

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 27 August 2019  
**Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 340**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper (ITRC), Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read  
Excused: Geoffrey Bennett (UCC)  
Guests: none

1. Welcome and Introductions – Spencer Jardine, as acting Chair, welcomed everyone. Members introduced themselves.
  - Jardine suggested new members peruse [GERC's website](#) prior to next meeting for info regarding this committee's work. GERC approves new courses to be added to the Gen Ed Program, and also reviews and approves course assessment plans. GERC also reviews annual course assessment reports and 5-Year Reports submitted by departments, and coordinates reviews of the Objectives themselves on a five year rolling schedule.
  - In spite of recent emphasis on initiating gen ed assessment program, GERC's intended purview extends to broader elements of the gen ed program.
2. Minutes – none, all were approved last Spring
3. Information & Updates –
  - a. SBOE/IRSA initiatives to be aware of:
    - **Complete College America/Momentum Pathways** (Game-changers)
    - **Credit for Prior Learning/Experiential Learning** – including awarding credit for military experience
    - **Open Educational Resources (OER)** -- this summer some ISU faculty were given small grants to develop and implement in Spring 2020 at least one section of gen ed course using free or low-cost textbooks and materials
    - **Credit for CLEP and AP Exams** – statewide alignment of credit articulation across institutions
  - b. UARC (University Assessment & Review Committee) update
    - Ann Hackert arranged for a NILOA coach come to ISU to conduct assessment workshops. He will attend GERC's **October 22** meeting to discuss gen ed issues.
    - UARC is also working with Aqua to develop an assessment tool whereby students can upload their assignments into Moodle, and then directly into Aqua, allowing for easy collection of student work to be used by faculty and departments in assessment activities.
4. Upcoming GERC due dates:
  - a. **September 20, 2019** – all new Gen Ed course proposals/assessment plans
  - b. **October 1, 2019** – send reminder to department chairs that annual assessment reports are due on November 1, and also that Objectives 5 and 6 are due for 5-Year Review this January
  - c. **November 1, 2019** – annual Gen Ed Course Assessment Reports – one report per Gen Ed course
  - d. **January 7, 2020** – 5-Year Reports for Objective 5 and Objective 6 courses
  - e. **January 8, 2020** – appoint GERC members to chair the Objective Review Committees for Obj 5 & 6
  - f. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports are due
5. GERC concerns/recommendations for statewide Gen Ed Committee and Objective Discipline Groups
  - a. Statewide Gen Ed Summit Sept 19 & 20 in Boise – [Objectives and Rubrics](#) are posted on SBOE's website under “related” on the right-hand side of the webpage (*the Rubrics are a new addition to the*

*Objectives – they have apparently become official)*

- possible changes to learning outcomes for each Objective –are the learning outcomes suitable for effective assessment, and do they identify core elements of the subject area as intended?
- specific recommendations from ORC Reports for Objectives 1 thru 4
- disparity of dual credit instructor qualifications across colleges is an ongoing concern

There will be a presenter at the Gen Ed Summit who has some assessment expertise who will work with the discipline groups on effective ways of assessing general education programs and courses. Randall Brumfield, the Chief Academic Officer at the Office of the State Board of Education, confirmed to Academic Affairs in a meeting this morning, that the discipline groups will have an opportunity to revise the learning outcomes for each GEM Objective at this Summit.

Jardine will invite ISU's discipline group representatives to attend the next GERC meeting to discuss concerns with the Objective learning outcomes in advance of the Summit.

6. New Officer Elections – the incoming GERC chair left ISU over the summer  
**Spencer Jardine** was nominated and subsequently elected unanimously to serve as **Chair**.  
**Matt Wilson** was nominated and elected to serve as **Vice Chair**.
7. Assessment Plans still missing: Physics (all) and MATH 1143 & 1147 – nothing new
8. Other Business – none this week
9. Adjourn: 3:28 p.m.

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

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

Attendance:

**GERC:** Spencer Jardine (Chair), Jennifer Attebery, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa (telecom), Paul Cady

**Discipline Group Reps:** Lydia Wilkes, Jim DiSanza, Bob Fisher, DeWayne Derryberry, Cathy Kriloff, Andy Holland, Eddie Tatar, Gesine Hearn

**Excused:** Hal Hellwig, Pat Brooks, Tom Klein, Erika Fulton; Ann Hackert,

**Absent:**

**Ex-Officio:** Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper, Susanne Forrest, Geoffrey Bennett (UCC) Catherine Read (Admin. Asst.)

1. Welcome and Introductions
  - Welcome State Gen Ed Representatives. Introductions all around.
2. Minutes – forthcoming (**August 27, 2019**)
3. Information & Updates – no discussion, information only
  - a. SBOE/IRSA initiatives to be aware of:
    - Complete College America/Momentum Pathways (Game-changers)
    - Credit for Prior Learning
    - Open Educational Resources (OER)
    - Credit for CLEP and AP Exams – statewide alignment of credit articulation across institutions
  - b. UARC (University Assessment & Review Committee) update
    - NILOA coach coming to ISU and will attend GERC's **Oct. 22** meeting; developing 2-3 outcomes for the group for 2019-2020
4. Upcoming GERC due dates: no discussion, information only
  - a. **September 20, 2019** – all new Gen Ed course proposals/assessment plans
  - b. **October 1, 2019** – send reminder to department chairs that Objectives 5 and 6 are due for 5-Year Review this January
  - c. **November 1, 2019** – annual Gen Ed Course Assessment Reports – one report per Gen Ed course
  - d. **January 7, 2020** – 5-Year Reports for Objective 5 and Objective 6 courses
  - e. **January 8, 2020** – appoint GERC members to chair the Objective Review Committees for Obj 5 & 6
  - f. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports
5. GERC concerns/recommendations for statewide Gen Ed Committee and Objective Discipline Groups
  - a. Gen Ed Summit Sept 19 & 20 in Boise – [Objectives and Rubrics](#) are posted on SBOE's website under "related" on the right-hand side of the webpage (*the Rubrics are a new addition to the Objectives – they have apparently become official*)
    - possible changes to learning outcomes for each Objective – are the learning outcomes suitable for effective assessment, and do they identify core elements of the subject area as intended?
    - specific recommendations from ORC Reports for Objectives 1 thru 4
    - disparity of dual credit instructor qualifications across colleges is an ongoing concern
  - b. [GERC Reports: 2018 + 2019](#)

## Discussion:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Concerns across all Objectives:

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

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

7. Other Business

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

9. Adjourn: 4:20 p.m.

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

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 24 September 2019  
**Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Geoffrey Bennett (UCC), Catherine Read  
Excused: Paul Cady; Mark Cooper (ITRC)  
Guests: none

1. Announcements
2. Minutes –**August 27, 2019** and **September 10, 2019**

3. UCC / UCC Executive Committee update

As UCC Chair, Geoffrey Bennett will be sending a letter to Faculty Senate asking for their help in encouraging faculty to serve on councils. Ann Hackert said assessment groups are experiencing the same problem in getting faculty to participate. Spencer Jardine reported the same concern was brought up by faculty at the Gen Ed Summit last week. Annual evaluation procedures do not reward service, nor are there any other rewards nor incentives.

