

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday 22 August 2017

Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301 and Meridian 653

2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Cara Esplin

Telecom: Julia Boyle

Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read

Excused: n/a

Absent: Lori Austill, Susan Belliston (UCC), Sarah Mead

Guests: Mary Lou Dunzik-Gougar

1. Welcome and Introductions

Shropshire opened the meeting and members introduced themselves.

2. Meetings Schedule

GERC is a subcommittee of University Curriculum Council, and meets on the 2nd and 4th Tuesdays of the month, frequently for the entire 2-hour time allotment.

3. Recent History of Gen Ed at ISU

Shropshire gave a brief overview of the many changes to Gen Ed program over the past few years. In April 2014 the State Board of Education rolled out its GEM (General Education Matriculation) program for all secondary institutions in Idaho to follow for Objectives 1 through 6. Each school may require two of its own institutionally-designated Objectives to round out the minimum of 36 credits of general education coursework required for a bachelors degree. GERC had to retrofit its existing general education structure to fit the SBOE's mandated GEM structure. In the 2015-16 academic year GERC created a structure for assessing general education courses and departments developed their gen ed assessment plans. 2016-17 was the first year Gen Ed assessment reports were submitted. This year will be the second year for gen ed assessment reporting, and the first year for beginning reviews of the Objectives, starting with Objectives 1 and 2. Each Objective will be reviewed on a 5-year cycle. During the last accreditation review in 2014, gen ed assessment was identified as one of the areas that ISU needed to work on. So there is a lot of focus and attention on GERC's efforts.

4. Role of GERC

It is not GERC's role to adopt the assessment of gen ed courses, only to devise the structure in which gen ed assessment can take place. All GERC's minutes and recommendations are accepted by UCC and then go on up the administrative approval chain.

5. State-wide Gen Ed Discipline Groups

The annual state-wide General Education Summit will take place at the end of September. GERC will meet with ISU's Discipline Group representatives on September 26 to discuss concerns and issues for the reps to bring up at the Summit. The outcomes of the Summit will result in decisions from the SBOE that will impact gen ed programs across the state, and thereby impact GERC's work.

6. Review of Summer 2017

a. Webpage update

In consultation with the website managers and Shropshire, Read spent a few weeks completely redesigning GERC's website using the new Content Management System. Proposal and assessment information is easier to find than previously. Shropshire encouraged council members to peruse the website and become familiar with the content. Approved gen

ed course proposals and assessment plans are posted, but access is restricted to the ISU community.

- b. GERC now has a seat on the University Assessment Review Committee, which is looking for an automated system for assessment data storage and management.
Tokle chairs this committee. Shropshire has been attending these meetings since she is on a 12-month contract and was here during the summer, but GERC could choose another member to attend in her stead.

7. Update from state-wide General Education Committee – Joanne Tokle

Tokle reported ISU is in Year 3 of the accreditation cycle. ISU submitted a report last week to the accreditors, and the site visit is to take place in October. The purpose of the mid-cycle review is to make sure ISU is on track for the full review that will take place in Year 7. This mid-cycle review will not result in findings, but is intended to ensure we are doing what we need to do for the full accreditation review in 4 years.

ISU hopes to hire a University Assessment Coordinator to help departments with their assessment efforts on all levels. The database software being considered by the University Assessment Committee would be an optional tool to support those departments that might want to use it, but would not be mandated. A subcommittee of that group is also working on revising the program review process for those programs that do not have specialized accreditation. Program review is supposed to happen every five years.

The State Gen Ed Summit is coming up on Sept 28-29 in Boise. Tokle is on the planning committee, so she can bring up suggestions to tweak the agenda a bit. Discipline Groups are supposed to work on Outcomes assessment. They will report to their counterparts from the other institutions about their schools' experiences in gen ed assessment efforts so far. The idea is to get a sense of what is working, what is not working, and how effective the competencies themselves actually are at assessing what they purport to assess.

Open Educational Resources will be discussed at the Summit as well, in the context of costs to students. GEM-stamping is another topic on the Summit's agenda. The SBOE has expressed some concerns about some of the courses that some schools are using to fulfill gen ed Objectives. The Discipline Groups will discuss those during one of their work sessions.

Another discussion topic will be the GEM Objective rubrics created by the Discipline Groups at the same time as the Competencies. Holland described the way the rubrics were developed, and said their purpose was never made clear even as the Groups were tasked with creating them. At best they were meant as guidelines to high schools as to what level of proficiency graduating seniors needed to have before starting college. The rubrics were not written with the intent for use in assessment.

- 8. Revision of process for naming ISU representatives to the state-wide Discipline Groups
Members were asked to consider the way selection currently occurs and to come up with ideas on whether any changes to the process might be advisable. At the very least the reps should be selected before the end of the spring semester to give time for making arrangements. GERC might think about standardizing the process, perhaps coming up with some criteria or qualifications for serving. Alternatively, Discipline Group seats could simply be added to the list of vacating council seats sent to each college in early spring.
- 9. Need for Assessment Workshops?
Members were encouraged to check with their faculty constituents to see if there is a need for or interest in having workshops on assessment. Let Tokle know if there is interest and she can look into arranging such workshops. A University Assessment Coordinator would be helpful in working with the colleges and departments to clarify the guidelines and expectations. Compiling

general concerns and widespread problems could help solidify the targets. There is a need to create and foster a culture of assessment in a systematic way. Individual assessment is being done, it's the systematic aspect where we fall short.

10. Form Objective Review Committees (ORCs) for Objectives 1 and 2, and begin that process. Skidmore will likely be on the ORC for Objective. Selena Grace wants GERC to start on this review process this year, rather than wait for another year. First step is to make sure the relevant departments know this fall that they will need to submit a 5-year report, and the ORC will be convening in spring. GERC can discuss the composition of each committee next time. ORCs should have fairly wide latitude for making suggestions about the Objective Outcomes themselves, as well as for the individual gen ed courses.

11. Schedule for ORCs for reviewing Objectives 3 through 9 – *deferred until next meeting*.

Shropshire will notify the departments for Objectives 1 and 2. Assessment plans and new course proposals should be submitted to GERC in the next few weeks. Assessment reports for 2016-17 are due on Nov. 1.

Adjourn: 3:40 p.m.

Important Dates:

- Sept. 20 –Gen Ed course proposals and assessment plans due to GERC
- Sept. 26—Discipline Group members attend GERC meeting for joint discussion
- Sept. 28 & 29 –state-wide General Education Summit, Discipline Groups meeting
- Oct 24—last day for GERC to act on proposals/assessment plans for inclusion in 18/19 catalog
- Nov. 1—2nd year assessment results due
- Spring 2018—ORC's for Objectives 1 and 2 conduct and complete work

Approved by GERC: October 25, 2017 via email vote
 Accepted by UCC: October 26, 2017
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 3, 2017

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday 12 September 2017

Academic Affairs Conference Room AA 102 and Meridian Room 653

2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Katy Kole de Peralta, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson

Telecom: Jennifer Adams (for Julia Boyle)

Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Susan Belliston (UCC), Catherine Read

Excused: n/a

Absent: Cara Esplin, Lori Austill,

Guests: none

1. Introductions and Announcements

Members introduced themselves for the benefit of the newcomers.

A Celebration of Life for long-time ISU employee Dawn Imel who recently passed away will take place at 4:00 pm today in the Student Union Ballroom.

2. Minutes for August 22, 2017 – will be voted upon by email

3. Update from Academic Affairs: Joanne Tokle

Tokle today received a revised agenda for the upcoming Statewide General Education Summit. Session will include:

- a panel discussion on Open Educational Resources;
- outcomes assessment and best practices;
- Objective rubrics;
- discussion of GEM-stamping of gen ed courses including identifying a set of common GEM courses available to students across all institutions;
- recommendations for common course numbering or indexing in each Objective
- discussion of the extent to which upper division courses should or should not be included in general education;
- suggest modifications to evaluation and assessment processes that would improve delivery of gen ed curriculum across the state.

Holland explained the Discipline Groups are charged by SBOE with creating and shaping policies and outcomes to be used and implemented by all the post-secondary schools across the state.

This will be the first Gen Ed Summit with the new SBOE Chief Academic Officer, and many of the initiatives listed above were not part of last year's discussions. GERC learns from the Discipline Group representatives what the SBOE's sentiments are regarding gen ed, which helps guide GERC's efforts. Tokle assured GERC members that the Provost fully supports faculty wishes and wants GERC to freely voice their opinions for the Discipline Group reps to take to the Summit and to the SBOE.

GERC needs clarification from the state about the gen ed Objective rubrics. Little guidance was given by SBOE for assessing the Outcomes and learning competencies, so each institution developed its own assessment methods and rubrics. The SBOE is now strongly advocating a common set of rubrics to be used by all in some way. Wait and see what comes out of the Summit. The Discipline Group reps are not favorably disposed toward mandating a uniform general education curriculum across the state, though the SBOE appears to be leaning in that direction. Tokle mentioned there is a lot of outside pressure from State Legislators regarding transferring credits from one institution to another, so this could be overlapping onto gen ed. The

problem is some courses with the same number are not equivalent from school to school, but the credits transferred do not allow for the inequities.

4. Plan for GERC meeting with Gen Ed Disciplinary Group Representatives on Sept. 26, 2017
 - a. GERC's concerns it hopes could be addressed at the Sept. 28-29 statewide Gen Ed Summit
 - SBOE rubrics decision
 - Lower division Foreign Languages as Objective 4 courses
 - Language courses do not fit the GEM learning outcomes for Objective 4
 - For several years GERC has wanted the state to take up this dilemma for consideration and give guidance
 - Assessment issues for dual enrollment gen ed courses
 - Communication with high school teachers
 - Ensuring the high schools are conforming with the learning outcomes and assessment
 - "Standard" course numbering for gen ed across the state
 - Test credit for gen ed
 - No assessment whether students have mastered the desired competencies
 - Removing a gen ed course from the gen ed program – departments and GERC must have some way of eliminating a course that does not meet gen ed requirements.
 - What constitutes a gen ed course at a college level? Need some criteria or definition.
 - No procedure for critical review of a course or Objective – how should GERC or other school raise a concern, and how should a defence of an institution's practice be structured? How to prevent high schools from shopping around to see which college or university will give their students the "best deal?"
 - Inequities in high school students' access to dual enrollment courses both on and off university campus.

Shropshire will devise a list of concerns to provide to the Discipline Group reps, and will send it to GERC members for their comments and input. She will also draft a brief summary where GERC is in regard to general education assessment on campus.

- b. Is current system for naming representatives, making clear their responsibilities, feedback, etc. effective?

Discipline Group representatives are currently appointed by Deans, and names are run by GERC for approval. Is this working, effective, etc.? Are two reps per Objective enough? Should GERC make a recommendation or nomination to deans? GERC could create some criteria or minimum qualifications?

Discussion. Continue to build stronger connection between the Discipline Group reps and GERC. Appointees should not be first year faculty members with no prior experience. Would be beneficial if reps were to have experience serving on GERC or UCC, or are involved in assessment and the issues to be knowledgeable enough. That will increase as this new process becomes more mature. No sentiment from GERC members for changing anything at this point.

5. Plan for Objective Review Schedule

Discussion. The greatest concern was to minimize the workload of departments involved in each years' review.

