

Minutes
General Education Requirements Committee
Tuesday, 8 September 2020
Zoom - <https://isu.zoom.us/j/99532797942>
3:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs
Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Chris Hunt (for Sarah Mead), Lisa Kidder, Abbey Hadlich
Admin. Asst. Catherine Read
Excused: Matt Wilson
Guests: none

1. Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements

Everyone introduced themselves. Jardine gave a brief recap of this committee's purpose and asked members to review GERC's website to familiarize themselves with GERC's tasks and procedures.

2. Minutes for **April 28, 2020** – *deferred until next meeting*

3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert

- a. [2020 Assessment Institute virtual workshop](#) October 25-28 – free via web-conferencing
- b. Equity and inclusion study involving the Math department
- c. Assessment Planning and Self-Study software
- d. continuing support for Physics department in developing assessment plans and reports
- e. a quick peek at the new, revised [assessment site](#)

Hackert showed everyone her Moodle page for Assessment Coordinators with lots of helpful information and links. Send her an email if you are interested in being added to her Moodle page to access the resources posted there. She encouraged council members to register for and attend the virtual workshop coming up in October. She also showed and explained the Assessment website. This year she will be piloting the new assessment software which she intends to share with GERC in the spring. She has been working with the Math department on their assessment process.

4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine

This group stopped meeting in March when the pandemic shutdown occurred. Jardine plans to reconvene them again soon.

5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill

- a. NWCCU Accreditation update – process, reports under way, GERC's involvement
Hill reported ISU has completed its Year 6 Report and the Provost is conducting a final review before submission to the Northwest accrediting commission in January. The Year 7 Report is being drafted. There are three components to that report: Institutional Effectiveness, Student Learning, and Student Achievement. The working groups are gathering input from the university community for each section of the report. NWCCU accreditors will be visiting ISU in Fall 2021 to conduct their site visit.
- b. annual state-wide Gen Ed Summit – October 22-23, via virtual web-conferencing
 - 1) State GEM discipline groups should be organizing their work for the summit
 - 2) GERC's ORC reports for Objectives 1-5 have been uploaded and shared with discipline group members, share Obj. 6 ORC report once GERC and Academic Affairs have accepted it

Hill reported Gen Ed Summit is coming up October 22-23. Joanne Tokle has just become the chair of the discipline group for Scientific Ways of Knowing. This year the discipline groups have already started

working on their tasks in advance of the Summit.

GERC traditionally has met with ISU's discipline group representatives before the Summit. Members agreed to invite the reps to an upcoming GERC meeting before the summit, either Sept. 22 or October 13.

Shu-Yuan Lin asked about the Open Educational Resources policy the State Board of Education has been working on. Hill replied the Board has not updated that policy yet, so nothing has changed so far.

6. Unfinished Business:

a. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports

1) Objective 6 ORC Report – Jim Skidmore – *deferred until next meeting, Sept. 22*

The committee is finalizing their report and should have it done in time for GERC's next meeting.

Jardine reminded members that Objectives 7 and 8 will be reviewed this spring. Departments in those Objectives will write and submit a Five-Year Review report for each general education course, and appoint a faculty member to serve on the Objective Review Committee (ORC), which will be chaired by a GERC member. The Objective Review Committees peruse the annual reports submitted for the past five years for each course in the Objective, along with the Five-Year Reports. The ORC members summarize their findings and submit their written report to GERC. The goal is to identify what is working and what is not in assessing how well students are achieving the learning outcomes for each course.

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

Members: Jennifer Attebery, Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Susanne Forrest, and Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)

This subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9. Jardine said the survey work was delayed because of the pandemic. Jennifer Attebery is on sabbatical this year, and Susanne Forrest retired at the end of last semester. **Abbey Hadlich volunteered** to replace Forrest on the subcommittee. Jardine will contact Stoutenborough and ascertain whether the final changes were incorporated and how close the survey is to being finished and ready to send out. There is no rush since another faculty survey is scheduled to go out next week.

7. New Business:

a. Discuss possible value of adding COVID-19 related questions to this year's Nov. 1 annual assessment report questions?

Student feedback indicates students are concerned that the shift to fully online courses has affected the quality of their education. Faculty have their own challenges and opportunities in changing their teaching methods to adapt to these new circumstances. How is online learning affecting teaching and student learning, particularly in the gen ed courses? Discussion ensued about the logistics of collecting information in a useful way. Adding new one-time questions to the existing annual gen ed reporting structure raises continuity issues. Conducting focus groups is another option to explore. Another idea is to add the questions to the gen ed survey being developed. Either way, GERC needs to carefully word the questions in a way that collects the desired information, and be clear about how the information gathered will be used and for what purpose or end goal. Jardine suggested asking the survey subcommittee to draft a few questions about the effect COVID-19 is having on faculty and students.

8. Adjourn: 4:27 p.m.

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

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 22 September 2020

Zoom - <https://isu.zoom.us/j/99532797942?pwd=eFhjRlV3YlwcVlNd3lONjQ0czdlUT09>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs
Nawotniak, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Lisa Kidder, Abbey Hadlich
Admin. Asst. Catherine Read
Excused: DeWayne Derryberry; Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guests: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Council **approved** its Minutes for [April 28, 2020](#) and [September 8, 2020](#)
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - a. GERC and Core Themes matrix

Hackert explained GERC's work is an integral part of what ISU reports to NWCCU accreditors. The Matrix summarizes and demonstrates ISU's progress in assessing the Gen Ed program. Hackert is continuing to work with Physics and Math on developing their course assessment plans. Completed assessment plans are submitted to gercmail@isu.edu for processing and subsequent consideration by this committee.
 - b. Workshop ideas for Gen Ed faculty from the Office of Assessment

Academic Affairs has granted some funding for a few internal assessment workshops to help engage faculty in learning about assessment. Workshop presenters receive a \$500 stipend. Hackert asked committee members to inform their constituents and solicit input for future workshop topics and potential presenters. Her work covers assessing all programs and university units, not just Gen Ed.

Jardine showed members where to find the Gen Ed assessment process and report forms on GERC's website. Annual course assessment reports are filed using the Qualtrics portal in BengalWeb.
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine – nothing to report
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill – nothing to report today
6. Unfinished Business:
 - a. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Report
 - 1) Objective 6 ORC Report – Jim Skidmore
Jardine will follow up with Jim Skidmore on the status of the report.
 - b. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – update

Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)

The subcommittee has been working on a broad-based survey soliciting faculty input the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9, which are not state-mandated GEM Objectives. Nothing further has happened on this survey since Spring and the COVID-19 shut-down. Discussion in this meeting resulted in deciding to hold off sending the survey out to faculty until next semester since other units have initiated faculty surveys this fall.

GERC is particularly interested in how faculty view Objectives 7, 8, and 9 and whether those Objectives should be revisited with an eye toward making changes, consolidating, or even eliminating or adding an Objective. Suggest members review the survey this semester in preparation for discussing it next semester.

c. Collecting data on how COVID-19 has affected teaching and student learning

A campus-wide faculty survey was recently sent out by administration that captured COVID-related feedback.

7. New Business:

a. Review ORC Reports for Objectives 1-5 in preparation for joint meeting with discipline group reps

[Objective 1 Review Committee Report - Spring 2018](#)

[Objective 2 Review Committee Report - Spring 2018](#)

[Objective 3 Review Committee Report - Spring 2019](#)

[Objective 4 Review Committee Report - Spring 2019](#)

[Objective 5 Review Committee Report - Spring 2020](#)

Jardine explained GERC usually meets with ISU's faculty representatives that serve on the statewide Gen Ed discipline groups before, and after, the annual Gen Ed Summit held in October. The discipline groups can make changes to the learning outcomes for each objective if warranted.

Members were assigned an ORC Report to review and take notes on the issues raised, recommendations, and suggestions in the report and present those at the next meeting.

Objective 1 ORC Report: Liz and Erika

Objective 2 ORC Report: Matt

Objective 3 ORC Report: DeWayne

Objective 4 ORC Report: Spencer and Shu-Yuan

Objective 5 ORC Report: Shannon

Objective 6 ORC Report: Tayo – if it is received in time

Hopefully, the Objective 6 ORC Report will be received soon and can be included in this review. Jim Skidmore intends to attend GERC and participate in the discussion of this ORC report.

Jardine thanked members for their work on this committee. He encouraged them to reach out to their constituents and remind departments to prepare and submit their annual gen ed course assessment reports by November 1. He also asked them to solicit faculty input and feedback on GERC and the gen ed program; gathering recommendations and concerns will help GERC in its work of improving the general education program to benefit student learning as much as possible.

Jardine will draft a letter to department chairs reminding to submit their annual course assessment reports by November 1.