Spencer Jardine reported he has been reviewing UCC catalog proposals on behalf of GERC. So far, there are no proposals that affect Gen Ed courses except for a Dance course title change.

4. Statewide Gen Ed Summit – debrief and update

Spencer Jardine reported the assessment consultant suggested simplifying the gen ed outcomes and gearing them toward an audience of parents and businesses. Some confusion became apparent during discussion among discipline group members whether the competencies are the metrics to assess the courses in the Objective, or to assess whether a particular course belongs in the Gen Ed program under that Objective. Need to change the message to students that gen ed is not something to get done so it's out of the way, but that there is inherent value in broadening one's horizons. Transfer students are reluctant to come to ISU when they are told they will need to repeat some courses in order to fulfill the gen ed requirements.

The Summit was intended to facilitate thinking about gen ed as a whole, not to create a particular work product to be implemented.

It is in GERC's purview to reconsider the Gen Ed program as a whole, in particular Objectives 7, 8, and 9. Discussion ensued. No impetus to make changes this year since Objectives 5 and 6 will be reviewed this year, and Objectives 7 and 8 the following year. Those review reports will provide more solid data to consider in evaluating the Gen Ed Program. It also would be a good idea to take a look at other models of Gen Ed programs used by other institutions. What is general education, what does it look like, what should students get out of it?

4. Upcoming GERC due dates:

- a. **October 1, 2019** – send reminder to department chairs that Objectives 5 and 6 are due for 5-Year Review this January
- b. **November 1, 2019** – annual Gen Ed Course Assessment Reports – one report per Gen Ed course
- c. **January 7, 2020** – 5-Year Reports for Objective 5 and Objective 6 courses
- d. **January 8, 2020** – appoint GERC members to chair the Objective Review Committees for Obj 5 & 6
- e. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports

Spencer Jardine will coordinate with administrative assistant whether to change the due date for Five-Year Reports. Members should think about which Objective Review Committees they might like to chair.

5. SBOE/IRSA initiatives – Nothing new to report.
  - Complete College America/Momentum Pathways (Game-changers)
  - Credit for Prior Learning
  - Open Educational Resources (OER)
  - Credit for CLEP and AP Exams – statewide alignment of credit articulation across institutions
6. UARC (University Assessment & Review Committee) update
  - NILOA coach coming to ISU and will attend GERC’s **October 22** meeting;
  - developing 2-3 outcomes for the group for 2019-2020

UARC is working on some projects which they plan to complete in the spring. A college is interested in Beta testing Aqua for collecting student work into Moodle and Aqua this fall that they can use for assessment this spring. Intent is to have Aqua available for those units who want to use it for data collection and assessment. Use of Aqua will be voluntary. The UARC committee is focusing on the logistics for the NILOA coach’s visit to ISU. Agenda and workshop sessions have been set. He will attend GERC’s regular meeting that day.

7. Assessment Plans still missing: Physics (all) and MATH 1143 & 1147 – no action
8. Other Business –
  - Disparity of dual credit instructor qualifications across colleges is an ongoing concern.
    - Suggestion was made at higher levels to State Board Office to consider assigning high schools to work with the colleges and universities in their own region instead of around the state.
9. Adjourn: 3:27 p.m.

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

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 8 October 2019  
**Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Jim Skidmore, Shu-Yuan Lin, Leonid Hanin, Spencer Jardine, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omatowa, Paul Cady  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Mark Cooper (ITRC), Catherine Read  
Excused: Neil Tocher, Geoffrey Bennett (UCC)  
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes – **August 27, 2019, September 10, 2019** and **September 24, 2019**  
A minor correction was made to the September 10 Minutes. Council subsequently **approved** all three via email.
3. UCC / UCC Executive Committee update  
Matt Wilson will attend this week's UCC meeting. UCC will be considering the proposed ISU 1101 introductory course and has invited all interested parties to participate in the discussion. Some discussion ensued regarding the nature and intent of the proposed course, and concerns that faculty have.
4. Review how Idaho State University's general education program compares with sister and peer institutions  
Idaho State University General Education Objectives and Learning Outcomes: [isu.edu/gerc/gen-ed-objectives-and-courses/General Education at Peer Institutions](http://isu.edu/gerc/gen-ed-objectives-and-courses/General Education at Peer Institutions)  
Members discussed the list, with a focus on the merits and drawbacks of ISU's Objectives 7, 8 and 9. The variety of ISU's Objective 9 course offerings was considered to be a strength since most of the courses fit well in the Diversity category. Course offerings in Objectives 7 and 8 were not as cohesive and some seemed to be an awkward fit in their respective categories. A single course is not sufficient to learn how to think critically, but can help students acquire the basic skills they can build upon. Suggest creating a survey to gather faculty input on how to improve the general education program.  
**Jennifer Attebery, Spencer Jardine, Tayo Omatowa, and Susanne Forrest** volunteered to serve on a subcommittee to create a faculty survey. They will solicit help from faculty experienced in developing social science surveys.  
  
The GEM Objectives no longer require students to learn History, nor does the K-12 educational system, so students do not always gain an adequate understanding of American or world history, nor how the various governmental systems function and interrelate.
5. Upcoming GERC due dates:
  - a. **October 1, 2019** – send reminder to department chairs that Objectives 5 and 6 are due for 5-Year Review this January
  - b. **November 1, 2019** – annual Gen Ed Course Assessment Reports – one report per Gen Ed course
  - c. **January 7, 2020** – 5-Year Reports for Objective 5 and Objective 6 courses – **revise this date**
  - d. **January 8, 2020** – appoint GERC members to chair the Objective Review Committees for Obj. 5 & 6
  - e. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports
6. SBOE/IRSA initiatives – updates - Joanne Tokle
  - Complete College America/Momentum Pathways (Game-changers) – three white papers will be published on their website later this week
  - Credit for Prior Learning – nothing to report
  - Open Educational Resources (OER) – last year the SBOE allocated \$25,000 among selected faculty at

