

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, 31 August 2021

Zoom—<https://isu.zoom.us/j/87677931430?pwd=cW1CTitQMWxhelQwc1ZjNlV2UVZEZz09>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, Ben Crosby, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson

Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Mark Cooper, Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Joann Trimmer, Carmen Febles (UCC), Catherine Read

Excused: none

Guest: none

1. Welcome and Announcements

- a. Introductions
- b. GERC 101 – Matt Wilson, chair
 - Introduction to GERC – what does GERC do, what are reps expected to do, etc.
 - GERC website introduction: information, instructions, documents, etc.
 - Sept. 16: Mock NWCCU site visit – GERC members should attend if possible

Send draft agenda to GERC members on Tuesday for their feedback ahead of GERC Exec Committee on Friday; then send out to full GERC on Friday afternoon.

Sept. 16 mock 'accreditation site visit' in preparation for full site visit in early October. GERC's timeslot is 1:00-1:45 on Sept 16; a calendar invitation has been sent to GERC members. GERC members will be meeting with the accreditors in the real site visit; this 'mock' visit is to help work out the kinks and make sure everyone is prepared.

GERC 101 Part 2:

Matt displayed and explained the Gen Ed Assessment Flowchart developed in 2014 summarizing the process and various documents generated and submitted by departments and the objective review committees. Next academic year GERC will conduct its overall review of the Gen Ed Program as a whole once the Objective Review cycle completes this spring.

2. **Minutes** – none this week; all have been approved

3. Unfinished Business:

- a. **Physics Assessment Plans** to be reviewed and considered for approval next meeting Sept. 14
GERC did not have enough time to consider these plans and resolve the concerns last spring, so the review carried over to this fall. Ann Hackert explained the entire Physics department worked with a few GERC members and the University Assessment Review Committee as they developed these plans. Discussion on the approach to take in reviewing and providing feedback on these plans. The Executive Committee will come up with guidance in the next few days for GERC members to use as they review the plans.

GERC reviewer assignments:

Matt Wilson, Joanne Tokle and DeWayne Derryberry:

- 1) [2021 PHYS 1100 Assessment Plan](#)
- 2) [2021 PHYS 1101 Assessment Plan](#)

- 3) [2021 PHYS 1101L Assessment Plan](#)
- 4) [2021 PHYS 1152 Assessment Plan](#)
- 5) [2021 PHYS 1153 Assessment Plan](#)

Shu-Yuan Lin, Jennifer Attebery and Cathy Gray:

- 6) [2021 PHYS 1111 Assessment Plan](#)
- 7) [2021 PHYS 1112 Assessment Plan](#)
- 8) [2021 PHYS 1113 Assessment Plan](#)
- 9) [2021 PHYS 1114 Assessment Plan](#)

Ben Crosby and Erika Fulton:

- 10) [2021 PHYS 2211 Assessment Plan](#)
- 11) [2021 PHYS 2212 Assessment Plan](#)
- 12) [2021 PHYS 2213 Assessment Plan](#)
- 13) [2021 PHYS 2214 Assessment Plan](#)

Only PHYS 1111 and PHYS 1112 are part of the GEM Common Courses.

- b. **Revisit Feedback Summaries** created last Spring – finalize for sending to departments
 Matt displayed the [Gen Ed Assessment Flowchart](#) again and explained that GERC decided last spring to provide some feedback and guidance for departments on the annual reports they submitted for 2019-20 assessment efforts. Just before the semester ended, more in-depth observations and concerns were identified. The task now will be for members to go through the [Feedback Summaries](#) from June 2021 and check for updates and concerns.

- Assign Summaries to members to complete for next GERC meeting Sept. 14:

- 1) [Objective 1](#), [Objective 2](#), and [Objective 7](#): (Matt and Jennifer)
- 2) [Objective 3](#) and [Objective 5](#): (Ben and Erika)
- 3) [Objective 4](#): (Matt and DeWayne)
- 4) [Objective 6](#) and [Objective 8](#): (Cathy and Joanne)
- 5) [Objective 9](#): (Shu-Yuan and Joanne)

Reference documents for Feedback Summaries:

- 1) [2019-20 Annual Assessment Reports](#) submitted as of Aug. 25, 2021:

- | | |
|--|--|
| Objective 1 annual reports | Objective 6 annual reports |
| Objective 2 annual reports | Objective 7 annual reports |
| Objective 3 annual reports | Objective 8 annual reports |
| Objective 4 annual reports | Objective 9 annual reports |
| Objective 5 annual reports | |