Objective	# courses	# depts	1 st Planned Review	2 nd Planned Review
1 Written Communication	4	2	Spring 2018	Spring 2023
2 Oral Communication	1	1	Spring 2018	Spring 2023
3 Mathematical Ways of Knowing	11	4	Spring 2019	Spring 2024

4 Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing	42	9	Spring 2019	Spring 2024
5 Scientific Ways of Knowing	23	9	Spring 2020	Spring 2025
6 Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing	15	9	Spring 2020	Spring 2025
7 Creative Thinking	14	10	Spring 2021	Spring 2026
8 Information Literacy	7	7	Spring 2021	Spring 2026
9 Cultural Diversity	39	8	Spring 2022	Spring 2027

Holland moved to approve the above schedule. Seconded by Wilson. **Approved unanimously.**

Shropshire asked members to start gearing up for Spring semester Objective Review Committees, and thinking about guidelines for the process. Also watch for new assessment plans that may be submitted in the next week or so.

6. Adjourn: 3:37 p.m.

Approved by GERC: November 14, 2017
 Accepted by UCC: November 17, 2017 via email vote
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: December 6, 2017

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
 Tuesday 26 September 2017
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301
 2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance:

GERC: Sandi Shropshire, Jim Skidmore, Katy Kole de Peralta, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Julia Boyle (telecom), Kaitlyn Jewkes

Discipline Group Reps: Hal Hellwig, Lydia Wilkes, Jim DiSanza, Gesine Hearn

Excused: Pat Brooks, Jim Wolper, Tom Klein

Absent: Cara Esplin; Bob Fisher, Eddie Tatar, Erin Rasmussen

Ex-Officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Lori Austill, Susan Belliston, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read (Admin. Asst.)

1. Announcements
 - Shropshire welcomed the discipline group members.
2. Minutes for August 22, 2017 and September 12, 2017 – will out send for email vote
3. Update from Academic Affairs: Joanne Tokle
 - Statewide Gen Ed Summit:
 - The SBOE's intent is to ask for input from discipline group reps, want the Groups' recommendations on a set of common courses across institutions, common course numbering, upper division courses in gen ed program, GEM evaluation and assessment processes. Provost Woodworth-Ney encourages the Group reps to speak freely and give their honest opinions.
4. Discussion of Gen Ed items with Gen Ed Disciplinary Group Representatives
 - A copy of the SBOE's charge to the Discipline Groups was handed out to everyone.
 - a. GERC's concerns it hopes could be addressed at the Sept. 28-29 statewide Gen Ed Summit
 - SBOE Rubrics
 - SBOE wants the general guideline developed a couple of years ago to now be rubrics incorporated into institutions' assessment somehow. It is not clear exactly what is expected by the SBOE. At ISU, GERC left the assessment planning up to the departments, very little standardization in assessment plans because there was no guidance otherwise. One question is how many categories should be used; okay for SBOE to mandate what categories and how many to use, but not to specify words to put into those rubrics. Possible refinements to the SBOE's preferred rubrics will be part of the Summit discussion.
 - Lower Division Foreign languages as Objective 4 courses
 - Language courses do not fit the GEM learning outcomes for Objective 4
 - For several years GERC has wanted the State to take up this dilemma for consideration and give guidance.
 - Assessment issues for dual enrollment gen ed courses
 - How are other institutions' dual enrollment courses being assessed in the high schools? Need to ensure State-mandated learning outcomes are assessed and dual enrolment courses are administered in similar ways across the state.
 - "Standard" course numbering for gen ed across the state

- ISU is the only institution that went to 4 digit course numbers, the other institutions only use 3 digits. Since course numbers cannot be re-used, ISU decided to switch to 4 digits to avoid running out of new numbers. To switch back to 3 digits would be very problematic for ISU's Registrar's Office in terms of accurate recordkeeping. Unclear what the state's actual concerns are so makes it difficult to address. Disciplinary Group reps should ask for more specifics on what the real problem is. Just because courses have the same number does not mean all students have sufficient prerequisite knowledge to succeed in their next level course work.
- Test credit for gen ed
 - No assessment is being done to determine whether students have mastered the desired competencies when they are granted gen ed credit by exam in lieu of taking the course.
 - Who is responsible for assessing student mastery, and how? Syllabi are not sufficient to evaluate outcomes or student learning.
 - Advanced Placement (AP) courses have a different set of competencies than the GEM Objective competencies, but students are still granted the gen ed credit without having mastered the required outcomes. Knowledge of a specific discipline such as Chemistry, for example, is not the same as general knowledge of the sciences.
 - Do the accreditors care whether students are granted gen ed credit for passing an exam without any assessment of their mastery of the skills?
 - ISU is doing its best to ensure its dual enrollment students are being assessed, but has no control over test credit.
- Other
 - Removing gen ed course from the gen ed program – departments and GERC must have some way of eliminating a course that does not meet gen ed requirements. But removal seems difficult unless it is initiated by the offering department. How are other institutions handling this? 5-Year Objective Review might be a good time to assess whether a course belongs in the gen ed program.
 - Also, what about situations where institutions do not accept another institution's gen ed courses as belonging in gen ed? Discipline group reps are asking for some guidance on how much authority they and the institutions' gen ed committees have to scrutinize and question gen ed courses that are dubious. Do upper division courses really belong in gen ed? Institutions should be able to defend their decisions to include courses in the Gen Ed Objectives. Asking for their assessment data might be one way of ensuring the courses really belong in the Gen Ed objective. Togle assured everyone the SBOE shared some of their concerns and would likely welcome their suggestions.
 - Double-dipping problem: gen ed courses that departments create in their program just so the credits count toward both the degree and gen ed. Institutions' GERC committees need to do a better job of due diligence. Upper division gen ed courses are also problematic. GERC's argument in evaluating courses was "if this is the only _____[science, math, etc.] course the student ever takes, will they have an overall understanding of that general discipline?"
 - What constitutes a gen ed course at a college level? Need some criteria or

verifiable, operational definitions of general education, not just meeting the conceptual conditions of gen ed competencies. Gen Ed courses should not have pre-requisites, should be open to all students, be beyond high school level, as well as meet the objective's competencies.

- No procedure for critical review of a course or Objective – how should GERC or other school raise a concern, and how should a defence of the practice be structured. How to prevent high schools from shopping around to see which college or university will give their students the “best deal”
- Discipline Group reps should bring back feedback from the Summit to GERC, give some idea what the other faculty reps are saying. Caution that the faculty reps may not be speaking for their institutions; not always in agreement.

Schedule another joint meeting between GERC and discipline group reps to discuss Summit happenings. Keep communication flowing between the two entities so all concerned are informed and in accord.

The discipline group reps left the meeting at 3:35 p.m.

5. Shropshire will send reminders to departments that their assessment reports are due November 1. Request their faculty provide their assessment materials to those individuals designated to analyze the data and conduct the assessment.
6. Assessment Report survey changes needed, inform Vince Miller:
 - no “Submit” button at end of survey.
 - No ability to review and edit report before submitting. Caused multiple report submissions of the same course.
7. Foreign language courses don't meet Objective 4 outcomes. One possible solution to this would be to create alternate learning outcomes. Not acceptable to remove languages from gen ed. SBOE is asking Discipline Groups for input as to what is not working, and for suggestions. Would it be possible to reinstate a language Objective? ISU could create its own Objective 10 for languages. GERC still needs to revisit Objectives 7, 8 & 9. Wellness is a very important aspect of human life but does not meet any gen ed Objective. Mead mentioned one institution requires all its students to take an ethics course. ISU could impose a graduation requirement into its programs in addition to the gen ed program. The State has been considering lowering required number of gen ed credits in their quest to smooth out transfer issues.

Shropshire will write up some of the concerns raised in this discussion about foreign languages and give it to Tom Klein and Pat Brooks for them to take to the Summit and their Objective 4 Discipline Group.

8. Adjournment: 4:22 p.m.

Approved by GERC: November 14, 2017
 Accepted by UCC: November 17, 2017 via email vote
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: December 6, 2017

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday 10 October 2017

Academic Affairs Conference Room AA102 and Meridian Room 653

2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance:

GERC: Jim Skidmore, Katy Kole de Peralta, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Julia Boyle (telecomm), Kaitlyn Jewkes

Discipline Group Reps: Hal Hellwig, Jim DiSanza, Jim Wolper, Andy Holland, Gesine Hearn

Ex-Officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Susan Belliston, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read (Admin. Asst.)

Excused: Lydia Wilkes, Eddie Tatar, Pat Brooks, Tom Klein, Erin Rasmussen

Absent: Bob Fisher; Lori Austill

1. Update from Summit attendees

Tokle reported State Gen Ed Committee met in the morning, will now report to CAAP (Council of Provosts) rather than to IRSA. Hope this change will solve some of the problems recently experienced.

Discipline Groups were asked to make several recommendations: changes or updates to GEM competencies and assessment rubrics, identify best practices in assessment, recommend common set of courses available to students across all institutions, courses for common course numbering, and the extent to which upper division courses should be included in general education curriculum.

Objective 1 Written Communication: Hellwig said his group is very cohesive and organized. ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102 are almost the only courses in this objective, so that was a very easy task. No upper level courses would be allowed in this objective since they don't fit the intent of general education. Group reps were all very much against teaching ENGL 1102 as a dual credit course in high schools; even though that is current practice, it is not a good idea. High school sections taught on college campus would be fine, or send a college instructor to teach in the high school. ENGL 1102 is a research and writing course that requires use of library information, infrastructure, databases and materials beyond what high school resources can offer, plus a level of instructor proficiency in teaching how to synthesize information from multiple sources and proper citation requirements that are beyond the expertise of most high school teachers.

Holland mentioned Northwest Nazarene College is in the GEM system even though it is not a state school, and they teach several dual credit courses, including ENGL 1102. This fact demonstrates the problem of ensuring sufficient quality and rigor in the gen ed program. Advanced Placement (AP) courses do not all fit in Gen Ed program. English AP courses do not prepare high school students for university level writing skills. Math AP courses do prepare students for college work.

Objective 2 Oral Communication: DiSanza reported his group's main goals were to finish and update their assessment rubric. The group also expressed its dismay at BSU's plethora of courses in Objective 2. Finally have a permanent member from Boise State University in the discipline group, so the next year should see some paring down of the course offerings. There was strong consensus in the group that upper division courses do not belong in Gen Eds. Discipline Groups should be allowed some authority and oversight of GEM course offerings, and to be able to push for changes as needed. Encourage more coordination within each Group and among the various Groups.

Objective 3 Mathematical Ways of Knowing: The group discovered there were major differences in the emphases in the way MATH courses with the same number are taught at each institution. Each are focused on quite different demographics of student populations and student interests. ISU students are primarily health professions, chemistry and biology, versus business majors at Boise State. The basics of each course do meet the gen ed guidelines at all institutions. However, a

uniform state-wide rubric would be difficult to adhere to because of the inherently different foci of the various institutions.

Rubrics discussion: The Rubric for each Objective will become a little more official, but will still be a guideline to be followed either directly or indirectly. Objective 1 rubric will be advisory, but the discipline will have to be able to tweak it as necessary. Objective 6 did not have enough assessment data to determine how well the rubrics will work, to the group tabled until next year when there will be a better opportunity to review them.

Objective 3 group does not agree with the learning outcomes to begin with, and the rubric does not fit the courses either. MATH 1143 at ISU is different than the MATH 143 courses at other institutions, with enough differences in emphasis that it is really a different course. The only way to fix it would be to redesign it from scratch and create a brand-new MATH 143 course. The main point is that the various sets of students are quite different with different goals in the different schools.