- each 4-year institution to develop open educational resources to use in GEM Objective courses. ISU's faculty will submit their reports to Academic Affairs in December. There is a campus presentation scheduled for March 13.
- Credit for CLEP and AP Exams – statewide alignment of credit articulation across institutions is complete.
7. UARC (University Assessment & Review Committee) update – Ann Hackert
    - NILOA coach is coming to ISU in two weeks to conduct faculty workshops and he will attend GERC's **Oct. 22** meeting to discuss assessment issues and answer questions members may have
    - Goal 8 Working Group – several faculty members have asked Hackert to help them with their assessment efforts.
  8. Assessment Plans still missing: Physics (all) and MATH 1143 & 1147 – nothing new
  9. Other Business – deferred to subsequent meeting
    - Disparity of dual credit instructor qualifications across colleges is an ongoing concern...
  10. Adjourn: 4:02 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 20, 2020 via email ballot  
Accepted by UCC: April 23, 2020  
Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 27, 2020  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 1, 2020

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 22 October 2019  
**Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102, Zoom**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Ann Hackert, Chris Hunt (for Sarah Mead), Susanne Forrest, Mark Cooper (ITRC), Geoffrey Bennett (UCC), Catherine Read  
Excused: none  
Guest: Daniel McInerney (NILOA coach from Utah State University)

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes – **October 8, 2019** -- *deferred*
3. NILOA Coach – Daniel McInerney

McInerney is one of 15 faculty members nationally that serve as volunteers for the National Institute of Learning Outcomes Assessment (NILOA) which began at Utah State University and has expanded across the U.S. and into other countries. Their focus is to help faculty understand how to approach assessment from a practical, meaningful, concrete standpoint. What do students need to learn from each class, from each program? What is the purpose of general education, what does it contribute to students, and what is so valuable about it that all students are required to take it? As faculty learn how to articulate the answers to these questions, they can better structure their assignments and courses to help students learn what they need to know. Assessment is a tool to help measure the quality and effectiveness of courses and programs in attaining the desired outcomes. It is not simply a matter of data collection and analysis -- there should be a story, a logic behind how and why courses, curriculum, and programs are structured the way they are.

In today's world, students will be changing jobs and even careers multiple times in their lives. They need skills that will help them make those transitions. A common theme from employers is they have a lot of specialists, but not enough employees who can communicate technical information to lay audiences, who can lead teams of people with diverse expertise and abilities, and who have the ability to assimilate information from diverse sources into a coherent, rational, and understandable whole. It is fine to make evidence-based arguments, but how do you frame the conversation in meaningful ways? General education is the foundation for training students in the soft skills that will carry them through and be successful in all their future endeavors and challenges.

Discussion ensued about the challenges faculty face in channeling their passion and enthusiasm for teaching and helping students become the best they can be, while dealing with mandated assessment processes and outcomes that do not match the desired goals of general education and programs in preparing students for life beyond the university. Suggestions included finding ways of engaging with employers, K-12 faculty, and alumni to identify what is needed and how to achieve it. Ensure that experienced faculty are teaching general education courses so they can impart their knowledge and life experience to students, not just dry subject matter of the course. In conducting assessment, do not expect every faculty member to participate, just get meaningful, representative samples. Begin where people are, not where you want them to be. Recognize those who are passionate about ensuring student success and engage them in the process.

McInerney expressed his appreciation and admiration for the engagement and passion demonstrated by the faculty at ISU in all his workshops and presentations today.

- . Upcoming GERC due dates:
  - a. **October 1, 2019** – send reminder to department chairs that Objectives 5 and 6 are due for 5-Year Review this January
  - b. **November 1, 2019** – annual Gen Ed Course Assessment Reports – one report per Gen Ed course
  - c. **January 17, 2020** – 5-Year Reports for Objective 5 and Objective 6 courses
  - d. **January 14, 2020** – appoint GERC members to chair the Objective Review Committees for Obj 5 & 6
  - e. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports
5. SBOE/IRSA initiatives – updates  
SBOE approved several policy changes during October 17, 2019 meeting:
  - Board Policy III.F: Program Prioritization
  - Board Policy III.L: Continuing Education – credit for Prior Learning & Experiential Learning
  - Board Policy III.N: General Education
  - Board Policy III.S: Remedial Education
  - Board Policy III.U: Textbook Affordability – Open Educational Resources (OER)
6. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – no update  
Members: Jennifer Attebery, Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Susanne Forrest
7. Assessment Plans still missing: Physics (all) and MATH 1143 & 1147
8. Other Business –
  - disparity of dual credit instructor qualifications across colleges is an ongoing concern...
9. Adjourn: 4:37 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 28, 2020  
Accepted by UCC: April 29, 2020 via email vote  
Accepted by Faculty Senate: May 6, 2020 via email vote  
Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 6, 2020

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 12 November 2019  
**Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102, Zoom**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Ann Hackert, Ann Davidson (for Sarah Mead), Susanne Forrest, Geoffrey Bennett (UCC), Catherine Read  
Excused: Paul Cady; Mark Cooper (ITRC)  
Guests: none

1. Announcements:

Joanne Tokle reported that State Board policy changes were approved at the October SBOE meeting to be implemented by 2021-22:

- **Policy III.U: Textbook and Instruction Material Affordability** – at least one section of all common index general education courses must use only Open Educational Resources or low-cost materials. All dual-credit common index courses must also provide OER options to students.
- **Policy III.N: General Education** – faculty discipline groups may recommend changes to the common course list. Requests by an institution to remove a common course must be submitted in writing to SBOE a year in advance.
- **Policy III.S. Remedial Education** – Gateway courses are MATH 1123, MATH 1143, MATH 1153, and ENGL 1101 and may not have prerequisites. Once a student completes a gateway Math or English course, they will not need to take a placement test for any subsequent course.
  - Unclear whether the minimum C- grade requirements will continue to be enforceable or not.

2. Minutes – **October 8, 2019** and **October 22, 2019** – *deferred, will be forthcoming for vote by email*

3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert

- a. Aqua Assessment Software update – software requires extensive set up of outcomes and rubrics before student work can be uploaded into the database. Hackert is available to help departments.
- b. “Close the Loop” handout -- distributed to members summarizing UARC’s 2017 Annual Report
- c. Assessment workshops idea – consider assembling groups of faculty from different disciplines to share how they conduct assessment and try to identify commonalities. The NILOA coach is willing to facilitate the workshops. If GERC thinks this is a good idea, Hackert will pursue finding funding for this. Acknowledged there is no incentive for faculty to do more than their own departments already do in ensuring quality and rigor in their courses and programs.