- 2) [GERC Feedback Summary Review Observations - June 2021](#)

- 3) **Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports:**

- | | |
|--|--|
| Objective 1 ORC Report | Objective 5 ORC Report |
| Objective 2 ORC Report | Objective 6 ORC Report |

- | | |
|--|--|
| Objective 3 ORC Report | Objective 7 ORC Report |
| Objective 4 ORC Report | Objective 8 ORC Report |

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

- 5) [NWCCU Summary Assessment Reporting Status](#) spreadsheet used in creating summaries; *supplanted by 2019-20 Annual Assessment Reports in Google folders listed above*

Due to time constraints, the remaining agenda items were deferred until next time:

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

Members: ~~Fayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine~~, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (PoliSci)

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.

4. New Business:

- a. [ANTH 2203 proposal](#) as new Objective 8 course

5. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson
- c. UCC update – Carmen Febles

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- b. Revisit [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)
- c. [Objective Review Committee \(ORC\) Report Action Items](#)
 - 1) Consider suggested changes to [Objective 7](#) Outcomes 4 and 5
 - 2) Consider creating subcommittee to update [Objective 8](#) outcomes
- d. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine
- e. Pilot assessment project
- f. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
- g. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- h. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- i. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:42 p.m.

Approved by GERC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot

Accepted by UCC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot

Accepted by Faculty Senate: October 25, 2021

Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 5, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, September 14th, 2021

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson

Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Mark Cooper, Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Joann Trimmer, (UCC), Catherine Read

Excused: Carmen Febles (UCC)

Guest: none

1. Announcements

- Reminder about mock Site Visit this Thursday at 1:00-1:45 p.m. All GERC members are invited, though a couple members have said they have conflicts and cannot make it.
- GERC Executive Committee met with Carmen Febles, UCC chair, on Friday and agreed on a trial basis this year to have the UCC and GERC chairs attend each other's Executive Committee meetings instead of the full council meetings, unless there is some business that needs full council review or discussion.
- Executive Committee decided to keep the updates and announcements at the beginning of meetings. If an update item needs more discussion, please inform the Executive Committee by Friday morning before the next GERC meeting so they can add it to the agenda as a business item.

2. Minutes for August 31, 2021 -- *forthcoming for review next meeting*

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates - Ann Hackert: none this week.
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson
 - SBOE is making some changes to the annual Gen Ed Summit usually held in October; more information will be forthcoming, but they are considering holding it in Spring 2022 since they prefer to have everyone there in person.
 - SBOE had its first reading of revisions to Policy III.N. relevant to General Education. The second reading to approve the revised Policy is scheduled for the October SBOE meeting.
- c. UCC update – Carmen Febles: none this week.

4 Unfinished Business:

- a. **Physics Assessment Plans** to be reviewed and considered for approval
(Reference: [Review Guide for General Education Course Assessment Plan](#))
Members reviewed each of the Assessment Plans submitted by Physics and had several observations:
 - Council noted the form Physics used does not have the first question asking when each outcome will be assessed; GERC does need that question answered. Not all outcomes need to be assessed every year, so long as all outcomes are assessed at least once every 5 years. Objective 5 has five outcomes, so assessing one outcome per year would work very well.
 - Threshold question also is not in the form that Physics used; they appear to have used an old form.
 - Suggest that instead of using target percentages, the department should choose specific questions correlated to the individual outcomes to measure how well students are performing on each outcome separately.
 - Not all plans include indirect assessment measures; that is not a requirement so not a problem if the department does not intend to review syllabi or other indirect measures. If they are collecting

syllabi, then explain how the indirect measures will be used in assessment. GERC has not yet made a determination whether to require indirect measures.

- Clarify how assignments will be used to assess each outcome.
- Good random sampling is an efficient way of assessing courses with large enrollment.
- Pros and cons for having a single point person for Gen Ed assessment versus spreading the responsibility among multiple faculty within the department. Can be a burdensome workload for a single person.
- If grading criteria matches the Gen Ed Objective learning outcomes, it can be okay to use grades in assessment. However, if different criteria or program or course learning outcomes are used in grading student performance in addition to the gen ed learning outcomes, grades should not be used in the Gen Ed assessment.
- For now, not required to show rubrics in the Plans, since not all Plans GERC approved do include rubrics.
- Consider including who will be involved in evaluating instruments and assessing student performance, though it's not required.
- Some concern that the 1000-level assignments appear to be the same as the 2000-level assignments; not clear whether more advanced responses are expected of the 2000-level students. The main difference between the course levels are the Math pre-requisites.
- Matt and Ann will get together and discuss GERC's concerns for Ann to take back to the department to consider as they revise the Plans.