Objective 4 Humanistic Ways of Knowing: Tokle reported it was very difficult to identify courses that would fit in a Common Course Numbering system. SPAN 1101 & 1102 and FREN 1101 & 1102, Introduction to Literature, Introduction to Music were about the only common courses in this Objective.

The committee recommended adding an eighth learning outcome to Objective 4 to address foreign languages, and require courses meet 5 of the 8 outcomes. SBOE does care about the rubrics, but are at least granting the institutions some leeway in how they use it.

Objective 5 Scientific Ways of Knowing: Holland reported the course offerings are well aligned among the schools, but are named and numbered very differently. Differences in student populations among the schools create quite a bit of disparity in courses. The problem common course numbering appears to try to solve is dual credit students not getting good advising and therefore not knowing how dual credit courses will count toward their eventual majors. Renaming courses might be helpful to the students, but would be problematic to renumber. The group advocated there be more focus on ensuring quality and rigor in the dual credit courses, and enforcing the instructors have the required credentials to make sure they are qualified to teach the subject matter at a university level. The Objective 5 rubric is general enough that it would not be difficult to implement if required.

Objective 6 Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing:

The group wants to change the wording of knowledge competencies to require courses meet all 5 of the outcomes, rather than just 4. This change would help prevent proliferation of borderline courses that do not meet the primary foundational outcome of the social science objective. The group looked at Passport program requirements, too, which does require all five outcomes. University of Idaho was adamant that their upper division courses need to be included in the GEM/Gen Ed program, though the rest of the group was unclear why. That practice could cause some transfer problems for students. The group reps are seeking feedback from their faculty and respective Gen Ed committees. Their goal is to make the recommended changes by February 2018 to implement into the GEM system as soon as possible. There is a wide variety of course offerings included in Objective 6, and the group was interested in finding out how often, and how many, students actually have problems transferring gen ed credits across the state. The group did not get to a discussion of common course numbering. Their consensus was the Registrars should discuss and resolve the numbering issue; faculty groups do not care about course numbers, only course content. At other institutions, there are faculty members who act as assessment coordinators and receive course releases or extra pay to do assessment.

Hearn asked GERC members to discuss requiring all 5 learning outcomes in Objective 6 and give its feedback to her so she can take it to her discipline group later this semester. She accepted Shropshire's invitation to attend another GERC meeting soon.

The Discipline Group reps, Jewkes, Wilson, and Skidmore left the meeting at this time.

2. Minutes – deferred for a subsequent meeting

3. Update from Academic Affairs: Joanne Tokle

Accreditation Midcycle Review went very well. The site visitors were happy with what ISU has done with creating the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee (IEAC) and mission fulfillment, though they were a bit concerned about faculty and staff fatigue when it comes to assessment. They were pleased ISU is looking at assessment software that can be used across campus, and working on hiring an Assessment Coordinator. GERC's efforts were much appreciated. Holland and Shropshire helped Tokle draft a short report for the Accreditors.

Shropshire sent two documents to members to consider and discuss soon:

- A calendar document which shows GERC's workflow, and shows how it is morphing into something it hasn't done before.
- Objective Review process: templates of 5-Year Report and Objective Review Committee Report
 - Objectives 1 & 2 will be reviewed by ORCs this spring, even though 5-Year Reports are not done yet

Discussion. GERC members thought it would be very helpful to have Objective 1 & 2 departments to do a 5-Year Review using their 2 years of data collected so far. Results could show see how well the process works and help plan for next year.

4. Discussion of Gen Ed items mentioned by Gen Ed Disciplinary Group Representatives

a. GERC's concerns it hopes could be addressed at the Sept. 28-29 statewide Gen Ed Summit

- SBOE rubrics decision
- Lower Division Foreign languages as Objective 4 courses
 - Language courses do not fit the GEM learning outcomes for Objective 4
 - For several years GERC has wanted the state to take up this dilemma for consideration and give guidance
- Assessment issues for dual enrol gen ed courses
- "Standard" course numbering for gen ed across the state
- Test credit for gen ed
 - No assessment whether students have mastered the desired competencies
- Other
 - Removing gen ed course from the gen ed program – departments and GERC must have some way of eliminating a course that does not meet gen ed requirements. But seems impossible to do so in reality.
 - What constitutes a gen ed course at a college level? Need criteria or definition
 - No procedure for critical review of a course or Objective – how should GERC or other school raise a concern, and how should a defence of the practice be structured. How to prevent high schools from shopping around to see which college or university will give their students the "best deal"

b. Is current system for naming representatives, making clear their responsibilities, feedback, etc. effective? Get reps' feedback on their experiences and opinions.

5. Adjourn: 3:40 pm

Approved by GERC: January 31, 2018 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: February 1, 2018 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 13, 2018

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday 31 October 2017

Academic Affairs Conference Room AA102 and Meridian Room 680D

2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson,

Telecom: Julia Boyle

Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read

Excused: Susan Belliston (UCC)

Absent: Cara Esplin, Katy Kole de Peralta, Kaitlyn Jewkes; Lori Austill, Sarah Mead

Guests: none

1. Announcements – none
2. Minutes for September 12, 2017; September 26, 2017, and October 10, 2017 – will vote via email
3. Update from Academic Affairs: Joanne Tokle
Tokle said not only has Physics not completed their assessment plans, some faculty in other departments are experiencing difficulty getting the information they need from their colleagues to prepare their assessment reports. Vice Provost Selena Grace will attend the next GERC meeting on November 14 to ask for suggestions on what Academic Affairs can do to hold faculty accountable for their part in assessment efforts. The problem is that instructors are not submitting materials, particularly with dual credit courses. Somehow need to make the assessment process useful to departments and less bureaucratic.
4. Gen Ed Course Proposals/Assessment Plans
 - a. Obj. 6: [SOC 1102 Proposal](#) to change the course title from “Social Problems” to “Current Social Issues”
This proposal came to GERC because of the push from the State Board of Education for common courses. All but one of ISU’s sister institutions that have this course call it “Social Problems.” The lone standout calls it “Current Social Problems.” The SBOE’s focus is on common course numbering and, so far at least, seems less concerned about course titles. Last Thursday the Undergraduate Curriculum Council (UCC) approved the new course title in the corresponding catalog change proposal (AY2019 Proposal #41).
GERC decided there was no need for their action on this change. If at some point the SBOE mandates common course numbers and titles, this course would be part of those wholesale changes.

Shropshire asked members their opinion on History’s proposal to delete HIST 2249 World Regional Geography from the catalog and from the Gen Ed program. GS 2270 World Regional Geography and Cultures is replacing that course since the faculty member who teaches it has changed departments.
Members agreed with this substitution and the removal of HIST 2249 from the Gen Ed Program. Shropshire will include GERC’s decision in her impact response for the UCC proposal.
 - b. New Obj. 9: [SPAN 2210 Spanish for Health Care I](#)
(existing course to become Gen Ed, may require course number change if approved)
Members discussed this proposal and ultimately **remanded** it back to the department for more information, i.e., syllabi, assignments, exams. Their main concern was whether the course content or placement exams sufficiently emphasize the cultural component required by

the objective.

5. Gen Ed Assessment Plans remaining to be approved
Skidmore will contact the departments and work with them to get these finished off:
 - a. Obj. 9: [IS 2270 GS 2270 World Regional Geography & Cultures](#)
 - b. Obj. 4: [ART 1101 Survey of Art History I](#)
 - c. Obj. 4: [ART 1102 Survey of Art History II](#)
 - d. Obj. 5: Physics courses – no plans received yet
 - e. Obj. 9: [CHNS 2201-2202 Intermediate Chinese I & II](#)

6. Call for nominations for next year's council officers: Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary
 - Chair: Wilson nominated **Jim Skidmore** as Chair. **Skidmore accepted** the nomination as long as he is not on a leave of absence out of the country next year. This year the GERC chair has attended Univ. Assessment Committee, but that could be delegated to any GERC member.
 - Vice Chair Forrest nominated **Matt Wilson** as Vice Chair; **he accepted** the nomination.
 - Secretary: **Andy Holland volunteered** to be Secretary if no one else wants it.
 Elections will be held next meeting on November 14, 2017.

Before the end of the semester GERC will set up Objective Review Committees (ORCs) for Objectives 1 & 2. GERC's consensus was to include the State Discipline Group representatives on the ORCs. Shropshire will contact the reps to let them know. Tokle will contact Selena Grace and make arrangements for her to attend next meeting to discuss assessment compliance.

Next meetings: November 14 and November 28. Shropshire does not plan to have GERC meet in December unless needed.

7. Adjourn: 3:55 p.m.

Approved by GERC: November 2, 2017 via email vote
 Accepted by UCC: November 2, 2017
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 17, 2017

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday 14 November 2017

Academic Affairs Conference Room AA102 and Meridian Room 653

2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Katy Kole de Peralta, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair),
Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Kaitlyn Jewkes

Telecom: Julia Boyle

Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read

Excused: Susan Belliston (UCC)

Absent: Lori Austill

Guests: Selena Grace

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes for **September 12, 2017** and **September 26, 2017**
Skidmore moved, Hanin seconded to approve both sets of Minutes. **Approved** unanimously.
3. Assessment Compliance: Vice Provost Selena Grace – deferred until later in the meeting to allow Grace to finish her other meeting.
4. Update from Academic Affairs: Joanne Tokle - deferred until later in the meeting since she was in another meeting.
5. Gen Ed Course Proposals/Assessment Plans
 - a. New Obj. 9: [SPAN 2210 Spanish for Health Care I](#)
(existing course to become Gen Ed, may require course number change if approved)
Was remanded last time, no revisions since then. Skidmore will follow up with the department. This will not be included as a gen ed course in the 2018-19 catalog, since it is too late to meet UCC's cutoff deadline.
6. Gen Ed Assessment Plans remaining to be approved
No changes on any since last time:
 - a. Obj. 9: [IS-2270 GS 2270 World Regional Geography & Cultures](#)
 - b. Obj. 4: [ART 1101 Survey of Art History I](#)
 - c. Obj. 4: [ART 1102 Survey of Art History II](#)
 - d. Obj. 5: Physics courses – no plans received yet (Assessment Reports were submitted, however)
 - e. Obj. 9: [CHNS 2201-2202 Intermediate Chinese I & II](#)
7. Elect next year's council officers: no other nominations
Chair nominee: **Jim Skidmore was elected** unanimously.
(conditioned upon his not being on a leave of absence out of the country next year)

Vice Chair nominee: **Matt Wilson was elected** unanimously.

Secretary nominee: **Andy Holland was elected** unanimously.
8. Appoint GERC members to **chair** the two Objective Review Committees convening in January 2018
Discussion. Consensus was that GERC's reps should be disinterested and from a different

discipline area than the Objective, if possible.

- a. Objective 1: Written Communication
Skidmore volunteered to chair this review committee.
- b. Objective 2: Oral Communication
Holland volunteered to chair this review committee.

Shropshire will draft an appointment letter to the assessment faculty selected to serve on the Objective Review Committees, and with copies for department chairs, and the GERC members.

GERC will have a follow-up meeting with Gesine Hearn on November 28, 2017 regarding Objective 6

Selena Grace and Joanne Togle arrived at the meeting at this point. Members returned to the deferred agenda items:

3. Assessment Compliance:

Grace thanked GERC for their efforts. The mid-cycle accreditation reviewers were impressed with what GERC has accomplished so far in gen ed assessment. Grace asked for GERC's input on what can be done to encourage departments' compliance with the assessment process. What is a good approach for holding faculty accountable for their part in assessment? Grace asked whether GERC would support purchasing assessment software, and hiring an Assessment Coordinator specifically to coordinate specialized and non-specialized assessment of programs, curriculum, student success, and gen ed. ISU's accreditation is dependent upon assessment compliance. Accreditors view General Education as a program, and ISU has to treat it and assess it as a program.