4. Upcoming GERC due dates:

- a. **January 14, 2020** – appoint GERC members to chair the Objective Review Committees for Objectives 5 & 6  
Spencer Jardine briefly described what the chair and the committees do in conducting their review and writing the reports describing their findings.
- b. **January 17, 2020** – 5-Year Reports for Objective 5 and Objective 6 courses  
A reminder letter from GERC will go out in the next week or so to all departments.
- c. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports

5. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – update

**Members:** Jennifer Attebery, Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Susanne Forrest, plus Jim Stoutenborough from Political Science to provide survey expertise.

The subcommittee met last Tuesday, November 5 and developed an outline for survey questions. Jim Stoutenborough will draft survey questions for the committee to review at their meeting next week.

All nine Objectives are included in this project, with a focus on the rationale for Objectives 7 and 8 in

particular.

6. Objective 8 Working Group – update  
Information Literacy group held their introductory meeting a couple of weeks ago. Group consists of faculty who teach courses in Objective 8. Idea is to share assignments and discuss how each unit conducts assessment, identify best practices, review learning outcomes and rubrics, etc. Good participation and discussion amongst the group members.
7. [MGT 1105 Entrepreneurship and Civilization](#) - preliminary review for existing course to potentially become an Objective 9 Gen Ed course, with [Syllabus](#)  
Ensuing discussion suggested including additional or different textbooks, and expanding focus to include how different societies create and organize economic systems.
8. Assessment Plans still missing: Physics (all) and MATH 1143 & 1147 – nothing new
9. Other Business:
  - disparity of dual credit instructor qualifications across colleges is an ongoing concern
  - One take-away from last meeting’s discussion with the NILOA coach is defining ISU’s gen ed identity: what is the mission of the Gen Ed program, what does the program intend to accomplish, etc. This foundational work has never been done, so GERC should take this up in the Spring. It may be useful to learn what consensus, if any, faculty have regarding what general education is. SBOE Policy III.N. is a good reference point. Student exit interviews information published on the Career Center’s website may also provide valuable insights.
10. Adjourn: 4:00 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 20, 2020 via email ballot

Accepted by UCC: April 23, 2020

Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 27, 2020

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 1, 2020

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 14 January 2020  
**Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102, Zoom**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Ann Hackert, Chris Hunt (for Sarah Mead), Mark Cooper (ITRC) Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read  
Excused: Shu-Yuan Lin, Leonid Hanin; Geoffrey Bennett (UCC)  
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes – **October 8, 2019, October 22, 2019** and **November 12, 2019** – *vote via email*
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
  - a. [New accreditation standards from NWCCU](#)
  - b. Math assessment – Ann Hackert met with the Math department and helped them with their assessment plan and mapping their outcomes to the GEM required outcomes. She is meeting with Physics department this week to get their assessment plans up to speed also.
  - c. University Assessment Review Committee (UARC) meets tomorrow. Their plan is to start publishing a monthly newsletter for the campus community and set up a website to provide information and helpful links to resources.

Welcome to new COSE representative Shannon Kobs. Still awaiting a replacement for Leonid Hanin who has a teaching conflict with GERC's meetings this semester. Members introduced themselves. Jardine gave a brief overview of GERC's purview and purpose in overseeing ISU's general education program and assessment.

4. Updates from Joanne Tokle:
  - a. OSBE's new Chief Academic Officer is T.J. Bliss, and the Associate Academic Officer is Jonathan Lashley
  - b. Faculty fellows from around the state will be serving on OSBE's Open Educational Resources (OER) Committee to develop/identify open educational resources for GEM Common-numbered gen ed courses.
  - c. Statewide Gen Ed Committee meets next Thursday in Boise to start planning the statewide Gen Ed Summit to be held October 22-23 at the Riverside Hotel in Boise.
  - d. Gen Ed Crosswalk: OSBE received a grant from the Lumina to train faculty in mapping military credits to GEM Common Courses. ISU will join College of Eastern Idaho faculty in attending a validation workshop in Idaho Falls on February 7. ISU's representatives include the GEM Discipline Group members, Spencer Jardine as GERC chair, Dwayne Derryberry from Math, and the Registrar, Laura McKenzie. The workshop will be facilitated by Dr. Marjorie Price from the SBOE Advisory Committee and by Mary Beth Lakin, Director of Credit for Prior Learning Assessment Network, Minnesota State Colleges and Universities.
5. Upcoming GERC due dates:
  - a. **January 14, 2020** – appoint GERC members to chair the Objective Review Committees for Obj 5 & 6
  - b. **January 17, 2020** – 5-Year Reports for Objective 5 and Objective 6 courses due
  - c. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports due

**Objective Review Committee (ORC) Chair elections:**

Jim Skidmore, Spencer Jardine, Paul Cady, Jennifer Attebery, and Shannon Kobs have all participated on past ORCs. The ORCs mainly look for problems or holes in the assessment process to provide ideas

for improvement. GERC strives to keep the workload from being overly burdensome, but the review has proven to provide valuable data and insights. Departments are supposed to be submitting names of their faculty reps along with their 5-Year Reports. ORCs are assessing the gen ed assessment process, not the discipline outcomes or department.

Shannon Kobs, Jim Skidmore, and Matt Wilson volunteered to serve as ORC chairs. Discussion.  
Election results:

Objective 5 ORC Chair: **Matt Wilson**

Objective 6 ORC Chair: **Jim Skidmore**

6. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – update  
Members: Jennifer Attebery, Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Susanne Forrest

Jim Stoutenborough from Political Science is on the subcommittee and has been writing a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9. A draft of the survey should be ready for GERC's review in February. No response yet from Academic Standards Committee regarding whether to consider codifying the difference between a B.A. and a B.S. degree.

7. Objective 8 Working Group – update  
Met in November and have been discussing the rubric and course assignments for assessments.
8. [MGT 1105 Entrepreneurship and Civilization](#) – any update?  
Nothing new at this point. Feedback received was not enthusiastic about this course as proposed. Hold off until other more pressing things in College of Business are finished up.
9. Review of Assessment Reporting and Plans – Vince Miller will provide Qualtrics spreadsheet to GERC soon.
10. Other Business –
  - Disparity of dual credit instructor qualifications across campus, institutions, and the state is an ongoing concern.
  - University Presidents and Provosts are considering making changes to [State Board Policy III.Z](#), which (among other things) assigns regional and statewide service regions among the various institutions in Idaho.
    - Waiver was granted to high schools to ignore the regional service areas, which is causing problems as high schools shop around and choose the least rigorous institution anywhere in the state. Makes meaningful oversight of dual credit courses and instructors by the universities very difficult, and does not serve students in the long run.