8. Adjourn: 3:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC: October 27, 2020

Accepted by UCC: October 29, 2020

Accepted by Faculty Senate: November 9, 2020

Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 6, 2020

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 13 October 2020

Zoom - <https://isu.zoom.us/j/99532797942?pwd=eFhjRlV3YlwcVlNd3lONjQ0czdlUT09>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady,
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Lisa Kidder, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Excused: Neil Tocher, Taylor Neibaur; Sarah Mead, Abbey Hadlich, Catherine Read
Guests: Andy Holland, Hall Hellwig, Margaret Johnson, Jim DiSanza

1. Announcements – new Bengal ID cards are available, mid-term grades are due by 5:00 pm today.
Carmen Febles introduced herself; she is the new chair of UCC for this academic year.
2. Minutes for **September 22, 2020** - forthcoming
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert: no report
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine: no report
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill: no report
6. Unfinished Business:
 - a. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Report
 - 1) Objective 6 ORC Report – Jim Skidmore: *deferred until next meeting*
 - b. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – no update
Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)
Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.
 - c. Collecting data on how COVID-19 has affected teaching and student learning – no update
7. New Business:
 - a. Review ORC Reports for Objectives 1-5 in preparation for joint meeting with discipline group reps
[Objective 1 Review Committee Report - Spring 2018](#)
Erika and Liz reviewed this report. ENGL 1101 does not have a plan yet. HONS 1101 does have a plan, but apparently has not implemented it yet. Consider combining ENGL 1101 and HONS 1101 into one plan. ENGL does not have any data from HONS 1101. Early College/Dual Enrollment courses are not adequately preparing students for university level coursework. Some question whether HONS 1101 belongs in Objective 1, or whether it be a better fit in Objective 4. Shannon clarified HONS program has started their assessment process and is submitting their reports. Students are satisfying the learning outcomes for this Objective.

[Objective 2 Review Committee Report - Spring 2018](#)
Matt reviewed this report. COMM 1101 is the only course in this Objective. Anecdotal evidence indicates the Early College program is not serving students well, which is reflected in most of the other Objectives as well. State level discussions will be required to mitigate this problem and foster more cooperation and collaboration between high school instructors and university faculty.

A logistical concern is how to store the historical assessment materials; even digital files add up to be a substantial storage burden.

Objective 3 Review Committee Report - Spring 2019

DeWayne reviewed this report. Until recently, assessment was under prioritized in the Math department, and faculty did not see the purpose so were not engaged in the process. Recent changes have resulted in faculty being more involved and better understanding the value of assessment. Assessment Plans for MATH 1143 and 1147 were recently approved by GERC. Faculty are reviewing the Assessment Plan for MATH 1123 and MATH 1153 so it should be coming to GERC soon. MATH 1130 and MATH 1127 have very low enrollment. MATH 2256 and 2257 both have gen ed pre-requisites, so may be revisited. The two calculus courses, MATH 1160 and 1170, are still of some concern.

Objective 4 Review Committee Report - Spring 2019

Shu-Yuan and Spencer reviewed this report. Learning Outcome 5 is not assessed by most of the programs. Theatre and Dance have not submitted some of their annual reports. The committee cautioned GERC not to approve any more courses for this Objective, since there are already a plethora of offerings. Faculty in these programs would benefit by more standardization, support, guidance, and resources in conducting assessment. Suggest GERC reach out to these departments to find out their needs and offer help and support. Learning outcomes should be streamlined and measurable, yet applicable across many disparate disciplines.

Objective 5 Review Committee Report - Spring 2020

Shannon reviewed this report. Biology and Physics are in the process of re-doing their assessment plans. It is apparent faculty are struggling to understand what is expected in assessing the courses, and would benefit from more feedback on how to improve their processes. The committee had recommendations for rephrased competencies in this Objective.

Objective 6 Review Committee Report – still under development

Tayo served on this committee and reported departments appear to be making good faith efforts to assess their courses and use the findings to improve their offerings. The discipline group has recommended to SBOE that all five competencies be required, rather than just four of the five.

- b. Discuss issues with ISU Gen Ed State reps prior to their participation in the Gen Ed Summit organized by the ISBOE

Some discipline group members joined the meeting at this point. Andy Holland is on the Objective 5 group and reported they have been working on revised competencies they will take to the Summit and recommend to the State Board. Erika reported some of the reps have encountered resistance from their peers to making any changes to the competencies or to the dual enrollment program. Andy said his group advocates establishing minimum qualifications for high school instructors seeking to instruct dual enrollment or early college courses. It would also help facilitate closer cooperation if the high schools worked with the university and colleges in their own region, rather than across the state. Matt mentioned GERC had suggested this a year or two ago.

GERC recognizes a need to figure out a process and guidelines for selecting the state discipline reps, how long they should serve on the working groups, and develop eligibility criteria. Andy expressed willingness to participate in developing such a process with GERC.

Suggestions from GERC to working group reps:

Objective 1:

Hal Hellwig and Margaret Johnson, their group will meet a couple of times before the summit, starting tomorrow. Will work on revised competencies, haven't discussed dual enrollment yet.

Discussion established that HONS 1101 by itself fulfills Objective 1, whereas ENGL 1101 and ENGL 1102 together fulfill the objective. ENGL 1101, especially in the high school dual enrollment courses, has much more variation in what material is covered, and how different instructors in different schools teach the course. Hellwig explained how ENGL 1102 is assessed, which seems to be working fairly well. Recommendation would be to ensure dual enrollment courses are robustly represented in the samples being assessed.

Objective 2:

Matt reported the only real concern is the early college courses in this objective. Jim DiSanza reported the working group has met 5 times in the past few weeks, and will meet once more before the Summit. They have discussed potential changes to the learning outcomes but have not reached a consensus. His understanding is that the Open Educational Resources project has not gone smoothly and the new head of OSBE is not as enthusiastic about enforcing implementation.

Objective 3:

DeWayne also serves on the working group, and they have had several productive meetings. They prepared several recommendations for changes to the rubric and streamlined the competencies.

Objective 4:

Neither Tom Klein nor Pat Brooks were able to attend today. Spencer will reach out to them to share GERC's observations and get their group's ideas and perspectives.

Objective 5:

Andy already reported above.

Objective 6:

Erika reported her working group has not met yet, though some emails were exchanged among members.

Cindy Hill will report back to GERC after the Summit to brief them on what transpired and what changes the working groups recommended.

c. Core Themes Matrix

Ann Hackert will share the matrix with GERC members this week so they have a chance to review it before next meeting on October 27.

Spencer has drafted an email to department chairs and assessment coordinators reminding them to submit their annual assessment reports, and to prepare the Five-Year Reports for Objectives 7 and 8.

8. Adjournment: 4:17 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 1, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: February 4, 2021

Accepted by Faculty Senate: February 8, 2021

Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 16, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 27 October 2020

Zoom - <https://isu.zoom.us/j/99532797942?pwd=eFhjRlV3YUtlwVlnd3lONjQ0czdlUT09>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady, Taylor Neibaur
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Lisa Kidder, Abbey Hadlich, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Admin. Asst. Catherine Read
Guest: Jim Skidmore

1. Announcements –

- Ann Hackert reported that Daniel McInerney, the NIOLA coach from Utah State University, plans to return to ISU virtually this spring to host another assessment workshop.
- Welcome to GERC's new ASISU rep, Taylor Neibaur, who is majoring in business management and outdoor education. Spencer Jardine explained a little of what the committee does and encouraged Neibaur to speak up during meetings and give his student perspective.
- Carmen Febles mentioned UCC, Graduate Council and Academic Standards Council are working on a draft policy to create a framework for accelerated bachelor's/master's pathways that will allow up to 12 graduate credits to count toward both an undergraduate degree and toward a master's degree to help them obtain the graduate degree a year earlier than usual. She encouraged members to inform their constituents of this framework, and provide their input.

2. Council **approved** the Minutes for September 22, 2020

3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert: nothing further to report

4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine: nothing to report

5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill

6. Gen Ed Summit debrief

Hill reported Justin Stover in ISU's History Department received the Objective 6 Gen Ed Instructor of the Year award. Format of the Gen Ed Summit was different this year than previously. Discipline Groups met several times before the Summit to discuss the learning outcomes for each Objective and think through potential changes. This approach worked quite well, resulting in well-thought-out changes to learning competencies.

Summit participants discussed dual credit enrollment; concerns about such programs are widespread across the institutions and nationally. The Discipline Groups made several recommendations about how to address some of the concerns. One suggestion would be for the State Board Office (OSBE) to require high schools work with the college or university in their particular geographical region rather than statewide. Another idea was to create a Dual Credit Enrollment Summit similar to the Gen Ed Summit, and invite high school dual enrollment instructors across the state to get together with university and OSBE staff to work together to resolve some of the issues.

Hill is working with Jonathan Lashley, OSBE's Associate Chief Academic Officer, to obtain SBOE approval to implement some or all of the recommended changes to the Objective learning outcomes. Jardine concurred this year's Summit format was more effective than in previous years. The Gen Ed Discipline Groups will continue to meet throughout the year instead of only once a year at the annual Summit. Online programs were not discussed as being specific to regions.