- 1) [2021 PHYS 1100 Assessment Plan](#)
- 2) [2021 PHYS 1101 Assessment Plan](#)
- 3) [2021 PHYS 1101L Assessment Plan](#)
- 4) [2021 PHYS 1111 Assessment Plan](#)
- 5) [2021 PHYS 1112 Assessment Plan](#)
- 6) [2021 PHYS 1113 Assessment Plan](#)
- 7) [2021 PHYS 1114 Assessment Plan](#)
- 8) [2021 PHYS 1152 Assessment Plan](#)
- 9) [2021 PHYS 1153 Assessment Plan](#)
- 10) [2021 PHYS 2211 Assessment Plan](#)
- 11) [2021 PHYS 2212 Assessment Plan](#)
- 12) [2021 PHYS 2213 Assessment Plan](#)
- 13) [2021 PHYS 2214 Assessment Plan](#)

ACTION: Council's consensus was to send the Plans back to Physics with comments for them to consider and revise the Plans accordingly.

b. **Revisit Feedback Summaries** created last Spring – finalize for sending to departments

- 1) [Objective 1](#), [Objective 2](#), and [Objective 7](#): (Matt and Jennifer)
- 2) [Objective 3](#) and [Objective 5](#): (Ben and Erika)
- 3) [Objective 4](#): (Matt and DeWayne)
- 4) [Objective 6](#) and [Objective 8](#): (Cathy and Joanne)
- 5) [Objective 9](#): (Shu-Yuan and Joanne)

Matt clarified the goal is to have a finalized feedback document for each 2019-20 annual report submitted that GERC can send to the departments as soon as possible ahead of the next round of assessment reports due November 1.

ACTION: Matt asked members to complete the Summaries by next Tuesday, Sept. 21, and then review the final versions in preparation for approving them during the September 28 meeting.

Reference documents for Feedback Summaries:

- 1) [2019-20 Annual Assessment Reports](#) submitted as of Aug. 25, 2021:

Objective 1 annual reports	Objective 6 annual reports
Objective 2 annual reports	Objective 7 annual reports

[Objective 3 annual reports](#)
[Objective 4 annual reports](#)
[Objective 5 annual reports](#)

[Objective 8 annual reports](#)
[Objective 9 annual reports](#)

- 2) [GERC_Feedback Summary Review Observations - June 2021](#)
- 3) **Objective Review Committee (ORC) Reports:**

Objective 1 ORC Report	Objective 5 ORC Report
Objective 2 ORC Report	Objective 6 ORC Report
Objective 3 ORC Report	Objective 7 ORC Report
Objective 4 ORC Report	Objective 8 ORC Report
- 4) [Annual Assessment Reports Spreadsheet](#) – GERC summary/findings report
- 5) [NWCCU Summary Assessment Reporting Status](#) spreadsheet used in creating summaries; *supplanted by 2019-20 Annual Assessment Reports in Google folders listed above*

Due to time constraints, the rest of the agenda items were deferred until next time:

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

Members: ~~Fayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine~~, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (PoliSci)

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.

5. New Business:

- a. [ANTH 2203 proposal](#) as new Objective 8 course
- b. Discuss proposed replacements for state disciplinary group representatives :
Objective 3: Xiaoxia (Jessica) Xie, (CoSE) and Don Allen, (CoT) - replacing Bob Fisher and Jim Wolper
Objective 4: Ryan Babcock (CAL) - replacing Pat Brooks
Objective 6: Kevin Marsh (CAL) - replacing Gesine Hearn

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- b. Revisit [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)
- c. [Objective Review Committee \(ORC\) Report Action Items](#)
 - 1) Consider suggested changes to [Objective 7](#) Outcomes 4 and 5
 - 2) Consider creating subcommittee to update [Objective 8](#) outcomes
- d. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine
- e. Pilot assessment project
- f. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
- g. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- h. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- i. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC
- j. ENGL 1101 assessment plan - forthcoming; hasn't been submitted to GERC yet