10. Adjourn: 3:43 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 20, 2020 via email ballot

Accepted by UCC: April 23, 2020

Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 27, 2020

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 1, 2020

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 11 February 2020  
**Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102, Zoom**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa,  
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle (for Cindy Hill), Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read  
Excused: Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, Paul Cady; Mark Cooper (ITRC), Geoffrey Bennett (UCC)  
Guests: none

1. Announcements

Campus-wide strategic plan open forum was held yesterday afternoon. Video will be posted online. Ann Hackert and Tayo Omotowa gave a brief overview of the planning forum highlights.

2. Minutes – *vote via email*

3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert

Short reception to be held in the spring for the assessment coordinators. Daniel McInerney, the NILOA coach, will be coming again in April to facilitate workshops with faculty to share their assessment efforts. Ann Hackert is working with Physics and Math departments to revise their assessment plans. ISU's assessment website is not finished yet, but it is [isu.edu/assessment](http://isu.edu/assessment). New software will be piloted this spring that will generate assessment progress reports.

4. Updates from Joanne Tokle

- The Statewide Gen Ed Committee met three weeks ago to start planning the annual Gen Ed Summit, which will be October 22-23 in Boise. The committee will reach out to the gen ed Discipline Groups to ask for their input on what they need in advance of the summit.
- The new SBOE Policy III.U on Open Educational Resources is being revised. Three listening sessions were held statewide to gather faculty input. The Board Office is noting faculty suggestions, and is working with faculty around the state. They will make a draft of the revised policy available for review later this spring. They are putting together faculty teams around the state to work on recommendations for OER materials to be used in some gen ed courses.
- Last week a workshop was held in Idaho Falls to start working on how to apply academic credit for certain types of military training and experience.
- Academic Affairs recently reorganized its administrative structure, and Cindy Hill will be replacing Joanne Tokle on GERC and UCC.

5. Upcoming GERC due dates:

- a. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports due  
Objectives 5 and 6 Five-Year Reports and list of ORC department representatives were provided to the ORC chairs. Shannon Kobs Nawotniak will chair the Objective 5 ORC instead of Matt Wilson since he had another potential commitment that would preclude him from being able to be chair.

6. Review of Assessment Reporting and Plans

- a. Divide workload and assign subcommittees to review annual reports  
Catherine Read gave a brief onscreen overview of the spreadsheet and showed how the annual reports were organized by course and by reporting year. Workload assignments were as follows:  
**Objectives 1, 2 and 4:** Jennifer Attebery and Neil Tocher  
**Objectives 3 and 5:** Spencer Jardine and Shannon Kobs Nawotniak  
**Objectives 6 and 7:** Tayo Omotowa and Jim Skidmore

## **Objectives 8 and 9:** Shu-Yuan Lin, Matt Wilson

Discussion ensued about the scope and extent of what these internal GERC reviews entail, and how departmental assessment plans are being reviewed, whether by ORCs or by GERC.

Red flags that have been noticed in the past:

- All outcomes being assessed have the exact same percentages of results reported
- Grades being used by departments in assessing whether outcomes are met
- Percentages of students meeting outcomes less than the plan's minimum threshold without any action being taken to address shortcomings

Past ORC reports are posted on GERC's website for reference.

### 7. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: Gen Ed program and assessment – update

Members: Jennifer Attebery, Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Susanne Forrest, Jim Stoutenborough

The subcommittee has finalized a version of the Gen Ed Survey, which they will share with GERC as a whole for discussion in the next meeting. They plan to submit an article to the campus newsletter to help publicize the survey. Attebery briefly summarized the survey format and the structure of the questions. There is a section asking for faculty input about Objectives 7 and 8, a separate section about Objective 9, and another section for longer-term faculty about the transition from the original twelve Goals to the current nine Objectives and how the change has affected their departments and units. The intent of the survey is to ask faculty what is the rationale for the Gen Ed program and whether it is working

### 8. Objective 8 Working Group - update

Jardine said the group continues to meet regularly, but nothing to report today.

### 9 Other Business – placeholder for future discussion

- Disparity of dual credit instructor qualifications across colleges and institutions is an ongoing concern.

Council members felt GERC's role should be to support departments in their efforts to raise concerns about the early college program, including the faculty instructor selection process, upholding curricular standards, etc. Nothing is happening on this at the state level. Dual credit standards and faculty qualifications are covered under SBOE Policy III.Y. However, it was noted that departments have little to no involvement in selecting the high school instructors teaching their departmental dual credit courses, even though the departments do have oversight responsibilities and students are earning ISU university credits in those courses. High schools are not adhering to instructor qualification standards. Department chairs should point out such problems in their annual assessment reports, and in other appropriate venues. This important issue needs to be ameliorated, since students are not getting the level of education being touted.

### 10. Adjourn: 3:58 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 20, 2020 via email ballot

Accepted by UCC: April 23, 2020

Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 27, 2020

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 1, 2020

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 25 February 2020  
**Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102, Zoom**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Jim Skidmore, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady  
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper, Susanne Forrest, Geoffrey Bennett (UCC), Catherine Read  
Excused: Neil Tocher  
Guests: none

1. Announcements –

Welcome to Cindy Hill from Academic Affairs, replacing Joanne Tokle on GERC. Introductions all around. ISU Band Concert this Friday at 7:30 p.m. in the Performing Arts Center. Academic Conduct Policy has been revised and open forums are being held for student and faculty input.

2. Minutes – *vote via email*

3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert

a. Gen Ed Assignment Workshop scheduled for April 23 and 24

Invitation cards sent around for members to look at. Daniel McInerney is returning in April to help facilitate a workshop with faculty who teach gen ed courses to share and discuss student assignments used in assessment. Assessment resources are posted on the website:

<https://www.isu.edu/assessment/>

b. Assessment Plan updates: Math and Physics

Assessment Plans for the Astronomy course and lab have been developed. Ann Hackert has seen the plan, but it has not yet been submitted to GERC for review. Math department is working on their assessment plan for MATH 1143.

4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine – group has not met recently, so nothing to report

5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill – nothing to report

6. Upcoming GERC due dates:

a. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports due

Objective 5 ORC: Shannon Kobs is still waiting for several departments' Five-Year Reports and a few names of departmental faculty appointed to serve on the committee.

7. Unfinished Business

a. Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment

Jardine gave a brief sketch of the survey and its intent. Attebery added the subcommittee wanted more in-depth feedback regarding ISU's discretionary Objectives 7, 8, and 9, which are more easily modified than the statewide GEM Objectives 1 through 6. Discussion ensued, and members suggested several edits for the subcommittee to incorporate into the survey. GERC will review the revised draft next meeting and potentially approve for release to campus faculty.

b. Review of annual Assessment Reporting

More experienced members gave a few pointers on what to look for during the review to the members who are new to GERC. Further discussion was deferred until next meeting.