Discussion. The value of assessment is not clear to faculty and departments – that is the bigger problem. Need to frame assessment not as a compliance issue, but in terms of how it helps students. GERC left departments a lot of latitude for creating their own assessment plans to measure how well their students are meeting the mandated learning outcomes. Many units are already assessing their courses and programs, but do not connect it to either the broader university accreditation requirements or the gen ed Objectives.

Consider a two-tier approach: need to give faculty creative leeway to use their discipline expertise to develop meaningful processes. Also need several professionals in positions to receive the faculty reports and convert them into the format needed. Grace agreed the assessment process has to be meaningful to faculty, and it should not be difficult to translate the data into what the accreditors are looking for.

4. Update from Academic Affairs:

Togle mentioned the SBOE has sent out a draft of not only common gen ed course numbering, but common course titles as well. She has conferred with the Sociology department and they are okay with holding off on changing the title to SOC 1102 until the SBOE has made a more definitive decision on common general ed courses. Some discussion.

9. Adjourn: 3:51 p.m.

Approved by GERC: January 29, 2018 via email vote
Accepted by UCC: February 1, 2018 via email vote
Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 13, 2018

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
 Tuesday 28 November 2017
 Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301 and Meridian Room 683
 2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Katy Kole de Peralta, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland,
 Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson

Telecom: Julia Boyle

Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read

Excused: Susan Belliston (UCC)

Absent: Jim Skidmore, Kaitlyn Jewkes; Lori Austill,

Guests: Gesine Hearn

1. Announcements -- none
2. Update from Academic Affairs: Joanne Tokle
 - a. The University Assessment Committee is in favor of hiring a central university assessment coordinator, feeling it would provide support and guidance for those who need it. Tokle clarified hiring an Assessment Coordinator would be for all assessment programs, not just gen ed. Stipends of \$3500 each for a faculty coordinator in all 104 departments would cost \$364,000.
 - b. GERC will give a presentation to the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee on December 12. Shropshire and Tokle will work together on this.
 - c. The State Gen Ed Committee met last week by phone and discussed transfer credits. There is wide variation among Idaho's colleges and universities on how and whether transfer credits are accepted as general education. Mead said ISU GEM-stamps only its own courses, not transfers from out of state. Transfer credits are evaluated for equivalencies in course content. Not all transcripts state specifically what transfer credit was granted in each category. Registrar's Office looks at the original school's transcript and compares only against ISU's requirements, does not look at how an intermediary school allocated transfer credits. The transcript will show whether a student has fulfilled all gen ed requirements or not.

Tokle left the meeting at this point to go to another meeting.

3. GEM Objective 6 prospective changes update: Gesine Hearn, Discipline Group Rep
 Hearn said Objective 6 courses currently must meet any 4 of the 5 learning outcomes. The Discipline Group agreed the first learning outcome should be met by all courses to ensure they are indeed meeting the theoretical and conceptual framework of social or behavioral sciences so students learn the necessary foundational knowledge. In keeping with the SBOE preference for simplicity, the Discipline Group's consensus was to require all 5 learning outcomes in Objective 6. The Discipline Group reps were tasked with soliciting feedback from their institutions. If feedback is favorable, the Discipline Group will take the necessary steps to recommend, and then implement, this change to the Objective in the next couple of years.

Discussion ensued. The Passport Program does require all 5 outcomes. The proposed changes might be problematic for certain interdisciplinary or cross-cultural courses currently in the Objective since they are not strictly social sciences. An alternative would be to add language to the Objective description itself that emphasizes the foundational knowledge component inherent in the nature of general education. Consider better defining social science approaches and possibly incorporating the Passport Program language. Assessment efforts may help weed out courses that do not fit the outcomes.

4. GERC Updates: Sandi Shropshire
 - a. ORC report template has been fixed and reposted on GERC's website.
 - b. ORC appointment letter
 - c. Assessment Reporting results access
 - d. Minutes
 1. **August 22, 2017** and **October 31, 2017** were accepted by UCC and Academic Affairs
 2. **September 12, 2017** and **September 26, 2017** under review by Assoc. Deans & Acad. Affairs
 3. **October 10, 2017** and **November 14, 2017** are forthcoming
5. Gen Ed Course Proposals/Assessment Plans
 - a. New Obj. 9: [SPAN 2210 Spanish for Health Care I](#) was remanded for revisions, no response yet
(Remains a regular non-gen ed course for the 2018-19 catalog)
6. Gen Ed Assessment Plans remaining to be approved
 - a. Obj. 9: [IS-2270 GS 2270 World Regional Geography & Cultures](#)
(Prefix GS is already in use, new prefix yet to be assigned)
Appendix has been added to the plan as requested. Discussion.
Motion to approve, with suggestion to consider truncating a particular assignment question.
Approved.

No activity since remanded, so no action taken by committee:

- b. Obj. 4: [ART 1101 Survey of Art History I](#)
 - c. Obj. 4: [ART 1102 Survey of Art History II](#)
 - d. Obj. 5: Physics courses – no revised plans received yet
(Assessment Reports were submitted, however)
 - e. Obj. 9: [CHNS 2201-2202 Intermediate Chinese I & II](#)
7. Continued discussion of centralized support for university assessment
Discussion. Accreditors favor the hiring of a University Assessment Coordinator and software to facilitate faculty participation in assessment. Campus conversation about assessment is focused on compliance with outside expectations, with very little attention paid to using assessment as a tool for improving student learning, courses, and programs. As a result, faculty buy-in on assessment is limited. Data generated by Gen Ed assessment is most valuable at the department level, but most departments simply see this assessment as another administrative task they have to squeeze in the midst of their other duties. Spending six figures apiece on assessment software and a person to provide guidance to the colleges and departments is not an effective use of resources. Holding workshops is not an effective method of dissemination. Faculty are, and will continue to be, responsible for actually conducting assessment. Creating more administrative/support positions and pouring resources into support activities rather than into instruction and research, which has experienced cutbacks for years now, is not well received.

Shropshire will have GERC review the proposed job description and give input.

Members noted that assessment results show faculty do not quite understand that course grades do not evaluate how well students are learning the specific outcomes, only how well they are learning the course material as presented.

8. Adjourn: 4:26 p.m.

Next meeting is Tuesday, December 5, 2017.

Approved by GERC: January 29, 2018 via email vote
Accepted by UCC: February 1, 2018 via email vote
Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 13, 2018

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
 Tuesday 5 December 2017
 Academic Affairs Conference Room AA102 and Meridian Room 653
 2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Katy Kole de Peralta, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair),
 Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson

Telecom: Julia Boyle

Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read

Excused: Susan Belliston (UCC)

Absent: Lori Austill

Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes – forthcoming by email
 - a. October 10, 2017
 - b. November 14, 2017
 - c. November 28, 2017
3. Update from Academic Affairs –
 SBOE subcommittee IRSA will talk about common course numbering when they meet this coming Thursday.
4. Gen Ed Assessment Results discussion
 - a. some assessment reports submitted without approved assessment plans
 - Physics submitted reports without assessment plans – encouraging sign, but hard to tell what they were evaluating
 - Several departments submitted grade-based reports
 - b. general discussion, observations, problems, suggestions, etc.
 - Early College program
 - Cannot tell by missing reports whether the report simply was not submitted or the course was not taught that year. Need to solve this.
 - Reiterate submission of one course per report, and all sections of that course must be included.
 - c. actions or clarifications needed?
 Need to go through and clean up the database. Some cases where assessment reports were submitted for individual sections of a course, resulting in multiple reports for each course.
 - Update website with more clear instructions of what is expected in reporting, i.e., one submission covering all sections and iterations of a course.
 - GERC needs to compare which reports were submitted versus database and send out reminders to the departments to submit their reports every November
 - Several departments did not follow their own assessment plans – okay to update their plans but need to inform GERC and get approval of the revised plan.
 - Remind departments they need to keep their assessment materials on file; will be needed for the 5-year review.
 - Grade-based assessment is not acceptable, since does not assess the specific, mandated learning outcomes – need to reiterate this with departments
 - Reiterate what period of time should be assessed (Fall, Spring, Summer in each academic year). Report the prior academic year in November.

- Assess each outcome individually, so numbers should differ rather than being the same across all outcomes.
- Survey changes:
 - Get info from Vince on what gen ed courses were taught versus what reports were submitted.
 - Grade-based assessment is not acceptable.
 - Add new questions:
 - Checkbox to recognize an assessment plan exists and department is following it.
 - Refine Early College question to prepopulate checkbox questions whether such courses exist, whether materials were collected and analyzed, or if simply not addressed. Include place on the survey for explanations.

GERC to continue reviewing assessment spreadsheet, assigned work by Objective to ease the workload for all:

- Obj 3: Leonid Hanin
- Obj 4: Jim Skidmore and Matt Wilson
- Obj 5: Andy Holland
- Obj 6: Katy Kole de Peralta
- Obj 7: Neil Tocher
- Obj 8: Shu-Yuan Lin
- Obj 9: Sandi Shropshire

Meanwhile, Catherine will work with Vince Miller to clean up the survey reporting database – eliminate test entries, correct errors, identify and check duplicate submissions, etc.

5. Final Gen Ed Course List for 2018-19 Undergraduate Catalog –
Deferred approval until January 9, 2018 meeting to allow members more time for review.
6. Other Business – none
7. Remanded Assessment Plans still pending: will take up again next semester
 - a. Obj. 4: [ART 1101 Survey of Art History I](#)
 - b. Obj. 4: [ART 1102 Survey of Art History II](#)
 - c. Obj. 5: Physics courses – no revised plans received yet
(Assessment Reports were submitted, however)
 - d. Obj. 9: [CHNS 2201-2202 Intermediate Chinese I & II](#)
8. Adjourn: 3:18 p.m.

GERC's next meeting will be Tuesday, January 9, 2018.

Approved by GERC: January 29, 2018 via email vote
 Accepted by UCC: February 1, 2018 via email vote
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 13, 2018

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
 Tuesday 9 January 2018
 Academic Affairs Conference Room AA102
 2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Katy Kole de Peralta, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, (Chair), Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson

Telecom: N/A

Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Susan Belliston (UCC), Catherine Read

Excused: Julia Boyle, Sandi Shropshire

Absent: Kaitlyn Jewkes; Lori Austill

Guests: none

1. Announcements – Jim Skidmore chaired today’s meeting since Sandi Shropshire was out sick.
2. Minutes – will vote by email per a member’s request
 - a. October 10, 2017
 - b. November 14, 2017
 - c. November 28, 2017
 - d. December 5, 2017
3. Final Gen Ed Course List for 2018-19 Undergraduate Catalog

Discussion. For next year’s catalog GERC may consider revising Objective 7, and revisit how 2000-level Foreign Languages fit into the general education program. The footnote at the end of Objective 9 was amended to reflect the current practice of granting students Gen Ed credit for passing some language exams, but not CLEP exams. GERC will likely revisit the exam credit issue for future catalogs. A few other minor changes were made.