7. Adjourn: 4:48 p.m.

Approved by GERC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot
Accepted by UCC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot
Accepted by Faculty Senate: October 25, 2021
Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 5, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, September 28th, 2021

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Cathy Gray, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Mark Cooper, Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Joann Trimmer, Catherine Read
Excused: DeWayne Derryberry, Shu-Yuan Lin; Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements:

Session schedules are posted on the website: www.isu.edu/accreditation
GERC's meeting with the accreditors is next Thursday morning, Oct. 7, 9:30-10:20 am

2. Minutes for August 31, 2021 and September 14, 2021 – *forthcoming for next time*

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
Ann Hackert provided links to recordings of last year's Assessment Institute sessions. Matt will forward the links to committee members.
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson
Mock Accreditation Site Visit feedback
Margaret displayed a Power Point and explained what GERC needs to be aware of before next week's site visit. There are only two standards: Student Success and Governance. Year 6 and Year 7 were combined this year. GERC's faculty members are encouraged to speak up and respond to the accreditors' questions. Please read through the self-study report, especially 1.C.2, 3, 5 & 6? Be prepared to answer questions about relationship to core themes, indicators, benchmarks/targets, campus, transparency, collegiality, use of assessment results to inform decision-making. Standard 1.B.1. explains the committee structure.
- c. UCC update – Carmen Febles: nothing new to report
- d. Physics Assessment Plans -- will be remanded to department for revisions, with comments from Matt and Ann, as discussed last meeting. Ann and Matt met this week and talked about what to take back to Physics. The template form Physics used was missing a few questions which caused some of the confusion GERC experienced in reviewing the Assessment Plans.
- e. New state disciplinary group representatives installed – GERC reviewed; no objections
Objective 3: Xiao Xia (Jessica) Xie, (CoSE) and Don Allen, (CoT) - replaced Bob Fisher and Jim Wolper
Objective 4: Ryan Babcock (CAL) - replaced Pat Brooks
Objective 6: Kevin Marsh (CAL) - replaced Gesine Hearn

4 Unfinished Business:

- a. **GERC Subcommittee: Faculty Survey re: gen ed program and assessment**
Members: ~~Tayo Omotowa, Spencer Jardine~~, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (PoliSci)
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.
Matt, Jennifer, and Abbey explained the background of why and how the subcommittee was originally formed. Jennifer recalled it came about through a discussion about Objectives 7, 8 and 9,

their integrity and how they fit within the Gen Ed Program, whether the courses in each Objective made sense, and broader questions about Objectives 1 through 6. Abbey said that last year the subcommittee brought a revised version to GERC leadership, but the full committee has not seen it since Spring 2020. Matt said the survey will give a good opportunity to solicit faculty feedback on the Objectives and General Education as a whole. Objective 9 will be reviewed this Spring, which will complete the first full 5-Year Review Cycle. Joanne Tokle suggested Objective 9 Review be completed before soliciting faculty feedback. The survey could also be used to help shape discussion of the Gen Ed Program review.

After discussion of timeframes, it makes sense to release the survey to faculty in early Fall 2022 after the Objective 9 ORC report is available to faculty. However, GERC needs to be clear within itself what questions they want answered and what kinds of information they are looking for in reviewing the Gen Ed Program itself.

ACTION ITEM: Abbey will check with Jim Stoutenborough to ensure the subcommittee's most recent changes are incorporated, then she will bring the survey back to GERC for discussion and feedback.

MOTION: Replace the two subcommittee members who have left GERC. Motion seconded.
Motion passed.

Joanne Tokle volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

Abbey Hirt will continue to serve.

Jim Stoutenborough has been the survey author.

Ben suggested subcommittee consider shortening the survey. After GERC provides its perspectives and suggestions, the subcommittee will revise the survey accordingly. The survey could be shaped or reshaped creatively as well as critically, with fresh eyes and ideas.

Abbey Hadlich is going to share latest copy with GERC members and then get feedback from members as to how they want to see changes. The smaller subcommittee could then implement those changes into the survey and then come back to GER with the updated survey. The general purpose of the survey is to be opened ended and stands to inform a full scale review of General Education program next year.

b. **Feedback Summaries** – finalized; approve for sending to departments

- 1) [Objective 1](#), [Objective 2](#), and [Objective 7](#): (Matt and Jennifer)
- 2) [Objective 3](#) and [Objective 5](#): (Ben and Erika)
- 3) [Objective 4](#): (Matt and DeWayne)
- 4) [Objective 6](#) and [Objective 8](#): (Cathy and Joanne)
- 5) [Objective 9](#): (Shu-Yuan and Joanne)

Consensus to include a blanket reminder in each report to file timely reports and include all types and locations of course offerings in the data collected and assessed in the single report (e.g. online, face-to-face, Early College, remote locations, etc.)