**Objectives 1, 2 and 4:** Jennifer Attebery and Neil Tocher

**Objectives 3 and 5:** Spencer Jardine and Shannon Kobs Nawotniak

**Objectives 6 and 7:** Tayo Omotowa and Jim Skidmore

**Objectives 8 and 9:** Shu-Yuan Lin and Matt Wilson

8. New Business – for discussion next meeting
  - a. Frequently asked questions:
  - b.
  - c. Office of Assessment and Gen Ed Committee relationships and ideas
  - d. Next Steps – where should GERC go from here? NWCCU accreditation review is next year...
9. Adjourn: 4:32 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 20, 2020 via email ballot

Accepted by UCC: April 23, 2020

Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 27, 2020

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 1, 2020

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 10 March 2020  
**Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102, Zoom**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs  
Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry (for Leonid Hanin), Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady  
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper, Susanne Forrest  
Excused: Geoffrey Bennett (UCC), Catherine Read  
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes – *vote via email*
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
  - a. Gen Ed Assignment Workshop scheduled for April 23 and 24  
(attachment: Q&A document for Assignment Workshop)  
Spring events, Ann is waiting on the exact timing of the events, in part due to  
Coronavirus concerns. Will be working on events geared to North West Accreditation
  - b. Assessment Plan updates: Math and Physics  
MATH 1143/1147 and Physics' Astronomy course assessment plan have been submitted. Jardine  
added those to the New Business section of the agenda.
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine  
They did not meet. There is no update. Members had been encouraged to attend the Academic Integrity  
Policy open forum meeting held a couple of weeks ago.
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill  
No Report at this time.
6. Upcoming GERC due dates:
  - a. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports due
    - a. Both committees have met and are working on their tasks.
7. Unfinished Business
  - a. Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – progress report  
This is on hold. The survey administrator has been ill and unable to make requested changes.  
Once the amendments are made, the survey will come back to GERC for final review before it  
goes out to campus faculty.
  - b. Review of annual Assessment Reporting (attachment: spreadsheet)  
Objectives 1, 2 and 4: Jennifer Attebery and Neil Tocher

**Objective 1:**

It appears that English and Philosophy department is trying to do the job. However, the project is  
massive. They are trying to pull in all the different places where written communication courses  
are being taught. That includes College of Technology (COT) and Early College courses. The  
COT has been very active in participating. The same cannot be said regarding the Early College

course teachers' participation.

Evaluation of ENGL 1101 and 1102: Comment – they might wish to work better with the Honors course (that is actually an 1102 equivalent course). Would a common assessment work? These courses are unique in foundation. Honors program has started communicating with the English Department.

The way Honors 1101 is being taught is not a tight fit with Objective 1.

There was discussion about the English 1101 course content and intent.

There was discussion about the current analysis being all aggregate. They may wish to separate locations or on-campus, on-line, early college.

Results: English has identified issues and will be holding a workshop to close the loop.

### **Objective 2:**

Strength that this objective only has one course, and it is well structured to assess the learning outcomes.

Results: It appears that online courses are not doing as well as face-to-face on the assessments. They are looking for ways to increase student engagement in the on-line courses.

Results: There was concern about faculty – mostly Early College – that are not turning in the requested assessment materials. Written guidance from GERC and/or SBOE would be helpful.

### **Objective 4:** A lot of courses in this Objective

Suggest departments use some tool to generate random samples.

Results: In philosophy – it did not work to assess a couple of outcomes each year. It worked better to assess all outcomes all at once every 2 or 3 years. A revised plan should be submitted to GERC.

Results: In language courses, it appears that individual instructors are doing the assessment. We do not have a “language program” doing assessment. It becomes a course level assessment instead of a “Program” level assessment. There was discussion regarding the difficulties of doing a program level assessment instead of course by course. However, it is a direction they should attempt to move towards.

Discussion regarding the difficulties students face in planning their studies when so many courses are not offered regularly or “on demand.” The catalog listings are somewhat misleading in this respect because students see some course offering they are interested in taking, only to find out the course will not be offered any time soon,

Objectives 3 and 5: Spencer Jardine and Shannon Kobs Nawotniak

### **Objective 3:**

Results: Some of the comments were terse to the point of not providing meaningful information. Perhaps this was a result of frustration with the process. Perhaps they do not see much value in assessment. Ann stated this may identify the need for assistance.

Courses from Business seem to have much more buy-in and active participation in the assessment.

College of Tech:

RCET: Scores seem very high. There may be some sense that they need to defend their program.

TGE: The reporting was unclear, with “finished” being “False” for many rows. It appears multiple reports are being submitted for each course, rather than a coordinated effort with one

person designated to file the report. Data show that students are mastering a couple of learning outcomes, but struggling with others.

*The remaining agenda items were deferred until next time due to time constraints:*

**Objective 5**

Objectives 6 and 7: Tayo Omotowa and Jim Skidmore

Objectives 8 and 9: Shu-Yuan Lin, Matt Wilson

c. **Frequently asked questions:**

(attachments: 5-year schedules and Annotated GenEd Proposal/Assessment form)

d. Office of Assessment and Gen Ed Committee relationships and ideas -

e. Next Steps – where should GERC go from here? NWCCU accreditation review is next year...

8. Adjourn: **4:22 p.m.**

Approved by GERC: April 28, 2020

Accepted by UCC: April 29, 2020 via email vote

Accepted by Faculty Senate: May 6, 2020 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 6, 2020

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday, 7 April 2020  
**Zoom - <https://isu.zoom.us/j/686795927>**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Present: Neil Tocher, Ann Hackert, Shu-Yuan Lin, Paul Cady, Spencer Jardine, Jim Skidmore, Tayo Omotowa, Sarah Mead, Jennifer Attebery, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson.

1. Announcements --
2. Minutes – *vote via email*
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert  
Ann discussed working with those in colleges/programs who were responsible for accreditation. She reported that things were moving forward.
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill
  - Cindy was at another meeting and will report next time.
  - It was reported that the General Education Summit is still being planned. If you wish the ISU State Representatives to promote your ideas regarding changes to Gen Ed State Policy, do so soon.
  - A list of ISU State Representatives for Gen Ed. is available on the GERC web site under Members and ISU Representatives.
6. Upcoming GERC due dates:
  - a. **April 1, 2020** – Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports due
7. Unfinished Business
  - a. Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment (progress report)  
Spencer will email Jim Stoutenborough regarding the survey. Due to the current increase in workload as faculty move their courses to online, it was agreed by all to postpone the survey to Fall 2020.
  - b. Reports from Objective 5 and 6
    - 1) **Objective 5 committee:** Shannon reported that the group hopes the report will be submitted within the week.  
  