Approved as amended ([Appendix](#)) and forwarded to UCC as the next step in the approval chain.
4. Update from Academic Affairs:
 - SBOE approved the Doctor of Physical Therapy expansion to Meridian.
 - Gen Ed Common Course List from SBOE has not been finalized yet, but is close. Pre-req structures of the courses could be somewhat problematic, as could credits. GERC had some questions that Tokle agreed to ask the SBOE office; she will inform GERC what she finds out. GERC may write a Memo of Concerns to be sent to the SBOE’s Gen Ed Committee:
 - How much leeway is there for changing the title of a particular course if all the institutions are in agreement?
 - Will institutions have to create courses they don’t currently have?
 - What avenue is there for GERC or institutions expressing concerns to SBOE?
 - What about pre-requisite structures for gen ed courses, especially those that require another gen ed course as a pre-req? Do both courses have to stay as gen eds, even though the first fulfills the gen ed requirement?
 - What happens in cases where a course at one institution requires a lab, and no lab is required at another institution? Or in cases where the number of credits differ?

Think about more concerns for next time that could be included in a Memo to the SBOE.
5. Proposed Website changes: *deferred until next meeting for Shropshire’s input*

Add a new menu item and webpage “For Department Chairs” for the following reminders:

 - One gen ed assessment submission per course
 - Include all sections and formats (online, dual enrollment, classroom, etc.) of the course in sample

- Assessment plans can be modified
 - Assessment should be continuous – reports due Nov. 1 of each year report the results of assessment for courses taught during the previous academic year
 - Approved assessment plans can be found at <https://www.isu.edu/gerc/assessment-plans-and-reports/approved-assessment-plans/>
 - Course grades are not considered to be valid assessment indicators for Gen Ed courses
6. Remanded Assessment Plans still pending:
- a. Obj. 4: [ART 1101 Survey of Art History I](#)
 - b. Obj. 4: [ART 1102 Survey of Art History II](#)
Members discussed these two revised assessment plans. Still need sample questions, clarify whether “marginal” is an acceptable threshold of competency, what type of the exams or instruments will be used to measure student performance?
Both plans were remanded.
Skidmore will contact the department to let them know what information is still needed.
 - c. Obj. 5: Physics courses – no revised plans received yet
(Assessment Reports were submitted, however)
 - d. Obj. 9: [CHNS 2201-2202 Intermediate Chinese I & II](#)
Awaiting a new instructor for these courses, since the previous instructor has left ISU.
7. Gen Ed Assessment Results “process-level” discussion: any problems, misinterpretation of the process, anomalies, patterns, etc.?
- Interesting that some departments consider “D”-level work as marginal, but meeting the objective outcomes, while other departments consider “D”-level work below the threshold of satisfactory mastery of the material. Accreditors are mostly concerned that an assessment process exists that examines student work, measures and analyzes performance levels over time, and the findings are used by the departments to address deficiencies and improve courses.
- Objectives 1 and 2 are being reviewed by their respective Objective Review Committees this spring.
- a. Objective 3 -- Leonid
 - Inconsistency in frequency of reviewing learning outcomes: some plans call for annual review of all outcomes, other plans review only one or two outcomes per year. Should there be more uniformity? So far, GERC has only required that all outcomes must be reviewed at least once every 5 years.
 - Should GERC consider encouraging a more uniform approach to data collection and how conclusions are reached, or continue leaving it up to the departments to decide?
 - Often difficult to get the necessary materials from instructors to include in assessment efforts, especially from adjuncts or early college teachers.
 - b. Objective 4 – Matt and Jim Skidmore
 - Reports were not submitted for many of the language courses.
 - Failing students were included in the assessment for SPAN courses, which is fine as long as course grades are not being used to determine whether students meet the learning outcomes.
 - Departments should submit an assessment report even if the course was not taught so there is some record for that year.
 - Need to ensure sampling size is adequate to represent the student population of the course.
 - Indirect materials may be most valuable for assessing how well the course itself is designed to impart the learning outcomes, while direct materials measure how well students are learning the desired skills.
 - Most important to make sure the results and findings are actually used and disseminated.

- c. Objective 5 – Andy
- Most departments appear to be following their plans. Geology was the one exception, but they recognized the need to develop some instruments more focused on individual outcomes.
 - Might be helpful if the online reporting system had some way of displaying the course’s assessment plan in a new tab for reference as the report is being created.
 - It appears in a few cases that individual instructors are submitting reports for their own course sections rather than including them in the aggregate data.
- d. Objective 6 – Katy
- Would be helpful to have the assessment plan process available when reviewing the reports
 - How many students total were included in the assessment, and how many passed? What percentage of students did the plan call to look at?
 - Some materials seemed doubtful: course grades, quiz scores, token assignments specifically addressing a learning outcome, team projects.
 - Revisions to assessment plans demonstrate the process is being used, as inadequacies are recognized and new approaches developed.
 - Supplemental documents separate from the online report are not acceptable, since the information is not entered into the assessment database.
- e. Objective 7 – Neil
- No reports submitted for several courses, no indication whether they were taught that year or not.
 - Map quiz and timeline quiz as assessment materials do not seem appropriate for measuring critical thinking skills.
 - Another instance of different sections reported separately rather than in aggregate.
 - Assessment is a way of helping departments determine how well their online and early college courses and instructors are doing.

Next meeting, members will create a template feedback memo with general observations and guidance that each member can modify

Remaining items were deferred until next meeting:

- f. Objective 8 -- Shu Yuan
- g. Objective 9 -- Sandi
8. Revised Assessment Plans for GERC’s consideration – updated by departments – *deferred till next time*
- a. [Obj. 6: TGE 1150 Applied Social Sciences in the Workplace](#) – department’s revisions 10/3/2017
 - b. [Obj. 9: CSD 2256 Deaf Culture and Community](#) – department’s revisions 10/26/2017
9. Other Business – none
10. Adjourn: 4:37 p.m.

Approved by GERC: January 29, 2018 via email vote
 Accepted by UCC: February 1, 2018 via email vote
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 13, 2018

APPENDIX

General Education (for the 2018-19 catalog)

Approved as amended by GERC on January 9, 2018

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 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 who falls 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 credit requirement for general education (36), the student must complete additional coursework from any of the outlined Objective areas to meet the 36 credit minimum.

Objective 1, Written Communication:

Minimum of two (2) courses. (6 credits)

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

- Use flexible writing process strategies to generate, develop, revise, edit, and proofread texts.
- Adopt strategies and genre appropriate to the rhetorical situation.
- Use inquiry-based strategies to conduct research that explores multiple and diverse ideas and perspectives, appropriate to the rhetorical context.
- Use rhetorically appropriate strategies to evaluate, represent, and respond to the ideas and research of others.
- Address readers' biases and assumptions with well-developed evidence-based reasoning.
- Use appropriate conventions for integrating, citing, and documenting source material as well as for surface-level language and style.
- Read, interpret, and communicate key concepts in writing and rhetoric.

Courses that satisfy Objective 1:

ENGL 1101	English Composition	3
or ENGL 1101P	English Composition Plus	<u>4</u>
ENGL 1102	Critical Reading and Writing ¹	3
HONS 1101	Honors Humanities I ¹	3

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

Objective 2, Oral Communication:

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

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

- Research, discover, and develop information resources and structure spoken messages to increase knowledge and understanding.
- Research, discover, and develop evidence-based reasoning and persuasive appeals for ethically influencing attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.
- Adapt spoken messages to the diverse personal, ideological, and emotional needs of individuals, groups, or contexts.
- Employ effective spoken and nonverbal behaviors that support communication goals and illustrate self-efficacy.
- Listen in order to effectively and critically evaluate the reasoning, evidence, and communication strategies of self and others.
- Understand key theories, perspectives, principles, and concepts in the Communication discipline, as applied to oral communication.

One course satisfies the objective:

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

Objective 3, Mathematical Ways of Knowing:

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

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

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

Courses that satisfy Objective 3:

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

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

Objective 4, Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing:

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

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

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

- Demonstrate self-reflection, intellectual elasticity, widened perspective, and respect for diverse viewpoints.

Courses that satisfy Objective 4:

Humanities

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

Fine Arts

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

Foreign Languages

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

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

Objective 5, Scientific Ways of Knowing:

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

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

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

Courses that satisfy Objective 5:

BIOL 1100 & 1100L	Concepts Biology Human Concerns and Concepts Biology Human Concerns Lab (designed for non-science, non-health related majors) ^L	4
BIOL 1101 & 1101L	Biology I and Biology I Lab (designed for students preparing for majors in science, pre-medical fields, and health related professions) ^L	4
CHEM 1100	Architecture of Matter ^L	4
CHEM 1101	Introduction to General Chemistry	3
CHEM 1102 & CHEM 1103	Introduction to Organic and Biochemistry and Introduction to General Organic and Biochemistry Laboratory ^L	4
CHEM 1111	General Chemistry I	5

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

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

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

Objective 6, Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing:

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

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

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

Courses satisfying Objective 6:

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

Objective 7, Critical Thinking:

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

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

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

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

Courses satisfying Objective 7:

ANTH/ENGL/LANG 1107	Nature of Language	3
CS 1181	Computer Science and Programming I	3
CMP 2205	Argumentation	3
GEOL 1107	Real Monsters	3
HIST 1100	History in Film	3

HIST 1118	US History and Culture	3
HIST 1120	Global History Since 1500 <u>Themes in World History</u>	3
INFO 1181	Informatics and Programming I	3
PHIL 2201	Introduction to Logic	3
PHIL 2250	Contemporary Moral Problems	3
POLS 2202	Introduction to Politics Critical Thinking and Analysis	3
SOC 2248	Critical Analysis of Social Diversity	3
THEA 1118	Oral Interpretation of Literature	3
THEA 2251	Fundamentals of Acting	3

Objective 8, Information Literacy:

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

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

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

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

Courses satisfying Objective 8:

ACAD 1111	University Inquiry	3
CMP 2203	Media Literacy	3
FIN 1115	Personal Finance	3
GEOL 1108	Exploring Data and Information	3
HIST 2291	The Historian's Craft	3
INFO 1101	Digital Information Literacy	3
LLIB 1115	Introduction to Information Research	3

Objective 9, Cultural Diversity:

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

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

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

Courses satisfying Objective 9:

ANTH/SHOS 2201	Intermediate Shoshoni I	4
ANTH/SHOS 2202	Intermediate Shoshoni II	4
ANTH/ENGL 2212	Introduction to Folklore and Oral Tradition	3
ANTH 2237	Peoples and Cultures of the Old World	3
ANTH 2238	Peoples and Cultures of the New World	3
ANTH 2239	Latino Peoples and Cultures	3
ARBC 2201	Intermediate Arabic I	4
ARBC 2202	Intermediate Arabic II	4
CHNS 2201	Intermediate Chinese I	4
CHNS 2202	Intermediate Chinese II	4
CMLT 2207	Contemporary European Culture	3
CMLT 2208	Cultures of the Spanish Speaking World	3
CMLT 2209	Cultures of East Asia	3
CSD 2210	Human Communication, Differences, and Disorders through Literature and Media	3
CSD 2256	Deaf Culture and Community	3
EDUC 2204	Families Community Culture	3
ENGL 2210	American Cultural Studies	3
FREN 2201	Intermediate French I	4
FREN 2202	Intermediate French II	4
GERM 2201	Intermediate German I	4
GERM 2202	Intermediate German II	4
GLBL 2270	<u>World Regional Geography and Cultures</u>	<u>3</u>
HIST 2201	Women In U.S. History	3
HIST 2249	<u>World Regional Geography</u>	<u>3</u>
HIST 2251	Latin American History and Culture	3
HIST 2252	East Asian History	3
HIST 2254	Middle East History and Culture	3
HIST 2255	African History and Culture	3
IS_GLBL 2202	The World Today: Introduction to Global Issues	3
JAPN 2201	Intermediate Japanese I	4
JAPN 2202	Intermediate Japanese II	4
LATN 2201	Intermediate Latin I	4