7. Unfinished Business:

a. [Objective 6 Review Committee Report – Spring 2020](#) – Jim Skidmore

The ORC committee recommended all five learning outcomes be required for this Objective. The GEM discipline group made the same recommendation to SBOE at the last Gen Ed Summit. Unclear where the policy currently stands at the state level; it still appears to require only 4 of the 5 outcomes. Fulton, who is on the discipline group, mentioned there was some resistance against requiring all five outcomes for the Economics courses, but she didn't remember the details of the difficulties. Most of the group felt strongly that all five outcomes should met. Lin recalled a couple of years ago there was some question whether College of Education should be teaching Objective 6 courses, but she was unsure of the details of the concern. Skidmore reported the Objective Review Committee did not see any obstacles to implementing all five outcomes. Their overall impression they got from the Five-Year Reports they reviewed is that departments are indeed adjusting their assessment methods and processes as they review their assessment findings.

Continued debriefing discussion of Gen Ed Summit and discipline groups' proposed revisions to the GEM Objective learning outcomes:

Jardine displayed the Objective 4 Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing discipline group's Executive Summary and their recommended changes to competencies for Objective 4. The proposed changes are more easily measured, and would help incorporate language courses more directly into the Objective. GERC members suggested additional changes to clean up ambiguities. The outcomes should fit the discipline, not the courses that have been slotted into the Objective.

Jardine pointed out how the Objective 5 Scientific Ways of Knowing discipline group streamlined the use and number of verbs in each competency to make it easier to measure students' mastery of the activity.

Derryberry said his Objective 3 Mathematical Ways of Knowing discipline group met and revised details of the competencies. They reduced the number of verbs in the competencies and improved the language to make them easier to measure and assess. They also changed the rubric to eliminate 'exceeds expectations' and left it with 'meets', 'partially meets', and 'fails to meet' expectations. He commended his group's chair for her ability to keep them organized and focused on accomplishing the task.

Fulton worked in the Objective 6 Social and Behavioral Ways of Knowing discipline group. They wordsmithed some of the competencies. Then they discussed the rubric, which was the subject of some disagreement. The rubric's headings are problematic, and the rubric's purpose and use were unclear. None of the institutions are using it. A basic unanswered question is should the rubric be used to determine whether a course belongs in the Objective, or should it define the Objective based on a preordained list of courses? Does History belong in Social Sciences, or should it be in Humanities? Should there be a cap on how many courses be allowed in the Objective?

How to determine where courses belong: does the discipline belong in the Objective? Can the course be adequately assessed by the competencies? Cady reminded the purpose of general education is to give students some exposure to liberal arts so they end up with a well-rounded community member with a broader foundational perspective. But academics are driven more by the financial impetus behind decisions that are made than by what is best for students.. Foreign languages have been sidelined because it benefits other departments, not because languages are not in demand or have lost value in society.

Jardine said Jonathan Lashley has been involved with the Open Educational Resources project. That has been equated to low-cost resources. Policy was to offer one section of each gen ed course with low-cost or free textbooks or class materials. There has been some push-back against this by the

institutions. OSBE is taking this issue up again; the policy will likely be revisited in the near future. The new Academic Officers at OSBE have a different philosophy than the previous leadership. Several other SBOE policies are under revision, too.

Jardine asked members whether they want to invite the GEM discipline group reps to GERC's next meeting. Wilson suggested reaching out to the specific reps and offer them the choice of submitting a written summary or attending GERC's meeting.

b. NWCCU Accreditation Report – Ann Hackert

ISU wants an analysis of what the numbers mean for the accreditation report and this might be something that comes out of the discussion

- a. [GERC and Core Themes Matrix](#)
- b. [GERC Assessment Stats spreadsheet](#)

Jardine displayed the assessment stats spreadsheet, and Read briefly explained how she compiled the data and from what sources.

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

Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)
Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.

Jardine reported he emailed Jim Stoutenborough asking where he is with the survey and is awaiting his reply. The subcommittee will bring the survey to GERC once they finish their work on it.

8. New Business:

a. [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)

Many of the current discipline group members have been serving since SBOE first formed the working groups. There is no established protocol for selecting replacements, ensuring smooth transfer of documents and knowledge from outgoing to incoming reps, parameters and time limit of terms, etc. Things to consider: staggered terms and longer term limits will help with continuity because of the time it takes for new reps to get up to speed and acquire the historical knowledge necessary for making informed decisions. This will be addressed more fully in a subsequent meeting.

9. Adjournment: 4:23 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 1, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: February 4, 2021

Accepted by Faculty Senate: February 8, 2021

Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 16, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 10 November 2020

Zoom - <https://isu.zoom.us/j/99532797942?pwd=eFhjRlV3YlwcVlNd3lONjQ0czdlUT09>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady, Taylor Neibaur
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Lisa Kidder, Abbey Hadlich, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Excused: Lisa Kidder, Catherine Read
Guest: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes for October 13, 2020 and October 27, 2020 – *forthcoming*
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
Hackert is working with Daniel McInerney again this year hoping to conduct another workshop to help faculty create assignments that aid in assessing gen ed courses. Incorporating indirect assessment measures such as student surveys as well as the usual direct measures would add valuable data for departments in assessing the efficacy of their gen ed courses.
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine: nothing to report
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill
Deans Council approved the proposed accelerated Bachelor's to Master's framework developed by UCC and Graduate School, so it will move on to the next step in the approval process.
6. Gen Ed Summit debrief
- ISU Gen Ed Reps to come and report on Gen Ed Summit or provide written summaries
The summaries are included in the [Appendix](#) below. All institutions have concerns about Dual Enrollment courses and program; the SBOE Office is considering holding a separate summit on dual enrollment to address some of the concerns. The groups recommended changes to learning outcomes in the Objectives. If SBOE approves changes, departments will need to update their assessment plans.
7. UCC update – Carmen Febles
Faculty Senate has concerns about dual credit being offered for courses above the 2000 level. She does not have any details yet, but this could affect GERC down the line.
8. Unfinished Business:
 - a. Follow-up matters related to the [Objective 6 Review Committee Report – Spring 2020](#) – Jim Skidmore
- New assessment plans required for Objective 6 courses since all five competencies may be required?
Some question where the requirement to meet four of the five competencies came from; no one seems to know for sure, but it may have been Boise State. SBOE will have to approve any changes to the competencies, so there is no point having departments update their assessment plans until the final revisions are approved. However, it would be wise to inform those departments that they may need to add the fifth competency to their plans so they are not blindsided if the change is made.
 - b. Jardine reminded members that Objectives 7 and 8 are due for review this spring, and each committee will need to be chaired by one of them. Kobs Nawotniak outlined the process she used in chairing the Objective 5 ORC committee last spring:

- she created a list of all the courses in the objective
 - made sure the committee had a faculty representative for each of those programs
 - each course Five-Year Report was reviewed by someone in the program and by someone outside the program, so there were at least two sets of eyes on each one
 - held an orientation meeting to discuss the expectations, what the committee was looking for, what feedback was needed, what was the point and value of the review and resulting report
 - led discussions and made sure the group was in agreement on each point, hashing out points of contention until consensus was reached
 - she cleaned up the language in the report and gave the committee time to review and edit the report, then they approved the final document
- ensured actual meeting time was productive in accomplishing the tasks

c. NWCCU Accreditation Report – Ann Hackert

ISU wants an analysis of what the numbers mean for the accreditation report and this might be something that comes out of the discussion

- [GERC and Core Themes Matrix](#)
- [GERC Assessment Stats spreadsheet](#)

Hackert asked whether GERC had established any goal percentages for students meeting the designated outcomes. She suggested GERC develop a narrative that summarizes how well the gen ed program is meeting its goals. One weakness in the process is how to hold departments and chairs accountable for conducting assessment, submitting their annual assessment reports and for using their findings to improve their general ed courses and student learning. Another weakness is communicating the value of assessment to faculty, and the expectations GERC and the university have. Perhaps consider developing a strategic plan for the general education program, and maybe updating GERC's purpose published on their website, with UCC and Faculty Senate approval. Hackert asked members to email her with suggestions to bring up with the Provost.

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

Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)

Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.

Jim shared the document with survey questions.

Jardine will follow up with Jim Stoutenborough to see where this stands.

8. New Business:

- [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)

Jardine is not ready to discuss this yet, but he will try to put something together for next time.

Members decided to cancel the December meeting since there was no pressing business to complete.

9. Adjourn: 4:11 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 1, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: February 4, 2021

Accepted by Faculty Senate: February 8, 2021

Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 16, 2021

APPENDIX

Gen Ed Reps Summaries

Objective 1 Working Group

Margaret Johnson:

The Written Communication disciplinary group met twice via Zoom prior to the GE Summit. Our meetings were very productive. We focused on a few items in particular.

1) Edits that had been made to the GE SLOs the previous year had never made it to the State Board, and so they had not been updated. We talked about those adjustments and again presented them at the Summit, asking that they go forward to the SBOE. These are the edits we proposed:

SLO 1. Use flexible writing process strategies to generate, develop, revise, ~~edit, and~~ proofread, **and edit** texts.

Rationale: This edit was made to better reflect the order of operations in the writing process.

SLO 6. Use appropriate conventions for integrating, citing, and documenting source material. ~~as well as for surface-level language and style.~~

Rationale: This is a change that we proposed at the last summit meeting in fall 2019 when asked to better streamline our outcomes. Therefore, we determined that “surface-level language and style” were included in “appropriate conventions” and deemed this as a redundancy.