**Objective 6 committee:** Jim reported on Objective 6. They are working on the report. He is hopeful they will have it in two weeks. He believes they can complete it through email and it will not require another meeting to complete.
  - c. Review of annual Assessment Reporting (attachment: spreadsheet)

**Objective 5:** Spencer Jardine and Shannon Kobs Nawotniak

It was reported that Physics is redesigning their plan.

BIOL 1100: inconsistency in assessing all formats each year. No annual reports submitted for 2018. They desire to assess the course using course grades. How do we help faculty

understand why this doesn't work? Grades include attendance and other factors that are not related to student learning outcomes. Example mentioned of a potential employer would be more concerned with what a student actually learned that will help them do the job than with the grade.

CHEM 1101: they seem to have incomplete results from their dual enrollment sections. See row 11.

CHEM 1111: sections from Idaho Falls didn't submit their assessment materials, but all Pocatello sections did. Additional training and information was given to the faculty teaching all sections. Assessment results were discussed in department meetings.

CHEM 1112: outcome number one has a low percentage but all others are greater than 98%.

GEOL 1100: sounds like they are doing well.

It was noted that Geoscience seemed to lack clarity on what should be included in the assessment. A comment was made that this finding was common in many areas.

There was discussion regarding the benefit of these 5-Year reviews because each department/course is able to see how others are approaching the assessment. They can learn from each other.

During the discussion, Ann H. restated that course grades are not sufficient for a quality assessment. While grades are part of the equation, it requires evaluating outcomes that may not be reflected in grades.

#### **Objectives 6 and 7:** Tayo Omotowa and Jim Skidmore

Jim said that some things in the annual reports were not easy to interpret. One department did not report any numbers. The lack of clarity in the annual reports make it difficult to interpret.

Jim mentioned that one of the issues is setting the standard. He stated that no one knows what "satisfactory performance" stands for. It could be barely meeting expectations or it could mean mastery.

Tao discussed Objective 7. Some of the data was confusing. An example was given that in some courses student achievement on outcomes ranged from 20% to 80%.

Jim stated it may not reflect student performance. Perhaps different courses interpret the same outcome differently.

Economics reports: they do not report numbers. They look at multiple choice exams. There was some discussion in our meeting about University guidance. The committee is interested to know if there is any guidance for satisfactory completion of student learning outcomes. Is there a certain number or percentage that departments should achieve? Are these naturally going to be different and varied among departments? What is satisfactory?

#### **Objectives 8 and 9:** Shu-Yuan Lin, Matt Wilson

Matt Wilson discussed Objective 8. He stated that one issue was that Library used only indirect measures. Spencer agreed with that statement. Jennifer stated that indirect measures

were used in both English assessments.

Shu-Yan discussed the need to determine the value of a syllabi review.

Matt Wilson also discussed Objective 9. He stated that there were low success rates: only 20 – 30% meeting expectations. He also stated they did not seem to have a plan to respond to the low rates. He had a question about a particular course that had a “Flag” on the report.

Ann H. said that when we find issues, she will contact Departments to see if she can do a “wellness check” to help them and possibly recommend actions that will provide more information and decrease workload demands.

Shu-Yan identified a course with 100% Meets Expectations. This is also a problem. It is unlikely that success is 100%.

She also noted that CSD 2210 included 3 years of data in the annual report. It was not clear why they combined the data over 3 years.

Reach out to ask CSD 2256 if they want help with their assessment plan. Let them know Ann can help.

The annual report for CMLT 2208 looks like it has not been submitted in the last 3 years.

#### **General observations:**

There was discussion about the annual assessment reports received from departments teaching courses for objectives 7, 8, and 9.

We can send an email to departments next fall, letting them know about the assessment process and how they can receive help from the University.

We can identify assessment plants that need help and ask Ann to support those departments that may need some extra help. Perhaps we can ask departments that have created exemplary plans to share those plans or discuss and talk with other departments.

Help people understand the purpose of assessment. Ann can offer a one-hour wellness check with individuals or departments.

We can ask Ann to attend the chairs’ meetings and also the deans’ meetings to promote assessment.

Going forward we can email departments that are going to submit their five-year reports, so they can understand what they need to do to prepare for that report. We can also email or contact departments who finished their five-year departmental assessment review report and point them to Ann who is willing to help them.

#### **d. Office of Assessment and Gen Ed Committee relationships and ideas**

There was considerable discussion led by Ann regarding how she can provide more institutional support. DeWayne mentioned that he felt many did not fully understand the purpose of this assessment, making it difficult to have a well-designed plan.

There was a discussion on how to identify programs that need additional assistance, who should receive notices, and through what channels. No decision was made. There were a lot of ideas and discussion.

Ann reported that the next NWCCU Accreditation site visit will be in Summer 2021. Ann will provide more information in a future meeting.

e. Next Steps – where should GERC go from here? NWCCU accreditation review is next year...

8. Committee membership: expiring terms and replacements

Brief discussion.

9. Adjourn - Next meeting April 28<sup>th</sup>.

Approved by GERC: April 28, 2020

Accepted by UCC: April 29, 2020 via email vote

Accepted by Faculty Senate: May 6, 2020 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 6, 2020

**Minutes**  
General Education Requirements Committee  
Tuesday 28 April 2020  
**Zoom - <https://isu.zoom.us/j/686795927>**  
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs  
Nawotniak, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady  
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, (UCC), Catherine Read  
Excused: Geoffrey Bennett, Mark Cooper  
Guests: none

1. Announcements –  
President Satterlee wants to keep the campus open with in-person classes next fall, pandemic allowing.  
Susanne Forrest is retiring as of August 10, but is on vacation until then, so this Friday is her last day.
2. Minutes for [October 22, 2019](#), **March 10, 2020** and **April 7, 2020**  
Council approved all, with two abstentions on October 22 minutes.
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert  
The assessment software pilot is going away because of budget cuts. Ann Hackert has been working on creating an in-house assessment reporting system. She will not be working over the summer, and will be going back to College of Business half-time next year, split half-time with Academic Affairs. She will continue to attend GERC meetings next year. She is updating the program review form to meet NWCCU’s new accreditation standards. She commended the Math department for rethinking and clarifying their assessment process and for really digging into SBOE’s intent behind the learning outcomes.
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine: nothing to report.
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill: nothing to report.
6. Unfinished Business:
  - a. Review of Assessment Plans

[MATH 1143](#)

Ann Hackert said Joanne Togle in Academic Affairs agreed it was okay to map their assessments to the SBOE’s mandated learning outcomes. Matt Wilson said there are other gen ed course assessment plans that do this mapping. Math department deconstructed and rethought everything they think is important to assess, and spent a lot of time perusing the SBOE’s Mathematical Ways of Knowing learning outcomes. DeWayne Derryberry, who is also the chair of the Math department, said they tailor course syllabi to the objective’s outcomes. The GEM outcomes are quite vague. He will be working on the assessment plans for MATH 1123 and 1153 this summer, but those may not be quite as detailed.