LATN 2202	Intermediate Latin II	4
PHIL 2210	Introduction to Asian Philosophies	3
RUSS 2201	Intermediate Russian I	4
RUSS 2202	Intermediate Russian II	4
SCPY 1001	Psychology of Diversity and Learning in Schools	3
SOC 2201	Introduction to Gender and Sexuality Studies	3
SPAN 2201	Intermediate Spanish I	4
SPAN 2202	Intermediate Spanish II	4

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

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
 Tuesday 23 January 2018
 Academic Affairs Conference Room AA102
 2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson
Telecom: N/A
 Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, JoAnn Hertz (for Susanne Forrest), Susan Belliston (UCC), Catherine Read
 Excused: Julia Boyle
 Absent: Katy Kole de Peralta, Kaitlyn Jewkes; Lori Austill
 Guests: none

1. Announcements
2. Minutes – vote via email per a member’s request.
3. Update from Academic Affairs
 - a. Common Course Numbering Change and Course List

GERC’s questions from last meeting for the SBOE’s Gen Ed Committee:

 - How much leeway is there for changing the title of a particular course if all the institutions are in agreement?
 - Will institutions have to create courses they don’t currently have?
 - What avenue is there for GERC or institutions expressing concerns to SBOE?
 - What about pre-requisite structures for gen ed courses, especially those that require another gen ed course as a pre-req? Do both courses have to stay as gen eds, even though the first fulfills the gen ed requirement?
 - What happens in cases where a course at one institution requires a lab, and no lab is required at another institution? Or in cases where the number of credits differ?
 - Additional concerns that could be included in a Memo to the SBOE?

Dr. Brumfield’s Responses:

 - advisable to add a lab to achieve same level of course outcomes around the state and to maintain credit hour designation consistent with sister institutions
 - keep Physics and other courses on common gen ed list even if their prereq(s) fulfill gen ed credit in the same objective
 - okay to suggest different course titles if all institutions agree. Tokle asked GERC members to let her know suggested titles and she will send them to the State
 - ISU may well have to add the Gen Ed courses to curriculum that currently are not offered
 - SBOE expects these changes to be reflected in the 2019-20 catalog, so that means starting immediately, this spring
 - GERC and UCC will have to work with departments to ensure proposals submitted this catalog cycle include these new courses and assessment plans
 - Consider asking UCC to create an expedited process for implementing the simple changes (e.g., course titles, uncomplicated course number changes) where possible
 - COMM 1101 should also have consistent number of credits across all institution
 - Hanin will send Tokle an email about all his concerns related to the common core of Objective 3 courses.
 - Discussion. Need to keep track of all the little details that need to be taken into account.

4. Proposed Website changes:

Add a new menu item and webpage “~~For Department Chairs~~ Frequently Asked Questions” for the following reminders. This list was compiled from last year’s council Minutes:

- One gen ed assessment submission per course
 - Include all sections and formats (online, dual enrollment, classroom, etc.) of the course in sample
 - Assessment plans can be modified
 - Assessment should be continuous – reports due Nov. 1 of each year report the results of assessment for courses taught during the previous academic year
 - Approved assessment plans can be found at <https://www.isu.edu/gerc/assessment-plans-and-reports/approved-assessment-plans/>
 - Course grades are not considered to be valid assessment indicators for Gen Ed courses
- . Members delayed discussion until after the next agenda item was addressed.

5. Gen Ed Assessment Results “process-level” discussion: any problems, misinterpretation of the process, anomalies, patterns, etc.?

a. Objective 8 -- Shu Yuan

- INFO 1101 may have been entered incorrectly in the Gen Ed Assessment Reporting as INFO 1110 – need to check whether this is simply a typo or a wrong course entry.
 - Plans called for assessing 2 outcomes per year, but results were reported for 4 outcomes. Another GERC member noted the same number was reported for all 4 outcomes, which seems improbable.
- ACAD 1111 used an annotated bibliography to assess the learning outcomes. They followed their assessment plan, which calls for assessing 2 outcomes per year.
- HIST report is very simple, but responses such as “see the assessment plan” and “see previous page” for the findings are not helpful to reviewers, who don’t know what the previous page was.
- Report had a suggestion that GERC consider adding a survey question to ask whether there were any problems following their assessment plan. Shropshire noted there is already a place in the survey where departments can explain changes or modifications they will make or have made to their assessment plan to address difficulties they have encountered in their assessment efforts, whether in the process, data or materials collected, course structure or content, etc.
- LLIB 1115 followed their assessment plan, but student performance results were rather low.
- FIN 1115 appeared to have a good plan, with a process for assessing and reporting on all 5 outcomes every year.

b. Objective 9 – Sandi

- Only 26 reports out of 39 courses listed in Objective were submitted, so do need some way to know which courses were and were not offered during the coverage period.
- Multiple instructors submitted reports for the same course, presumably for different sections.
- Multiple reporting periods were reported this round, too; the survey instrument does not restrict which years may be selected.
- Most reports submitted were consistent with the relevant assessment plan.
- Errors in submitting incomplete reports, either as tests or accidentally.
- Data collection difficulties: some instructors left ISU without giving their data to their departments.
- Many reports did properly include all sections of the course
- Delay in assessment plan approval by GERC resulted in non-collection of data during assessment time period in some cases.
- Consider requiring departments to submit reports every year even for courses that were not taught, with a simple explanation that the course was not offered that semester or year. Could help reinforce annual reporting cycle.

- Would be useful for submitter to have a way of simultaneously viewing the assessment plan as they work on their report. Vince Miller indicated that may be possible, but will take some work to investigate and implement into the survey instrument, perhaps this summer.
- c. Assessment Plan Feedback Template Memo
- Create a template memo with general observations and guidance from GERC that members can modify and add comments tailored to each of their constituent departments' assessment plans, reports and process to aid their future assessment efforts.
- Website changes proposed above could address some of the common problems. Should clarify what types of changes to assessment plans would need to be reviewed by GERC (e.g., sampling percentages and/or method, which outcomes will be assessed when) and which do not. (e.g., different textbook, minor changes in assessment instruments, timing of departmental review, etc.).
- Add a section to the survey instrument where departments can comment on the gen ed assessment process itself, separate from their individual course assessment process.
6. Remanded Assessment Plans still pending:
- a. Obj. 4: [ART 1101 Survey of Art History I](#)
 - b. Obj. 4: [ART 1102 Survey of Art History II](#)
Not ready for consideration yet. Skidmore is working with the Art department chair on these, suggesting they refer to the approved ART assessment plan for guidance.
 - c. Obj. 5: Physics courses – no action, still awaiting department's response
(Assessment Reports were submitted, however)
 - d. Obj. 9: [CHNS 2201-2202 Intermediate Chinese I & II](#)—awaiting hire of a new instructor
7. Revised Assessment Plans for GERC's consideration – updated by departments
- a. [Obj. 6: TGE 1150 Applied Social Sciences in the Workplace](#) – department's revisions 10/3/2017
Members discussed the revisions, a few concerns remain. Wilson will discuss those with the plan author.
Remanded.
 - b. [Obj. 9: CSD 2256 Deaf Culture and Community](#) – department's revisions 10/26/2017
Changes look acceptable, **except for the sampling size change from 30% to 10%** of students, without a setting a minimum number. Shropshire will contact the plan author.
8. Other Business – none
9. Adjourn: 3:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC: January 31, 2018 via email vote
 Accepted by UCC: February 1, 2018 via email vote
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 13, 2018

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 13 February 2018
Academic Affairs Conference Room AA102
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson
Telecom: N/A
Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper (ITRC), Susanne Forrest, Susan Belliston (UCC), Catherine Read
Excused: Julia Boyle; Ganesh Sapkota
Absent: Katy Kole de Peralta
Guests: none

1. Announcements
2. Minutes – none, all were approved via email vote
3. Update from Academic Affairs – deferred until later in the meeting after Joanne Tokle arrives
NWCCU has accepted ISU’s Fall 2017 Mid-cycle Review Report. ISU has satisfied the Recommendations #3 and #4 from 2014 Review Report, so we are good until next full review in 2021. Next meeting of the Statewide Gen Ed Committee is February 27, 2018 at 1:30 p.m.
4. Remanded Assessment Plans still pending:
 - a. Obj. 4: [ART 1101 Survey of Art History I](#)
 - b. Obj. 4: [ART 1102 Survey of Art History II](#)
Motion to approve the **amended** ART 1101 and ART 1102 Assessment Plans.
Motion **passed**.
 - c. Obj. 6: [TGE 1150 Applied Social Sciences in the Workplace](#) – nothing new. Wilson has spoken to the author, who intends to add the missing information but has not done so yet.
 - d. Obj. 5: Physics courses – still no revised plans received yet
(Assessment Reports were submitted, however)
 - e. Obj. 9: [CHNS 2201-2202 Intermediate Chinese I & II](#) – awaiting hire of a new instructor
5. Objective 1 & 2 ORC updates – how are the reviews going so far? Do the ORCs have everything they need, including adequate support?

Objective 1 Review Committee: Jim Skidmore is chair.
Committee has met, their review is moving along well. They will meet again once more and then draft their report. The committee has all the data it needs, as long as the Google Doc spreadsheet has all the assessment reports that have been submitted in the past few years.
Discussion.
GERC action to take:

 - Need to emphasize to the campus community this is not GERC’s review; this is the departments’ and faculty’s opportunity to review their courses and plans, as well as comment on the State Board’s learning outcomes and the Objective itself.

Objective 2 Review Committee: Andy Holland is chair.
Committee has received the two-year report from the department now, after some confusion over whose responsibility it was to write the report. The committee’s review is coming along well. They will meet again next week.

GERC actions to take:

- Remind departments every fall before Winter Break their five-year reports are due at the beginning of the spring semester, and that it is the responsibility of the entire department to write the report, not the faculty member designated to serve on the Objective Review Committee.
- Review experiences of the past two years, and adjust the reporting process where needed to improve communication and workflow.

6. Other Business

Website changes:

Shropshire had emailed a “Frequently Asked Questions” draft for the Council’s consideration. Please give her feedback soon so the questions can soon be posted to GERC’s website.

Update from Academic Affairs

Tokle reported NWCCU has accepted ISU’s Fall 2017 Mid-cycle Review Report. ISU has satisfied the Recommendations #3 and #4 from 2014 Review Report, so we are good until next full review in 2021. GERC’s work was a major part of this review in satisfying the Recommendations. The next meeting of the Statewide Gen Ed Committee is February 27, 2018 at 1:30 p.m.

Upcoming State Gen Ed meeting discussion:

The next meeting of the Statewide Gen Ed Committee is February 27, 2018 at 1:00 p.m. Members asked Tokle to investigate how much wiggle room there is for the universities to make changes to the state’s list of common courses. All these mandated changes will have to be implemented this spring and fall to be included in the 2019-20 catalog.

Shropshire decided to cancel the February 27, 2018 GERC meeting, since there is very little business to discuss until after the Objective Review Committee reports and Tokle has an update from the State Gen Ed Committee meeting.

The next GERC meeting will be Tuesday, March 13, 2018.