2) Since at least 2015, the disciplinary group has made use of a general value rubric for written communication, but it had not been updated with descriptions for SLO 7, so our group created the language for the rubric related to that SLO.

3) We also spent a lot of time discussing challenges with dual enrollment courses. The issues that were raised included these:

- Decrease in on-campus enrollment
- Problems with mentoring qualified dual credit instructors in high schools
- Pressure to let any student participate in dual credit courses

We would like to see some stand-alone meetings on dual credit that bring together a wide range of stakeholders

4) We also discussed a variety of other issues, including overcoming the digital divide, different delivery formats, placement issues, funding cuts, credit for standardized tests, and labor challenges.

.

Hal Hellwig:

Our work in Written Communications continues, kind of. We revised some wording on several objectives, discussed many things. Our statewide group is planning on meeting twice a month, though that hasn't started yet. We are particularly interested in dual enrollment issues, too numerous to mention here because we haven't resolved some of these yet.

Objective 3 Working Group

DeWayne Derryberry – verbal report during this GERC meeting:

The Mathematical Ways of Knowing working group has been using the Association of American Colleges & Universities' VALUE Rubrics all along. The Office of the State Board of Education (OSBE) will work on these recommended changes this spring.

Objective 4 Working Group

Tom Klein:

For Humanistic and Artistic Ways of Knowing, I felt that the interaction was generally productive. We raised interesting questions and had provocative conversations. The success of each working group depends in part on having an agile, well-focused leader. In our group, suggestions by individual members could result in policy changes that aren't necessarily well thought-through or reflective of the field at large; each suggestion was entered into the document under question, so that we were engaged in a committee-driven wordsmithing exercise, which could have bizarre results. Ultimately, I think we agreed on some persistent and hard-to-solve issues: in general, the problem of ensuring quality in Dual-Enrollment courses (and especially the institution "shopping" that can occur when high school instructors aren't accepted), and the tenuous place of foreign language programs in a gen ed system that wasn't created for them.

Objective 5 Working Group

Andy Holland:

My apologies for the late response, but here are the things that I think GERC should know:

- 1) If our proposed changes are approved, most Objective 5 courses will need to meet all 5 learning outcomes instead of four. GERC will probably need to communicate that to any departments whose plans currently skip one of them. I think the other changes to the outcomes in Obj. 5 are likely to be welcome to the folks executing these policies, as they are intended to make the language conform to typical practice and broaden the scope of acceptable activities.
- 2) My group was very unified in the opinion that the current dual credit program sacrifices standards to deliver credits, and that the data supporting dual credit as a strategy to improve go-on rates or accelerate degree completion is skewed by a selection bias for the stronger students that take dual credit courses. There was pretty wide appetite to try to address concerns about dual credit by collecting better data on student outcomes, and perhaps pursuing geographic restrictions or common instructor qualifications to better ensure the quality of dual credit offerings. One concern particularly relevant to gen ed was that courses spread out over two highschool trimesters or semesters may deliver content adequately without developing college readiness the way that introductory courses on our campus do.
- 3) The format of the summit event this year was much improved, and the structure of the pre-summit meetings could potentially allow for broader participation if other GERC members or campus stakeholders wanted to take part in some or all of these discussions in the future.

Objective 6 Working Group

Gesine Hearn:

We have finally (I assumed that was done ages ago) adopted all 5 competencies that gen ed courses for Objective 6 have to meet. That might have some impact on courses offered at ISU. The objective 6 group will also work on adjusting the rubrics. There was quite some substantive discussion critiquing the existing rubrics. The work will be done over the next few weeks/months.

Also, future discussions will be about the inclusion of history courses in objective 6 especially if they are not theoretical in nature.

The board is planning on a summit on dual credits. The issues with dual credits came up over and over again over the past few years (regions and university overview, number of credit hours, etc.). The SBOE is open to discuss this more thoroughly.

Another issue that has come up is foreign languages and the option in many of our institutions to skip learning any foreign language. This is another issue that will be further discusses.

Erika Fulton verbally reported during this GERC meeting that their working group members met again after the summit and formed a subcommittee to considering revising the rubrics for Objective 6.

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 26 January 2021

Zoom-- <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84074929871?pwd=eU5odnRJZXpEdFYzQXN2UEd3WnhHUT09> (new link)

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Taylor Neibaur
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper, Abbey Hadlich, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Admin. Asst. Catherine Read
Excused: Paul Cady
Guest: none

1. Announcements - none
2. Minutes for [October 13, 2020](#), [October 27, 2020](#), and [November 10, 2020](#) – approved via email vote
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - a. Updates on assessment plans that are still pending
 - BIOL 2227/L and Physics are working on their plans, will submit to GERC by March.
 - b. Zoom workshop in late February with Physics faculty to develop course assessment plans
 - will form ‘breakout’ rooms for each of the Gen Ed courses.
 - need volunteers from GERC to hang out in the breakout rooms and provide help and support
 - be aware, SBOE is making clarification changes to the learning outcomes for all GEM Objectives; the proposed changes will go to SBOE for their August and October meetings for the first and second readings, with estimated approval in August.
 - have departments review their assessment plans in the fall; any adjustments needed?
 - c. Gen Ed perspective on diversity, inclusion, and equity during assessment activities
 - identify constituent groups; how well is each group performing?
 - identify broader categories and issues that could be covered
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine: no report today
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill

State GEM Gen Ed Committee approved the recommended Objective competency changes as-is, now they go to council of Provosts (CAAP) for their approval, then on to IRSA subcommittee and then SBOE for final approval and implementation.
6. UCC update – Carmen Febles

UCC Executive Committee has met this month; UCC itself won't meet until next week. UCC is working with Graduate School on developing a single proposal form for both Grad Council and UCC to use for accelerated Bachelor/Master degree pathways. UCC's Executive Committee is also working to streamline and formalize the change memo process. Updates to UCC's proposal form incorporates affected College of Education program changes to eliminate the need for a separate proposal.
7. Unfinished Business:
 - a. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – still pending, hope to start working on it again soon.
 - b. [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)

Jardine assigned members to Zoom ‘breakout rooms’ to discuss proposed ideas in small groups, then everyone rejoined the main meeting for more discussion with the full council. Groups liked the three-

year term with option to serve a second term. Department faculty to nominate, GERC to vote, then results go to Faculty Senate for ratification. Tenure and tenure-track less important than a minimum of 3 years teaching, and experience in teaching gen ed courses. Candidates' enthusiasm for gen eds and assessment is a plus.

8. New Business:

- a. Assign GERC members to review annual assessment reports spreadsheet and ORC reports
Identify trends, any difficulties departments are experiencing, whether all outcomes are being systematically assessed for each course, how well are students achieving the outcomes, potential confusion or misunderstanding of the assessment process.

Findings to document are twofold:

- what concerns do the departments and ORCs express in the reports; and
- what concerns do the GERC reviewers have after reviewing the spreadsheet and ORC reports

- 1) **Objectives 1, 2, and 7:** Matt and Liz volunteered – due 1st Feb meeting
- 2) **Objectives 3 and 5:** Paul and Erika volunteered – due 2nd Feb meeting
- 3) **Objective 4:** Spencer and DeWayne volunteered
- 3) **Objectives 6 and 8:** Shannon volunteered, and Neil was volunteered in absentia
- 4) **Objective 9:** Shu-Yuan and Tayo volunteered

Taylor will look over the spreadsheet and decide which group he wants to work with.

- b. Discuss 5-Year Reporting and responsibilities of ORC members and chair, and select GERC members to chair ORC committees for Objectives 7 and 8. Members reviewed the responsibilities of the Objective Review Committees on GERC's website. Shannon gave a brief description of how she managed last year's Objective 5 Review Committee and the tasks they worked on to compile the findings presented in their report.

- 1) Objective 7 Critical Thinking ORC Chair: Erika volunteered
- 2) Objective 8 Information Literacy ORC Chair: Matt volunteered

- c. New Assessment Plans for consideration

- i. [CS 1181 Assessment Plan](#) – split off from INFO 1181. Review this one for next time.

- d. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC; and perhaps revising GERC's purpose statement on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.

