a reasonable time frame.

The assessment plans for the Physics courses noted below remain unapproved and are the subject of GERC concern:

Phys 1100	Phys 1112	Phys 1152	Phys 2212
Phys 1101	Phys 1113	Phys 1153	Phys 2213
Phys 1101L	Phys 1114	Phys 2211	Phys 2214
Phys 1111			

Sincerely,

Sandra Shropshire, AY16/17 Chair, GERC  
X2671