7. Adjourn: 2:54 p.m.

Approved by GERC: March 13, 2018

Accepted by UCC: March 14, 2018 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: April 9, 2018

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 13 March 2018
Academic Affairs Conference Room AA102
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Ganesh Sapkota

Telecom: Julia Boyle

Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read

Excused: Katy Kole de Peralta, Susan Belliston (UCC)

Absent: Mark Cooper (ITRC)

Guests: none

1. Announcements –welcome to new student senator representative, Ganesh Sapkota. Members introduced themselves.
2. Minutes from **February 13, 2018 -- approved**
3. Update from Academic Affairs
 - a. Common Course Numbering

The State Gen Ed Committee met by conference call at the end of February and send out a revised list of common courses. Trigonometry was removed from the list of common courses, but added Math for Elementary Teachers I. The Discipline Groups are able to recommend changes to the list by May 1, 2018, as long as all institutions agree on the particular courses, prefixes, numbers, and titles to be included in each Objective on the list. For now, institutions will not be required to create new courses if they do not offer all the courses on the list.

UCC is discussing a simplified process for making the appropriate catalog changes to courses numbers and titles to alleviate the burden on departments of implementing the mandated list into the 2019-20 catalog.
 - b. State Legislature re: Gen Ed transfer credits

Tokle reported the State Legislature introduced and unanimously passed a new bill (Senate Bill #2021) that turned SBOE policy into law that codifies how gen ed courses and credits transfer from one institution to another in Idaho.
4. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports
 - a. Objective 1: Written Communication – Jim Skidmore, chair

Committee is still working on their report. Interesting findings on grade disparities in Early College sections compared to regular campus sections. The English Department is taking some action to address those disparities.
 - b. [Objective 2: Oral Communication](#) – Andy Holland, chair

Holland reported the Objective Review Committee structure is biased toward status quo. Skidmore concurred, based on his committee’s work. Consider adding some sort of devil’s advocate role into the process to ensure some objectivity in reviewing the courses and the outcomes and Objective itself. Considerable amount of work involved in this review process, even just for this single course in this particular objective. Recognize the workload could be burdensome when more courses and reporting years are included in an Objective review. May need to adjust the timeline to delay ORC reporting due date to end of spring semester for GERC to look over in fall semester.

5. Remanded Assessment Plans still pending:
 - a. Obj. 6: [TGE 1150 Applied Social Sciences in the Workplace](#)
Revisions have been entered. Members will review the revisions and discuss this one next time.
 - b. Obj. 5: Physics courses – no revised plans received yet
(Assessment Reports were submitted, however)
 - c. Obj. 9: [CHNS 2201-2202 Intermediate Chinese I & II](#)—awaiting hire of a new instructor
6. End of Year Communication with Departments
Discussion deferred until next meeting after ORC reports received and reviewed.
7. [Gen Ed Course Offering data](#) from Vince Miller, Institutional Research
It will be more efficient to require departments to file an assessment report for each Gen Ed course regardless of whether it was taught during the reporting period or not.
8. Other Business –
 - a. Invite the UCC Executive Committee and the Discipline Group reps to attend the next GERC meeting on March 27, 2018 to discuss ramifications and implementation of common course numbering.
 - b. Appears to be little control on ensuring quality of Early College sections, particularly online, even though that is the fastest growing segment of enrollment. Students are passing those courses, but are not prepared to succeed in subsequent coursework. Much discussion ensued, this is a major concern not only at ISU but at the other institutions as well. No viable solutions posed, however.
9. Adjourn: 3:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 4, 2018 via email ballot
Accepted by UCC: April 5, 2018 via email ballot
Accepted by Academic Affairs: April 23, 2018

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
State Discipline Group Reps and UCC Executive Committee
Tuesday 27 March 2018
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 340
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance:

GERC: Sandi Shropshire, Jim Skidmore, Katy Kole de Peralta, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson, Julia Boyle (telecom), Ganesh Sapkota (ASISU)

Discipline Group Reps: Jim DiSanza, Bob Fisher, Jim Wolper, Diana Livingston- Friedley, Jonathan Fardy (for Tom Klein), Eddie Tatar, Gesine Hearn

UCC Executive Committee: Bob Houghton, Spencer Jardine, Chris Hunt

Excused: Hal Hellwig, Lydia Wilkes, Tom Klein

Absent: Mark Cooper; Erin Rasmussen

Ex-Officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Lori Austill, Susan Belliston, Susanne Forrest, Catherine Read (Admin. Asst.)

1. Announcements – Jonathan Fardy from Art attended as proxy for Tom Klein. Everyone introduced themselves.
2. Common Course Numbering and Titles
 - a. Status updates from State Discipline Groups
 - Objective 1: Disciplinary Group has agreed on Writing and Rhetoric I and II as common course titles for ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102.
 - Objective 2: Disciplinary Group agreed on the title for COMM 1101 as Fundamentals of Oral Communication.
 - Objective 3: Disciplinary Group has several problems to be worked out. ISU already has a 3000-level Statistics course with the suggested title for the introductory statistic course. MATH 1143 and 1144 might become Pre-Calculus A and B, respectively. MATH 1160 should be Applied Calculus, not the suggested Survey of Calculus. Some discussion going on whether Math for Elementary School Teachers should be a gen ed course or not. For accreditation purposes students have to take both courses for K-5 Elementary Teachers, regardless of gen ed credit. At ISU, there are pre-requisites and the courses are 2000- level and non-sequential. Prospective Middle School math teachers will still have to take more Math courses.
 - Objective 4: ISU changing the single Music common gen ed course to MUSI prefix would be odd, but is doable. ISU's Art department recommends titling ART 1100 as Introduction to Art, as distinct from any course in Art History. Avoid any title involving Western Art for an introductory course. Philosophy and English departments are fine with the suggested titles.
 - Objective 5: Disciplinary Group is still trying to figure out which courses belong on the list, since the original list does not account for prerequisite structures of the courses. Most group members agree several courses should be removed from the list because they are redundant. There is some disagreement on how many courses should be on the list, and the group could use some guidance from the State how many common courses are expected for this Objective. Once that is clarified, the group can consider how corresponding labs need to fit in to the list. After that, common course numbers and titles can be considered. Anatomy & Physiology would be a good course to pull off the list, since some institutions require a cadaver lab and some do not. The course structures differ among the schools, too.
 - Objective 6: Disciplinary Group has decided to go with World History I & II; all institutions agree on those titles and agree Western Civilization should be avoided. American National Government should be U.S. National Government to distinguish from other American continental countries (Latin, Central, South...).

- b. Discussion and coordination among GERC, UCC, and State Discipline Groups
The Disciplinary Group final recommendations are due on May 1, 2018. All common courses, titles, and number changes need to go into effect for the Fall 2019 catalog.
- c. prepare for 2018 UCC proposal submissions to reflect common course numbers and titles
UCC Executive Committee had discussed how to implement these changes into the catalog in a streamlined process. A handout was distributed describing how this could be done. UCC leadership will write a single proposal containing all the necessary changes to course numbers and titles, and will send the proposal out for affected unit impacts as usual. How much does GERC want to be involved in this process? Courses that are not currently in the Gen Ed Program will require a separate GERC proposal and assessment plan. UCC is willing to help departments write their GERC proposals, but assessment plans will have to be created by the departments themselves.

Discipline Group reps and UCC Executive Committee left the meeting at this point.

- 3. Minutes from **March 13, 2018** -- deferred for email vote
- 4. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports
 - a. Objective 1: Written Communication – Jim Skidmore, chair
Some concerns whether HONS 1101 fits within Objective 1 or not. Honors program has not started implementing its assessment of HONS 1101 courses yet. Some grade disparities were noted and the English Department is taking steps to address those. The ORC recommends Early College courses for ENGL 1102 and 1102 be taught on a university campus rather than in high schools.
 - b. [Objective 2: Oral Communication](#) – Andy Holland, chair
 - c. continue discussion on additional changes to overall assessment plan
 - i. extend ORC report due date to end of spring semester?
 - ii. consider bringing in “outside” member to ORCs as way of ensuring objectivity?
 - iii. more emphasis on including all courses in sample pool
 - iv. review the overall assessment plan and reporting process and consider whether to make some changes or adjustments

Shropshire will start drafting a report from GERC on the process and Objective Review reports.

- 5. Remanded Assessment Plans still pending:
 - a. Obj. 6: [TGE 1150 Applied Social Sciences in the Workplace](#) Revisions received and reviewed.
Motion to approve assessment plan as revised
Approved.

Future Action: If the Objective 6 Disciplinary Group does decide to require learning outcome #1 for all courses, GERC will need to review all the gen ed assessment plans for Objective 6 and contact the departments whose assessment plans do not address that particular learning outcome. GERC will also need to plan how to remove courses from the Gen Ed Program that do not comply with the revised learning outcomes.

- b. Obj. 5: Physics courses – still no revised plans received yet
(Assessment Reports were submitted, however)
- c. Obj. 9: [CHNS 2201-2202 Intermediate Chinese I & II](#)—awaiting hire of a new instructor
- 6. End of Year Communication with Departments
 - a. Request to make one assessment report per gen ed course, including those not offered during

- reporting period
- b. Note SBOE common course number and title requirements, and the need to prepare for fall UCC proposal submissions accordingly
 - c. Note collective efforts to resolve specific conflicts in course numbers and titles among institutions
 - d. Objectives 3 & 4 departments: ORCs for upcoming year
 - e. Separate communication to those departments that made multiple reports for the same course, apparently at the section level.
7. Select GERC's UARC (University Assessment Review Committee) representative for summer 2018 and upcoming academic year
Assessment software is being purchased for the university. The committee is hoping to have it implemented by July 1. **Jim Skidmore volunteered** to attend the UARC meetings this summer since he is the incoming GERC chair for next year.
8. Other Business – none
9. Adjourn: 3:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 4, 2018 via email ballot
Accepted by UCC: April 5, 2018 via email ballot
Accepted by Academic Affairs: April 23, 2018

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday 10 April 2018
Academic Affairs Conference Room ADMIN 102
2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Jim Skidmore, Katy Kole de Peralta, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Sandi Shropshire (Chair), Andy Holland, Leonid Hanin, Matt Wilson

Telecom: none

Ex-officio: Joanne Tokle, Sarah Mead, Susanne Forrest, Mark Cooper (ITRC), Catherine Read

Excused: Julia Boyle, Ganesh Sapkota, Susan Belliston (UCC)

Guests: none

1. Announcements

Shropshire's intention today is to bring GERC's year to a close by reviewing GERC's overall plan and ensuring the committee is adhering to it.

2. Minutes from **March 13, 2018** and **March 27, 2018** were approved by email vote

3. [Proposed Website Changes](#)

Members will review the proposed changes and post their suggestions and comments.

4. [Course Assessment Results](#) – spreadsheet summary organized by Objective.

This year's Fall 2017 data has been cleaned up in this spreadsheet, still need to doublecheck last year's Fall 2016 data to make sure errors have been corrected. Will be stored on Box and made available for the university community to access.

Motion to accept.

Accepted.

These results have illuminated some adjustments GERC should incorporate into the reporting process.

Multiple submissions per course;

Reporting period is unclear;

Different courses within the same objective are reviewing different outcomes – which GERC has allowed, but might be found to be problematic in the future

5. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports

a. Objective 1: Written Communication ORC Report ([Appendix 1](#))

b. Objective 2: Oral Communication ORC Report ([Appendix 2](#))

Motion to accept both ORC Reports.

Accepted.