9. Adjourn: 4:30 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 16, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: February 18, 2021

Accepted by Faculty Senate: February 22, 2021

Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 25, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 9 February 2021

Zoom-- <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84074929871?pwd=eU5odnRJZXpEdFYzQXN2UEd3WnhHUT09> (new link)

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs
Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Mark Cooper, Abbey Hadlich, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Admin. Asst. Catherine Read
Excused: Taylor Neibaur; Sarah Mead
Guest: none

1. Announcements – The Library is organizing a series of Open Educational Resources (OER) workshops Feb 22-26 with faculty and ITRC experts presenting. Black History Month events are also scheduled for that week.
2. Minutes for January 26, 2021 – vote by email
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - a. Reminder to the volunteers for Physics – 1-3 pm on Feb. 26. Helping them finish up the assessment plans for the Physics gen ed courses. Need to decide how they want to assess the learning outcomes for each course, create an assignment tailored to the outcome(s), and create a schedule for assessing each outcome every 5 years.
 - b. Hackert is exploring software that could help departments easily assess their courses. A demonstration may be forthcoming later this spring.
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine: no report
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill
 - a. Academic Affairs is working with departments to collect missing assessment reports, both annual and Five-Year reports. In some cases, the submitter may not have taken the final step required to submit the report. A copy of the report may be generated before the final step, which could be confusing.
 - b. [Proposed GEM Policy updates – Gen Ed learning outcomes](#) and [3-Year Review Cycle](#)

These items will be on the next GERC agenda for further consideration; CAAP wants faculty feedback on the proposed revisions. Hill explained the changes that are proposed, most of which clarify the outcomes and make them measurable. CAAP will vote on these changes in their March meeting. Further changes are possible, but not likely.

Council **approved** a motion to have Physics use the proposed revised outcomes for Objective 5 as they develop their assessment plans this semester.

The proposed changes to Objective 6 will require all five learning outcomes be met instead of only four of the five. Departments will need to review their assessment plans this fall in accordance with these revisions.
6. UCC update – Carmen Febles

UCC Executive Committee is preparing for the next proposal cycle. They have streamlined the proposal request form, and the proposal form itself. They are working with Graduate School to collaborate on 4000/5000 course changes and the accelerated Bachelor/Masters pathways. UCC's proposal form will now include student learning outcomes for new courses and course changes. New programs will also need to include student learning outcomes. This will help collect the needed information for accreditation and institutional purposes. Keep line of communication open between GERC and UCC as this new

assessment piece is developed.

7. Unfinished Business:

- a. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – no update
Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)
Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.
- b. Council formally **accepted** (with 2 abstentions) [Objective 6 Review Committee \(ORC\) Report](#) – was reviewed by GERC last fall, but not accepted at that time.
- c. New Assessment Plans for consideration
 - i. [CS 1181 Assessment Plan](#) – split off from INFO 1181
Council voted to spend the next two weeks reviewing and posting comments on the Google Doc for this plan.
- d. [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)
Need to turn these ideas into a document that can be forwarded to UCC, Faculty Senate, and Academic Affairs for input. GERC is inclined to include this group as a standing subcommittee of GERC and include the membership and selection process as part of GERC's bylaws.

8. New Business:

- a. [Annual Assessment Reports Spreadsheet](#) – GERC summary/findings report

- 1) **Objectives 1, 2, and 7:** Matt and Liz – Feb. 9

Matt shared his screen and talked through some of the things he looks for during these reviews for the benefit of new members.

Discussion ensued about how GERC should close its own loop, document its findings, and provide feedback to departments in a systematic fashion. This spring is a good time for GERC to evaluate the gen ed assessment process and course reports, identify trouble spots, and highlight what is working well.

Shannon, Ann, and Matt volunteered to create a form for GERC members to use as they review the various reports in their assigned objectives that will provide useful feedback to the departments.

For subsequent meetings:

- 2) **Objectives 3 and 5:** Paul and Erika
 - 3) **Objective 4:** Spencer, DeWayne, and Taylor
 - 3) **Objectives 6 and 8:** Shannon and Neil
 - 4) **Objective 9:** Shu-Yuan and Tayo
- b. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports – due April 1, 2021
 - 1) Objective 7 ORC: Erika Fulton, chair
 - 2) Objective 8 ORC: Matt Wilson, chair
 - d. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC; and perhaps revising GERC's purpose statement on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.

9. Adjourn: 4:40 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 16, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: February 18, 2021

Accepted by Faculty Senate: February 22, 2021

Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 25, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 23 February 2021

Zoom-- <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84074929871?pwd=eU5odnRJZXpEdFYzQXN2UEd3WnhHUT09> (new link)

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: **Liz Moreno-Chuquen**, Erika Fulton, Neil Tocher, **Shu-Yuan Lin**, **Spencer Jardine**, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, **DeWayne Derryberry**, **Tayo Omotowa**, **Paul Cady**, Taylor Neibaur
Ex-officio: **Cindy Hill**, Ann Hackert, Mark Cooper, Abbey Hadlich,
Admin. Asst. **Catherine Read**
Excused: Matt Wilson; Carmen Febles (UCC), Sarah Mead
Guest: none

1. Announcements -

This is ISU Open Education Week organized by the Library in coordination with ITRC. Jardine displayed the list and calendar of events on the Library's website. Faculty can find free and open textbook resources to help students save costs.

2. Minutes – none; the minutes for January 26, 2021 and February 9, 2021 were already approved via email vote

3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert

a. Ideas about completing annual reports

Evident that faculty aren't sure what to do in filing the annual assessment reports. In some cases the final step wasn't taken to submit the report, in other cases the departments collected the student materials but didn't do the assessment piece. Late reports can still be submitted in Qualtrics for next year's spreadsheet report.

b. Summer stipend and work – stipends \$500 apiece for three volunteers to use this fiscal year (by June).

1) Create a Gen Ed Assessment Coordinator Handbook – not to replace information on GERC's website, but would be supplemental material explaining what assessment is and how to do it.

2) Create a rubric for GERC's annual feedback on the annual departmental reports

c. Threshold Guidance - what percentage of students would meet or exceed expectations?

Currently assessment plans set their own thresholds. Best practices: No lower than 75% and no higher than 80%.

d. Working with a Gen Ed objective in the new software - candidates to simplify the pilot

Considering a software package called **Planning and Self Study**. Hackert suggests starting a pilot program this fall and choose a single Objective to use this new software, possibly Objective 1 since there are few courses in it and they don't have a Five-Year Report due for awhile. Need to make sure the software does what it is supposed to and work out the bugs to see if it will suit GERC's needs.

e. Making assessment meaningful, address rigor and expectations – disconnect between the mandated Objective learning outcomes and the student materials collected and how they are being assessed. Address higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy, not just the lower "recall information" level.

f. Asking for departments to review and update their assessment plans next fall – rethink how and why they are doing assessment. Departments are not always following their plans.

Hackert hopes to ask for stipends or some funding for faculty presenting how-to assessment workshops and materials.

g. Hackert will be working with Physics this week, and Biology next week to help them create and submit their missing assessment plans.

4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine – no report

5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill
 - a. Reminder to review the [Proposed GEM Policy updates – Gen Ed learning outcomes](#) and [3-Year Review Cycle](#). CAAP (SBOE’s Provosts’ Council) wants faculty feedback on the proposed revisions.
 - If everyone has had a chance to respond to the proposed GEM changes, then Academic Affairs will so inform CAAP and OSBE.
 - Accreditation site visit will be this October 5, 6 and 7. Accreditors visit with GERC as one of the stakeholders. She wants to make sure GERC has what they need to prepare for the accreditors’ visit. May need to walk them through GERC’s processes. Hackert suggested GERC consider a process for getting new members up to speed.

6. UCC update – Carmen Febles – UCC is now accepting proposals for the 2022-23 undergraduate catalog.

7. Unfinished Business:
 - a. Draft [GERC Departmental Assessment Review Feedback Report](#) – for consideration, tweaking, and approval for use by GERC members in reviewing annual assessment reporting spreadsheet (item 7.d. below). Shannon and Matt developed this form as a structured way for GERC members to document their observations for each course as they review the assessment reporting spreadsheet. It can be shared with the departments to give them some feedback on how they are doing with their gen ed assessment efforts.

Motion and second to approve the GERC Feedback Summary Report document. Motion **passed**.
The document was approved and will be put into use immediately.

 - b. New Assessment Plans for consideration
 - 1) [CS 1181 Assessment Plan](#) – split off from INFO 1181
Motion and second to approve this Assessment Plan. Motion **passed**.

 - c. [Process for Selecting ISU’s State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#) – for next time
Jardine is rewriting these ideas into a document for GERC’s consideration in a format that can be approved and forwarded up the approval chain. GERC’s Bylaws should be updated to include the Discipline Group as a standing subcommittee of GERC.

 - d. [Annual Assessment Reports Spreadsheet](#) – GERC summary/findings report
[NWCCU Summary Assessment Reporting Status](#) spreadsheet for reference
 - 1) **Objectives 1, 2, and 7:** Matt and Liz
 - 2) **Objectives 3 and 5:** Paul and Erika
 - 3) **Objective 4:** Spencer, DeWayne, and Taylor
 - 3) **Objectives 6 and 8:** Shannon and Neil
 - 4) **Objective 9:** Shu-Yuan and Tayo

Members divided into Zoom breakout rooms with their Objective partners to decide how to divide up the workload. After reconvening together, members discussed how to approach the task.

 - e. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – no update this week
Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)
Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.

 - f. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports – due April 1, 2021
 - 1) Objective 7 ORC: Erika Fulton, chair
 - 2) Objective 8 ORC: Matt Wilson, chair

 - g. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC; and perhaps revising GERC’s purpose statement on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.