Spencer noted the plan does not include SBOE’s “select, execute and explain” in the departmental assessment plan. Part C gets to the heart of what GERC is trying to do in terms of assessment of analyzing what students are actually mastering, and what could be done to improve the courses and gen ed program. Ann mentioned Math can serve as a pilot, with demographic data from Institutional Research and Student Affairs. The accreditors want ISU to dis-aggregate the data. Jim asked what type of demographic information is needed. Ann explained she has demographic data on each student from last fall. This data can help identify groups of students that may be struggling with the course and provide insights on what types of solutions would be

most effective in helping those students succeed. Multiple choice questions are an option, but students still have to show their work and calculations to demonstrate their understanding of the course material.

Correction to the plan: changed “SBOE” to “GEM” to be consistent with state-mandated Objectives.

Council **approved** this assessment plan for MATH 1143.

#### MATH 1147

This plan is very similar to the previous MATH 1143 plan, though this course is not a designated common course.

Council **approved** this assessment plan for MATH 1147.

#### PHYS 1152

This plan used the proposal form for Assessment Plans only, not for approval of the course as a Gen Ed. Ann explained this plan follows a national precedence for pre-test and post-test as a way of assessing student mastery of the course content. The lab component is numbered differently than the lecture course. Ann worked with the plan’s author to avoid using grades as an assessment tool.

Matt noted that this plan works in coordination with the plan for the lab course, PHYS 1152. The lecture class assesses some of the learning outcomes, whereas the lab course assesses the other learning outcomes.

#### PHYS 1153

Shannon noted that students are only required to take one lab course and two lecture courses to fulfill Objective 5. For this reason, the lab course is offered separately from the lecture. Learning Outcome #5 in this Objective is aimed at the lab component of the course.

Council’s consensus is to treat these two plans as one assessment plan for the lecture and lab components. Susanne questioned whether that would cause problems for students who pass one course but not the other. Sarah explained how DegreeWorks course audit system handles such situations. No objections to combining the plans.

Council **approved** the two assessment plans as **one plan** for PHYS 1152/1153 to be consistent with other gen ed courses that have lab components.

#### b. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports

##### 1) Objective 5 ORC Report – Shannon Kobs

Shannon said the committee broke the report into the various sections.

Biology has hired a person specifically to handle assessment and will be making some revisions to their assessment plans. Geology is also planning to make some changes. Physics hasn’t developed assessment plans so they haven’t filed annual reports.

It is apparent that programs in this Objective are trying to follow their assessment plans. Departments are not consistent in how they are selecting materials and samples, even within the same department and year. The number of items used in their sample introduces additional disparities. The report noted that the same percentage is often reported in each category. The values appear to be based on estimates rather than calculated from data.

Departments could benefit from some guidance on what and how to assess their courses, especially what degree of student mastery of the material is sufficient to meet the outcomes.

Section C list of courses in the Objective was fine, no changes needed.

Section D of the report examines the learning outcomes themselves and suggests changes to the learning outcomes that could be brought up by the discipline group reps at the Gen Ed Summit in the fall. Suggest adding “recognize” to competency #1, since observation and recognition is precursor to being able to analyze and predict phenomena. Scientific Method is open to interpretation, so could use some clarification.

Section E specifically examines the scientific method outcome. Committee noted the “scientific method” is open to interpretation and could use some clarification.

Overall, the committee consensus was that scientific ways of knowing is a critical component to general education overall, and were appreciative that the GEM mandate includes this Objective.

Ann mentioned it might be beneficial for all faculty who teach courses in the Objective to get together to discuss the learning outcomes and see about reaching a consensus on best practices that still allow flexibility for tailoring to specific disciplines and programs. The suggestions contained in this and the previous Objective Review Committee reports would be helpful to the discipline groups to consider at the upcoming annual statewide Gen Ed Summit.

Spencer reiterated that the annual assessment reporting survey asks what percentage of students in all sections of a course have sufficiently mastered each learning outcome. No overall standards have been set for a baseline percentage as an acceptable minimum. Mapping departmental goals to the GEM student learning outcomes in each Objective would be a good strategy for programs to follow in their gen ed courses.

GERC should consider providing appropriate clarifications to departments regarding the selection of materials for assessment samples. Need to reiterate that assessment is about improving student learning and success, not making extra work for faculty. Departments are best served by recording realistic percentages that accurately represent student mastery of the material and skills rather than being concerned the data will be used in ways that are adverse to the department itself. Discussion ensued about what happens next with these review reports, and how the information could be best used going forward instead of shelved and forgotten.

Council **accepted** the Objective 5 Review Committee’s Report.

2) Objective 6 ORC Report – Jim Skidmore – *will be forthcoming for review in the fall.*

Jim is finalizing the report, which he plans to send to the committee members for their approval later this week.

7. Committee membership: expiring terms and replacements

- CAL: B&SS: Jim Skidmore: replacement is **Erika Fulton** for a full 3-year term
- CAL: FA&H: Jennifer Attebery: replacement is **Liz Moreno-Chuquen for 1 year**  
(Jennifer will be on sabbatical next year, but will return to complete her term in 2021-22.)
- Education: Shu-Yuan Lin: *no known replacement yet*
- Pharmacy: Paul Cady: *no known replacement yet*

8. Officer Elections for next year AY2020-21 – Chair, Vice Chair, Executive Secretary

Eligible members:

**Neil Tocher, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa**

Jennifer read the officers' duties from GERC's bylaws.

Chair: **Spencer Jardine** was nominated, and accepted the nomination. Council **acclaimed** him as chair for next year.

Vice Chair: Shannon Kobs Nawotniak and Matt Wilson were nominated, and both accepted the nominations. Nominations were closed. Votes were cast via the Chat feature on Zoom, with messages sent privately to Jennifer.

**Matt Wilson** was re-elected as Vice Chair.

Secretary: **Shannon Kobs Nawotniak** was nominated, accepted, and was elected as Secretary.

9. Adjourn: 4:30 p.m.

Approved by GERC:	September 22, 2020
Accepted by UCC:	September 24, 2020
Accepted by Faculty Senate:	October 12, 2020
Accepted by Academic Affairs:	October 6, 2020