Council discussed dissemination options and decided to create a GERC repository online in Box and make it available to the campus community, requiring ISU login credentials. Included in the repository folder will be:

- Objective Review Committee Reports
- Departmental 5-Year Reports
- Assessment Reporting Results
 - GERC's working analysis documents
 - Qualtrics raw data

Some cleanup of the assessment reporting data will be completed before the reports will be posted: such as eliminating duplications, test entries and correcting errors.

6 [Year End Report draft](#) – discussion

Council discussed the merits of breaking out information by objective versus presenting an aggregate summary. This summer Vince Miller will investigate the feasibility of adding a link to the course assessment plans to the assessment reporting form. Instructions need to clarify that the report should include the full academic year, not each semester. Also include in the assessment reporting an option for indicating when a course was not taught during the academic year, so there is a consistent record for the 5-Year Report data. Point out the concerns GERC has noted applied to only a small percentage of the assessment results reported. Council decided against creating an Assessment Plan Feedback Template. Also need some mechanism for checking whether modifications departments make to their approved assessment plans need GERC's approval. The "last modified" feature in Google Docs could help serve that purpose. GERC's website should include an explanation of what types of changes will require GERC's approval. Members were asked to review and post their comments on this Google Doc for Shropshire to incorporate into the final report.

7. End of Year Communication with Department Chairs and Program Directors

- a. Request to make one assessment report per gen ed course, including those not offered during reporting period
- b. Note SBOE common course number and title requirements, and the need to prepare for fall UCC proposal submissions accordingly
- c. Note collective efforts to resolve specific conflicts in course numbers and titles among institutions
- d. Objectives 3 & 4 departments: ORCs for upcoming year
- e. Separate communication to those departments that made multiple reports for the same course, apparently at the section level.

8. Determine Agenda for April 24 meeting

No need to meet again in person, all remaining Council business to close the academic year can be conducted electronically.

9. Other Business

There are several GERC-related projects that Read will be working on over the summer; she will coordinate with Shropshire and Skidmore as needed.

Katy Kole De Peralta will be on maternity leave this fall; Kevin Marsh will be her temporary replacement.

10. Adjourn: 3: 55 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 3, 2018 via email ballot

Accepted by UCC: May 4, 2018 via email ballot

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 22, 2018

APPENDICES

1. Objective Review Committee Report

Objective 1, Written Communication, Spring 2018

Objective Review Committee Membership: Jim Skidmore, Jennifer Attebery, Steven Hall, Lydia Wilkes

A. Evaluate the assessment plan for each course, together with its implementation. Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings in this area. Describe any recommended changes.

Approved plans are in place for ENGL 1102 and HONS 1101, and the committee sees no problem with these plans. A distinct plan for ENGL 1101 is still needed. The implementation of the plan for ENGL 1102 is underway and is proceeding well. The implementation of the HONS 1101 plan, however, does not seem to have begun. The committee recommends that HONS 1101 be incorporated into the assessment framework that already exists for ENGL 1101/1102, perhaps with participation from an Honors program representative. If, however, the Honors program wishes to conduct its own assessment of HONS 1101, it should commit to begin carrying out its approved assessment plan as soon as possible.

B. Evaluate the assessment *outcome* for each course. To what extent are students in each course satisfactorily achieving the learning outcomes for the objective? Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings in this area. Describe any recommended changes.

Because no data has yet been collected for HONS 1101, the committee cannot make a judgment about the extent to which students in this course are meeting the learning outcomes. The same applies to ENGL 1101. The committee notes that in the case of ENGL 1101 it is *not expected* that students will adequately meet all the learning outcomes for Objective 1 (since that course is not designed to meet them all).

Assessment for ENGL 1102 is in its early stages, but the data thus far suggest that the overwhelming majority of students are meeting the learning outcomes to at least an *adequate* degree. This seems to be true of Early College and online sections as well, although sample sizes are too low as yet to make confident judgments. English has identified some areas of concern emerging from the assessment. Results have shown a need for further professional development related to competencies that students find the most difficult (e.g., source synthesis) as well as a need for assessment attuned to the modality of instruction (e.g., face-to-face, online). Finally, a comparison of grade distributions to assessment results revealed grade inflation in Early College Program sections of ENGL 1101. The department plans to address these findings through professional development of faculty on campus and in high schools.

C. Evaluate the list of courses currently approved to satisfy the objective. To what extent does the current list contribute to a strong, coherent system of general education. Would a reduction or increase in the number or variety of courses in this objective strengthen the overall system? Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings. Describe any recommended changes.

The committee sees the first-year writing sequence (ENGL 1101/1102) as crucial to a strong, coherent system of general education. Both of these courses must remain at the core of Objective 1. Eliminating or replacing either of these courses would be detrimental.

The committee is concerned that the trend toward relocating these courses to high school campuses, as the Early College Program does, may also damage the system of general education. In addition to the grade inflation concern mentioned above, there is some anecdotal evidence that students who complete part or all of Objective 1 on high school campuses are not adequately prepared for the writing demands of upper-division courses. The committee believes that high

school students will be best served if Early College sections are located on an ISU campus rather than on a high school campus.

Finally, there is some concern among members of the committee concerning the fit of HONS 1101 in Objective 1; the course seems more naturally suited to Objective 4. But more information is needed (in the form of assessment materials from this course) to make a judgment about this.

D. Evaluate the stated learning outcomes of this general education objective. Are there any problems with the learning outcomes as currently described, or ways in which they might be improved? Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings in this area. Describe any recommended changes.

The committee is satisfied with the current learning outcomes for Objective 1 and does not recommend changes. English faculty participate on the statewide Written Communication disciplinary group, and the department has confidence in the work of that group, including the creation and annual review of the learning outcomes.

E. Evaluate the objective itself and its place within the system of general education. To what extent does the objective, in its current form, contribute to a strong overall system of general education? Are there ways in which the objective could be modified to improve it? Could the system be improved with its elimination or replacement? Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings in this area. Describe any recommended changes.

The committee sees Objective 1 as crucial to general education. Eliminating this objective, or watering down its requirements, would be a serious mistake. The current 2-course sequence is in line with national best practices and should not be altered.

2. Objective Review Committee Report

Objective 2, Oral Communication, Spring 2018

Objective Review Committee Membership:

Nancy Legge (CMP)

Jill Collins (CMP)

Andy Holland (GERC Representative and ORC Chair)

A. Evaluate the assessment plan for each course, together with its implementation. Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings in this area. Describe any recommended changes.

The assessment plan for COMM 1101, the only course in this Objective at ISU, combines both quantitative and qualitative elements:

Quantitative: Four selected sections administer an exam composed of 20 multiple choice questions aligned with Objective 2 learning outcomes (i), (ii), (iv), (v), and (vi). Composite scores on these questions are tallied to produce the numerical outcome-specific data that are reported to GERC each

November. The reported percentages reflect the percentage of students correctly answering the questions aligned with each outcome.

Qualitative: Representative outlines for student presentations, instructor evaluations of student presentations, and final examinations are also collected to provide context for the numerical results, to more precisely identify areas of weakness, and compare the ways that students and instructors meet each learning outcome.

This approach satisfies reporting expectations and informs more detailed discussions and interventions within the department. Based on preliminary findings the initial version of the plan has been amended to improve the precision of exam questions and increase the frequency and breadth of departmental meetings on the subject. Ongoing refinement of the assessment program is focused on more systematic inclusion of all delivery modes (face-to-face, online, dual credit, and on-site dual credit sections), which have not been reliably captured to date. The committee encourages continued efforts in these areas, but recommends no additional changes.

Another anticipated challenge is the management of the large volume of assessment materials being collected, which is already substantial just two years into the program.

B. Evaluate the assessment outcome for each course. To what extent are students in each course satisfactorily achieving the learning outcomes for the objective? Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings in this area. Describe any recommended changes.

Collectively, students have scored between 72% and 78% on multiple choice questions correlated to outcomes (i), (ii), (iv), and (v), and consistently lower on outcome (vi). This is not surprising, as outcome (vi) corresponds to the most advanced reasoning skills in the course, and requires that students form, support, and critically evaluate arguments. The department has used qualitative assessment data to more precisely diagnose student weaknesses in this area, and has revised and added supplemental course materials to help students make the leap from written outlines to effective oral presentations. Faculty discussions have also identified a need for all instructors to present and evaluate this material more consistently, and iterative efforts to improve this aspect of the course continue. The jump from 48% to 66% achievement of outcome (vi) over the last year shows that these efforts have been effective. The committee encourages continued efforts in this direction.

Assessment data to date do not fully encompass all course delivery modes such as dual credit ECP sections, but it is clear from qualitative and anecdotal observations that marginally qualified instructors do not deliver the same student experiences and outcomes. This fact can be difficult to demonstrate, as these instructors may or may not cooperate with assessment expectations. Uncooperative ECP instructors have already been removed from the program, and this problem is being addressed in the structure of ECP liaison procedures going forward.

C. Evaluate the list of courses currently approved to satisfy the objective. To what extent does the current list contribute to a strong, coherent system of general education. Would a reduction or increase in the number or variety of courses in this objective strengthen the overall system? Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings. Describe any recommended changes.

The Oral Communication objective is unusual in that it comprises only one course at ISU. This limited menu of options ensures that ISU students receive a consistent foundation in core skills that they will continue to use throughout their education. While COMM 1101 is sometimes

misperceived as teaching only the mechanics of public speaking, its emphasis on organizing ideas and evaluating arguments requires the full focus of a three-credit course, and efforts to streamline general education curricula by locating these components at the periphery of courses in other subjects would undermine the intent and value of the objective.

While other Objectives offer courses at multiple levels to serve students of varying skill levels, COMM 1101 students are fairly uniform in their general lack of preparation. Even those with more experience in speaking or argumentation are typically unaware of how to apply the formal structure of the discipline to tackle diverse communication tasks, so there is relatively little to be gained from separating students by incoming ability level. Significantly more advanced classes would require COMM 1101 as a prerequisite, rendering them redundant for general education purposes, and more specialized introductory courses would not deliver on the learning outcomes of the objective.

We note also that the statewide Discipline Group for this Objective recently modified the defining learning outcomes specifically to disqualify less focused courses, and that the narrow composition of the objective at ISU is in keeping with the prevailing philosophy throughout Idaho.

D. Evaluate the stated learning outcomes of this general education objective. Are there any problems with the learning outcomes as currently described, or ways in which they might be improved? Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings in this area. Describe any recommended changes.

Because COMM 1101 is the only course in Objective 2, CMP has been closely involved in the crafting of the learning outcomes since their inception. The homogeneity of the objective across the state has led to a rigorous and focused set of learning outcomes that closely align with the intent of the course at ISU, and correlate to students' preparation to succeed in a broad range of educational and professional environments. No changes are recommended.

E. Evaluate the objective itself and its place within the system of general education. To what extent does the objective, in its current form, contribute to a strong overall system of general education? Are there ways in which the objective could be modified to improve it? Could the system be improved with its elimination or replacement? Provide a brief summary of the Committee's findings in this area. Describe any recommended changes.

Oral Communication is a standard general education category throughout the country, and builds core skills that equip students to succeed both in college and thereafter. As such, it is one of the truly foundational general education categories, which serves not only to broaden perspectives but to make sure students have the tools to get the most from their collegiate experiences. To make sure students acquire these tools early in their college curricula, CMP works closely with advising to encourage most students to take the course freshmen or sophomores, and also offers the course through dual credit where qualified instructors are available. These strategies seem to be effective, as delayed enrollment does not seem to be a frequent phenomenon.