8. New Business: None this week.

9. Adjourn: 4:12 p.m.

Approved by GERC: March 29, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: April 1, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 5, 2021

Accepted by Academic Affairs: April 14, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 9 March 2021

Zoom-- <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84074929871?pwd=eU5odnRJZxpEdFYzQXN2UEd3WnhHUT09> (new link)

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady, Taylor Neibaur
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Abbey Hadlich, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Excused: Neil Tocher; Catherine Read, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper
Guest: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes for February 23, 2021 – *will vote via email*
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - a. Physics Assessment Plans – progress update
 - Several GERC members met with the Physics faculty; they will continue to work on their assessment plans. Hackert met with Astronomy, and will meet with the lab instructors next week. She will also meet with Biology. Soon, all gen ed courses will have assessment plans.
 - b. Hackert has a small amount of funds for gen ed projects during the summer, perhaps next year's officers might be interested.
 - c. Pilot assessment project: Consider Objective 1 as a gen ed pilot for planning and self-study which would result in an annual report that would not be in Qualtrics. This would over time collect all the data that would help departments write their Five-Year reports. The idea would be to hire a Career Path Intern to enter all the class data into the pilot software program. If GERC approves, Hackert wants to move forward and start building out that report. Emma Wood is helping Hackert with this project; needs actual data to work with. It is a similar software to TaskStream, but supposedly more user friendly.
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine – nothing to report
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill

Hill thanked members for their hard work in gathering annual assessment reports and getting departments to submit their Five-Year reports.
6. UCC update – Carmen Febles – UCC has not met recently since no proposals have been submitted yet. No updates to report this time.
7. Unfinished Business:
 - a. [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#) – *new draft underway, not finished yet*
Create new standing subcommittee, to be added to GERC's Bylaws
 - b. [Annual Assessment Reports Spreadsheet](#) – GERC summary/findings report
[NWCCU Summary Assessment Reporting Status](#) spreadsheet for reference
 - 1) **Objectives 1, 2, and 7:** Matt and Liz
 - 2) **Objectives 3 and 5:** Paul and Erika
 - 3) **Objective 4:** Spencer, DeWayne, and Taylor

- 3) **Objective 6 and Objective 8:** Shannon and Neil
- 4) **Objective 9:** Shu-Yuan and Tayo

Kobs explained the purpose of the feedback document is to give a quick summary of what the department did during their assessment process and highlight a couple of strengths and weaknesses the GERC reviewers observed. Can include helpful suggestions for departments to consider as they review their assessment plans and process. Significant changes to assessment plans require GERC's review and approval. Some discussion ensued about what constitutes significant changes.

Jardine reminded GERC members they have only two more meetings scheduled this semester, since the 4th week of April is Spring Break this year because of the pandemic. Members should complete their feedback reports and review the reports as a group. Be prepared to share your perspectives, insights, and concerns on this feedback process as well any problematic courses. GERC's correspondence with the campus community should be the consensus of the full committee, not just individual members.

For March 23 meeting, review and discuss feedback reports for Objectives 6 and 8, and Objectives 3 and 5. The rest of the Objectives will be reviewed and discussed at the April 13 meeting.

- c. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – update
Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)
Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.
Jardine reported the committee is still interested in continuing their work on the survey. One concern GERC had last spring was the department and affiliation listings were incomplete and inconsistent, varying between college-level and department-level, with some units not existing anywhere. Also some concerns about questions regarding the ISU-specific Objectives; several of those questions seemed to be leading and somewhat biased. Ensure the survey has a place where faculty can record their discontent or observations based on experiences at other universities, or ideas in general. Keep it broadly welcoming and less of an attack on the switch from Goals to Objectives several years ago.
 - f. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports: due April 1, 2021 -- progress update
 - 1) Objective 7 ORC: Erika Fulton, chair
 - 2) Objective 8 ORC: Matt Wilson, chair
No progress because of competing workload priorities. ORC chairs don't know who is on their committees yet; must have missed the email that was sent. GERC needs to review and accept the ORC Review Reports once the ORCs complete them. Based on their experience as previous ORC chairs, Kobs and Cady suggested the ORCs meet initially, divide up the tasks among their members, work independently on their own, and meet again to bring it all together into a single report.
 - g. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC
 - h. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
Jardine asked members to review the purpose statement and Bylaws excerpt and record suggestions or comments on the Google Doc.
8. New Business:
- a. Bylaws Revisions –
 - 1) create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
 - 2) revise purpose statement?
 - b. Officer Elections for next academic year – Hill suggested members start thinking about nominations
Jardine mentioned the Chair position comes with a course release or overload stipend because of the behind-the-scenes work, and the chair also attends UARC meetings once a month. The Vice Chair

occasionally attends UCC meetings as liaison to keep communication channels open.

9. Adjourn: 4:00 p.m.

Approved by GERC: March 29, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: April 1, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 5, 2021

Accepted by Academic Affairs:

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 23 March 2021

Zoom-- <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84074929871?pwd=eU5odnRJZxpEdFYzQXN2UEd3WnhHUT09>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady,
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Abbey Hadlich, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Admin. Asst. Catherine Read
Excused: Neil Tocher. Taylor Neibaur
Guest: none

1. Announcements -- none

2. Minutes for February 23, 2021 and March 9, 2021 – *will vote via email*

3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Spencer Jardine for Ann Hackert

a. Physics and Biology Assessment Plans – progress update

Within Objective 5 some lecture courses are required as co-requisites with the lab courses, some labs are not required at all. This causes some challenges for assessment. Wilson reminded that GERC already had decided that in cases of lecture/lab courses, the lecture courses should meet 4 of the 5 outcomes and the co-requisite lab meets the 5th outcome. The objective only requires one lab course. How to assess the fifth outcome if a student does not take the corresponding lab in their second lecture course? Discussion.

Febles mentioned Biology has reached out to UCC; they are considering dropping the lab component for BIOL 1100. Uncertain what prompted this idea; could be a workload issue since many lab courses are taught by graduate student Teaching Assistants. Biology's response to an emailed question was that their reason for wanting to drop the lab is that they are considering going in a different direction with the course. Academic Affairs has contacted OSBE to find out whether this would even be an option, since BIOL 1100 is a GEM Common Course

If a science course does not require a lab, will it have to meet all five learning outcomes or only four? Clarification is provided by OSBE's proposed changes to Objective 5, which entail **students will meet all five outcomes upon completion of a lab course**. Derryberry suggests not making this mandatory so as to preserve the option for departments to include all outcomes in their lecture courses or some other method. Hackert will take this guidance from GERC back to Physics and Biology.

4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine

5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill – no report.

6. UCC update – Carmen Febles – nothing more to report.

7. Unfinished Business:

a. [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#) – *new draft underway, not finished yet*
Create new standing subcommittee, to be added to GERC's Bylaws

b. [Annual Assessment Reports Spreadsheet](#) – GERC summary/findings report
[NWCCU Summary Assessment Reporting Status](#) spreadsheet for reference

1) **Objectives 1, 2, and 7:** Matt and Liz

- 2) **Objectives 3 and Objective 5:** Paul and Erika
- 3) **Objective 4:** Spencer, DeWayne, and Taylor
- 3) **Objective 6 and Objective 8:** Shannon and Neil
- 4) **Objective 9:** Shu-Yuan and Tayo

Fulton reported that since Physics does not have approved assessment plans, their assessment reports are an anomaly. Their plans will be in place by this fall. Some discussion what GERC's position should be when 100% of students meet all learning outcomes. High percentage of students meeting the threshold for sufficiently mastering the learning outcomes is not necessarily a lack of rigor nor an unreasonable thing to achieve.

Some departments are not including work from students who drop out or do not pass the course, which might skew the results. This could be a difference in interpretation by the various departments. Not counting students on the lower end of the rubric does not allow for making improvements in the course that will help students succeed. Future discussion needed on whether to require departments to factor in students who do not complete the course.

Some courses assess every learning outcome every year, and some assess one or two outcomes on a rotating schedule. GERC's vision of assessment goals may not be translating to departments. It is important to ensure departments understand that assessment is a tool to promote student learning, not a prescribed task to check off on a list of things departments have to do. Several assessment reports show no indication the departments know they should be using the assessment findings to improve the course. Missing annual assessment reports affect GERC's ability to create effective feedback summaries and assess the progress of the Gen Ed program. Suggestion to send a feedback summary asking departments to remember that although they may be assessing their courses diligently every year, ensuring they submit their annual reports will enable GERC to provide meaningful feedback on their assessment efforts, thereby closing that loop.

Ensure all email correspondence from GERC to department chairs include an invitation to them to share the emails with their assessment coordinators.

Two types of reporting observed: some course reports assess all outcomes every year, some choose one or two outcomes to assess. Some concern among GERC members that if a department does not assess an outcome again for 2 to 5 years, how do they know the changes they make are effective in ensuring students are learning? Departments should do an informal assessment of all outcomes each year to make sure students are doing well, even if they formally report to GERC on one or two outcomes that year. Course syllabi include the department's course objectives, but not always the Gen Ed Objective outcomes. This creates confusion among faculty who are conducting and reporting their assessment.

Ann Hackert suggested GERC create an Assessment Manual to help guide faculty and explain how to do assessment. This might help eliminate such confusion. She can work on developing a draft manual over the summer. One thing for GERC to discuss and decide, and include in the manual: what does it mean that 75%-80% students achieve the minimum acceptable threshold? Makes sense that grades would reflect that, but does it make sense to tell departments they shouldn't have all their students exceed expectations? For many courses it would be realistic to have a high percentage of students meet or exceed the minimum thresholds set by the gen ed rubrics. Comes back to a question of what exactly are departments measuring and how does it relate to their curriculum?

GERC needs to get university-wide guidance on what assessment is, the value and uses, ISU's expectations, and how to conduct assessment in a meaningful way. Need to communicate somehow to departments that this assessment program should be a continuous improvement effort, not a static thing to stick away in the files and never look at again. 100% scores do not leave any room for improvement of courses or programs. Need more consistency in levels of achievement; might help for GERC to ask for more than a binary judgment whether students met the minimum expectations or not. The SBOE rubrics ask for 3 levels of student achievement.

Jardine asked members to complete the rest of the feedback summaries for next time.

- c. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – update
Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)
Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.

Tayo and Spencer are meeting with Jim Stoutenborough tomorrow morning to work on the faculty survey.

- e. [Objective Review Committee](#) (ORC) Reports: due April 1, 2021 -- progress update
 - 1) [Objective 7](#) ORC: Erika Fulton, chair – she has figured out what she needs to do
 - 2) [Objective 8](#) ORC: Matt Wilson, chair – Matt has emailed his committee members and will hold their first meeting this week.

Revised due date: April 12 if possible so GERC can review them during the April 13 meeting.

- f. Officers for Next Year – email nominations to Jardine in the next week or so
 - 1) Chair (comes with course release or overload stipend for each semester, Fall and Spring)
 - 2) Vice Chair
 - 3) Executive Secretary
- g. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC – *not discussed because of time constraints*
- h. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
No action taken at this time.

8. New Business:

- a. Bylaws Revisions – *not discussed*
 - 1) create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
 - 2) revise purpose statement?

Next meeting will be **Tuesday, April 6** at 2:30 p.m.

9. Adjourn: 4:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 10, 2021

Accepted by UCC: May 11, 2021

Accepted by Faculty Senate:

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 24, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 6 April 2021

Zoom-- <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84074929871?pwd=eU5odnRJZXpEdFYzQXN2UEd3WnhHUT09>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Taylor Neibaur
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Abbey Hadlich, Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Admin. Asst. Catherine Read
Excused: Neil Tocher, DeWayne Derryberry, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, Paul Cady,
Guest: none

1. Announcements – this week is National Library Week.
2. Council **approved** the Minutes for **February 23, 2021** and **March 9, 2021** by email ballot.
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Spencer Jardine for Ann Hackert
 - a. Physics and Biology Assessment Plans – progress update
Biology is working on their Plan. Hackert is following up with Physics. Hackert presented suggested changes to the questions in the Qualtrics annual assessment reporting. This item appears below under New Business for GERC's consideration.
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine – no report
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill
Accreditation, Assessment and Academic Program Review (AAAPR) committee is working on the accreditation reports. They want GERC to review three pages of the report and provide input. Watch for it next week and add comments and suggestions.
6. UCC update – Carmen Febles
UCC will meet this week to review proposals requiring state action. They are also reviewing their bylaws for potential updates.
7. Unfinished Business:
 - a. [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reqs](#) – *new draft underway, not finished yet*
Create as new standing subcommittee, to be added to GERC's Bylaws
 - b. [Annual Assessment Reports Spreadsheet](#) – GERC summary/findings report
[NWCCU Summary Assessment Reporting Status](#) spreadsheet for reference
 - 1) [Objective 1, Objective 2, and Objective 7](#): Matt and Liz
 - 2) [Objectives 3 and Objective 5](#): Paul and Erika
 - 3) [Objective 4](#): Spencer, DeWayne, and Taylor
 - 3) [Objective 6 and Objective 8](#): Shannon and Neil
 - 4) [Objective 9](#): Shu-Yuan and Tayo

Wilson expressed discomfort with GERC prescribing a target range of percentages of students meeting learning outcomes. Consider asking departments to review their own rubrics and target percentages for relevancy. Hill mentioned there might be historical reasons behind the target percentages based on university needs from a few years ago. Hackert said 85% is common expectation in the assessment research she has done. Jardine displayed a feedback report as an example for discussion. Wilson argued that since the assessment report is a binary pass/fail judgment whether students met the minimum threshold, it is not unreasonable to have all students meet the expected outcomes. This binary conundrum could be something to consider in the future whenever

changes to the assessment reporting process are proposed. Tayo, Shu-Yuan, Spencer, and Taylor are still working on their feedback summaries; they will finish and submit soon.

- c. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – update
Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)
Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.
Jardine reported the subcommittee has discussed and suggested revisions. He will check in with Jim Stoutenborough on his progress on incorporating the suggestions into the survey.
 - e. [Objective Review Committee](#) (ORC) Reports: due April 12, 2021 -- progress update
 - 1) [Objective 7](#) ORC: Erika Fulton, chair
Fulton reported her committee has been working on their tasks. They will meet again to discuss and integrate into a report. She is optimistic the committee will have their report completed by April 12.
 - 2) [Objective 8](#) ORC: Matt Wilson, chair
Wilson said his committee is divided on some issues about the composition of the objective and would prefer to see some changes in the objective and outcomes. Their report should be ready by the final meeting of this semester for GERC's consideration.
 - f. Officers for Next Year – nominations
 - 1) Chair (comes with course release or overload stipend for each semester, Fall and Spring)
 - 2) Vice Chair
 - 3) Executive Secretary
Wilson suggested holding off until next week when more members are present; everyone else agreed this is a good idea. Reminder that Shannon will be on sabbatical next year.
 - g. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC
No one had any ideas to discuss yet.
 - h. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
No action taken at this time.
8. New Business:
- a. [Bylaws Revisions](#) –
 - 1) create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
 - 2) revise purpose statement?
Mead suggested adding something in the purpose statement about the discipline groups, and how GERC relates to the statewide gen ed committee and SBOE-mandated GEM Objectives. Hill mentioned departments are very interested in the process of selecting discipline group members. It would be best if it were in place by early Fall semester.
 - b. [Annual Assessment Report](#) – consider changing the questions
Lin suggested adding assessment process changes to the question about curriculum changes based on assessment findings. GERC needs to provide clear guidance to departments when they revisit their assessment plans this Fall.
Jardine asked members to consider the proposed changes and suggestions for next meeting.

9. Adjourn: 3:38 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 10, 2021
Accepted by UCC: May 11, 2021
Accepted by Faculty Senate:
Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 24, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 13 April 2021

Zoom-- <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84074929871?pwd=eU5odnRJZXpEdFYzQXN2UEd3WnhHUT09>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, DeWayne Derryberry, Shannon Kobs Nawotniak, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa, Paul Cady, Taylor Neibaur
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Ann Hackert, Abbey Hadlich,
Admin. Asst. Catherine Read
Excused: Sarah Mead, Mark Cooper, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes for March 23, 2021 and April 6, 2021 – *will vote by email*
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Spencer Jardine for Ann Hackert
 - a. Physics Assessment Plans – progress update
Hackert will follow up with Physics to have them finish and submit their plans.
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine – no report
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill
Accreditation site visit was rescheduled for October 6 – 8; it was moved back a day. The accreditors will likely meet with at least a few members of GERC. The site visit committee's chair is the assessment director from UNLV.
6. UCC update – Matt and Catherine
UCC met briefly last week and took care of a few minor items. Proposals are starting to come in. UCC will not meet this week, but will meet next week and consider as many of the proposals as possible. They might meet during finals week if necessary to finish time-critical business before the semester ends.
7. Unfinished Business:
 - a. Officers for Next Year – nominations and elections
 - 1) Chair (comes with course release or overload stipend for each semester, Fall and Spring)
Nomination for Matt Wilson as Chair; he accepted the nomination
 - 2) Vice Chair – Nomination for Joanne Tokle who will be joining GERC in the fall as a faculty member; Neil and Cindy affirmed she will accept the nomination
 - 3) Executive Secretary – Nomination for Erika Fulton – need to confirm whether she will accept.
ACTION: Members voted to elect **Matt Wilson as Chair**
ACTION: Members voted to elect **Joanne Tokle as Vice Chair**.

When Erika Fulton joined the meeting, she expressed some hesitancy at accepting the nomination as Executive Secretary. DeWayne Derryberry nominated himself as Executive Secretary,
ACTION: Members voted to elect **DeWayne Derryberry as Executive Secretary**.
 - b. [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#) –
If this process is approved, GERC will create a new standing subcommittee to be added to GERC's Bylaws. Members discussed the process document and made a few changes and clarifications.
ACTION: Council voted to **approve this process as revised** and to forward the memo to UCC for approval, then to Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs for their approval.
 - c. Proposed changes to the Qualtrics [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#)
Ann Hackert and Catherine Read met with Vince Miller in Institutional Research yesterday and worked out the logistics of how to incorporate GERC's changes in the annual assessment reporting

system. Once GERC finalizes and approves the changes they want to make, Vince will create a new Qualtrics survey for use starting this Fall 2021 for Reporting Period 2020-21. It will generate a brand-new spreadsheet that will not include the data from previous reporting years, so GERC and other reviewers will have to refer to two different spreadsheets when comparing and analyzing gen ed course reporting data for reporting years before and after the Qualtrics change.

Discussion ensued about direct versus indirect assessment materials and where course syllabi and sample exams fit into the equation. The consensus was that GERC should encourage departments to use direct assessment of student materials in their assessment efforts, not just indirect methods. GERC should also provide better guidance on what assessment materials are acceptable; the annual reports should reflect how well students are mastering the desired skills specified in the learning outcomes. Communicate this to departments in the fall before they start their reviews and revisions of their assessment plans. Members observed that not all departments have been following their own gen ed course assessment plans.

Members will continue this discussion at next week's meeting. Suggest considering the new questions separately from the direct/indirect materials issue.

- d. [Annual Assessment Reports Spreadsheet](#) – GERC summary/findings report
[NWCCU Summary Assessment Reporting Status](#) spreadsheet for reference
 - 1) [Objective 1, Objective 2, and Objective 7](#): Matt and Liz
 - 2) [Objectives 3 and Objective 5](#): Paul and Erika
 - 3) [Objective 4](#): Spencer, DeWayne, and Taylor
 - 3) [Objective 6 and Objective 8](#): Shannon and Neil
 - 4) [Objective 9](#): Shu-Yuan and Tayo

- e. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – update
Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)
Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.
Nothing new on this yet. Jardine will check in with Jim Stoutenborough.

- f. [Objective Review Committee](#) (ORC) Reports: due April 1, 2021 -- progress update
 - 1) [Objective 7](#) ORC: Erika Fulton, chair
The committee will be putting final touches on their report this week. They are aiming to have it ready for GERC's review by the weekend.
 - 2) [Objective 8](#) ORC: Matt Wilson, chair
The committee is working on their report, and they hope to have it ready for GERC's review by next week's meeting.

Due to time constraints, the rest of the agenda items deferred for now:

- g. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website,
 - h. [Bylaws Revisions](#) –
 - 1) create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
 - 2) revise purpose statement?
 - i. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC
8. New Business:
- a. [BIOL 2227/L Assessment Plan](#) – for GERC's consideration
9. Adjourn: 4:36 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 10, 2021
Accepted by UCC: May 11, 2021
Accepted by Faculty Senate:
Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 24, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 20 April 2021

Zoom-- <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84074929871?pwd=eU5odnRJZXpEdFYzQXN2UEd3WnhHUT09>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

GERC's website: www.isu.edu/gerc/

Attendance: Liz Moreno-Chuquen, Erika Fulton, Neil Tocher, Shu-Yuan Lin, Spencer Jardine, Shannon Kobs
Nawotniak, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson, Tayo Omotowa,
Ex-officio: Cindy Hill, Mark Cooper, Abbey Hadlich,
Excused: Paul Cady, Taylor Neibaur; Ann Hackert; Catherine Read, Sarah Mead, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements -- none
2. Minutes for March 23, 2021, April 6, 2021, April 13, 2021, and today April 20, 2021 – all approved by email
3. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert – no report
4. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine – no report
5. Academic Affairs update – Cindy Hill
Academic Affairs is updating the deadline calendar and wants to make sure to include the date by which departments need to appoint Objective Review Committees. Make it the same due date as the Five-Year Reports, January 18.
6. UCC update – UCC did not meet last week; they will meet on Thursday this week.
7. Unfinished Business:
 - a. [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) – consider changing the questions
Not discussed, **no action taken at this time.**
 - b. [Annual Assessment Reports Spreadsheet](#) – GERC summary/findings report
[NWCCU Summary Assessment Reporting Status](#) spreadsheet for reference
 - 1) **[Objective 1, Objective 2, and Objective 7](#)**: Matt and Liz
 - 2) **[Objectives 3 and Objective 5](#)**: Paul and Erika
 - 3) **[Objective 4](#)**: Spencer, DeWayne, and Taylor
 - 3) **[Objective 6 and Objective 8](#)**: Shannon and Neil
 - 4) **[Objective 9](#)**: Shu-Yuan and TayoA concern still to be decided is the target for percentages of students meeting the learning objectives. Could be a function of the samples drawn from the overall student population in the courses. Good idea to remind departments there is no expectation of reaching 100% in all learning outcomes. Ensure the feedback summaries are provided to future GERC reviewers.

MOTION: strike any language that prescribes target percentages in all the feedback summaries.
Motion seconded. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Once those changes are made, the summaries will be ready to be provided to the pertinent department chairs and assessment coordinators.
 - c. GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment – update
Members: Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (Political Science)
Subcommittee has been working on a broad-based faculty survey regarding the Gen Ed program

and Objectives, with an emphasis on obtaining feedback for Objectives 7, 8 and 9.

The subcommittee is waiting for Jim Stoutenborough to incorporate their suggested edits into the survey. The revised survey will be taken up again in the Fall as Unfinished Business.

Spencer and Tayo are rotating off GERC this spring, so may need replacements on the subcommittee in the Fall.

d. [Objective Review Committee](#) (ORC) Reports: due April 1, 2021 -- progress update

1) [Objective 7](#) ORC: Erika Fulton, chair

The report is finished and the ORC committee has until this Friday to formally approve it. It can go out to GERC members for their review and acceptance. There are a couple of recommendations for minor changes to the learning outcomes for GERC to consider in the Fall.

2) [Objective 8](#) ORC: Matt Wilson, chair

The committee has approved the ORC report except for last-minute additions by a department rep lately appointed to the Objective Review committee. Once the full committee has approved the additions, the report will be ready for GERC members to review and accept.

Wilson reported the ORC committee recommends GERC revisit the learning outcomes for Objective 8. The current outcomes were established in 2000, and much has changed in Information Literacy in the last 20 years. GERC can accept the report now by email, and then discuss the committee's concerns and recommendations about the learning outcomes as New Business in the Fall.

After results come in from the subcommittee's faculty survey about Objectives 7, 8 & 9 in the fall, GERC may revisit all the learning outcomes for those Objectives to ensure they are measurable and make sense as skills students should master in the Objectives. Look at the Association of American Colleges & Universities' Value Rubrics used by the State Gen Ed committees in amending the GEM Objective outcomes for ideas.

MOTION: GERC will vote on both ORC reports by email and approve a plan of action for revisiting the Objective learning outcomes to forward to UCC before the end of this semester. Motion seconded. **Motion passed unanimously.**

e. [BIOL 2227/L Assessment Plan](#) – for GERC's consideration

GERC members made a few suggested changes in the assessment plan for the department to consider. GERC **approved** the assessment plan, pending the department's agreement to those changes.

f. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.

No action taken at this time.

g. [Bylaws Revisions](#) –

- 1) create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- 2) revise purpose statement?

No action taken at this time.

h. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC - **No action taken at this time.**

8. New Business:

a. Physics Assessment Plans

The members broke off into four small groups on Zoom to review and discuss the assessment plans assigned to their group.

Group 1:

[2021 PHYS 1100 Assessment Plan](#)
[2021 PHYS 1101 Assessment Plan](#)
[2021 PHYS 1101L Assessment Plan](#)

Group 2:

[2021 PHYS 1111 Assessment Plan](#)
[2021 PHYS 1112 Assessment Plan](#)
[2021 PHYS 1113 Assessment Plan](#)

Group 3:

[2021 PHYS 1114 Assessment Plan](#)
[2021 PHYS 1152 Assessment Plan](#)
[2021 PHYS 1153 Assessment Plan](#)

Group 4:

[2021 PHYS 2211 Assessment Plan](#)
[2021 PHYS 2212 Assessment Plan](#)
[2021 PHYS 2213 Assessment Plan](#)
[2021 PHYS 2214 Assessment Plan](#)

GERC members reconvened and discussed their observations. Plans were unclear which outcomes will be assessed each year. Part D was very confusing on some of the plans; appears the department intends to conduct their assessment at the beginning of the semester, which makes no sense. Would be wise for departments to collect student materials each semester, so they have them on hand for whenever they do their assessments of the course and the learning outcomes. Members are not ready to vote on these plans yet.

ACTION: Matt suggested members write up their initial observations about the plans they each reviewed then remand the plans back to the department for revision by fall. Spencer will create a Google Doc for members to record their observations and he will include links to each of the Plans. GERC will consider the revised plans again early in the fall semester.

Matt will write up a proposed action plan for Objective 8, and Erika will write an action plan for Objective 7. These will be voted upon by email along with the ORC Reports for Objections 7 and 8.

Neil recommended in the future GERC rearrange its meeting agenda to start with business items and avoid taking up so much time with announcements and updates at the beginning of the meeting.

9. Adjourn: 5:48 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 10, 2021
Accepted by UCC: May 11, 2021
Accepted by Faculty Senate:
Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 24, 2021