MOTION: Provide the Feedback Summaries as amended back to the departments. Motion seconded. **Motion passed.**

c. [ANTH 2203 proposal](#) existing course as new Objective 8 course (no UCC proposal required)

Discussion. It was suggested that perhaps some additional research of resources and analytic evaluation of search results warrants inclusion in the Objective focused on imparting sufficient Information Literacy skills for students to apply in their future courses and careers.

Consensus was to **remand** the proposal with comments and feedback to the department for revisions.

5. New Business:

- a. [ENGL 1101/1101P Assessment Plan](#) – for existing Objective 1 course
- b. [SOWK 1101 proposal](#) as new Objective 6 course (corresponds to [AY2022-23 UCC Proposal #36](#))
- c. [ENGL 2215 proposal](#) as new Objective 9 course (corresponds to [AY2022-23 UCC Proposal #51](#))
- d. [PHIL 2260 proposal](#) as new Objective 7 course (corresponds to [AY2022-23 UCC Proposal #53](#))

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a. *Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations*
- b. Revisit [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)
- c. [Objective Review Committee \(ORC\) Report Action Items](#)
 - 1) Consider suggested changes to [Objective 7](#) Outcomes 4 and 5
 - 2) Consider creating subcommittee to update [Objective 8](#) outcomes
- d. *Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine*
- e. *Pilot assessment project*
- f. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
- g. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- h. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- i. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:33 p.m.

Approved by GERC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot
Accepted by UCC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot
Accepted by Faculty Senate: October 25, 2021
Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 5, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, October 12th, 2021

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Sacha Johnson, Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Joann Trimmer
Excused: Ben Crosby; Margaret Johnson, Carmen Febles (UCC), Catherine Read
Guest: none

Announcements

- Sacha Johnson introduction.
- Minutes will be emailed soon for approval, look out for them.
- No updates.

Unfinished business

- SOWK 1101 course proposal and assessment plan
 - Discussion of Google docs comments on grading vs assessment.
 - Robust discussion of grading vs assessment.
 - Suggested feedback on assessment from Ann Hackert might be useful.
 - **Motion** (Attebery, second Fulton) Approve the course proposal for Objective 6, but remand the assessment plan to the department for revision. **Motion passed; SOWK 1101 approved** as Objective 6 Gen Ed, **Assessment Plan remanded**.
- ENGL 2215 course proposal and assessment plan
 - An issue came up about whether this course should be Objective 4 or Objective 9. Very similar courses taught at other schools are usually transferred in as Objective 4.
 - Staffing issues. Whether the right staffing exists to teach this course as an Objective 9 course, but a competing question arose as to whether this sort of question is within GERC's scope.
 - It was felt the proposal was incomplete and is was, due to this, hard to determine whether this was an Objective 4 or Objective 9 course.
 - **Motion** (Tokle, second Attebery) Remand the proposal back to the department for further clarification of the appropriateness of this course for Objective 9 and for a more complete proposal. **Motion passed; entire proposal was remanded**.
- PHIL 2260 course proposal and assessment plan
 - There was a very positive discussion of the course as appropriate for Objective 7.
 - The assessment plan produced considerable confusion.

- In particular, the size of classes and plan to assess only every third year caused committee members to be concerned about whether this plan would best facilitate continuous improvement and whether sample sizes might be too small.
- **Motion** (Attebery, second Fulton) Approve the course proposal for Objective 7, but remand the assessment plan back to the department. Motion passed; **PHIL 2260 approved** for Objective 7 Gen Ed; **Assessment Plan remanded**.
- A short general discussion about how to handle the logistics of courses remanded back to departments for revised assessment plans ensued.
- ANTH 2203 course proposal and assessment plan
 - The proposal has been remanded to the department and they have not yet responded.
 - A brief discussion brought out a concern that the course just uses information literacy tools in an archaeological setting, and is not broadly a course about information literacy, in a more general sense.
 - There is no motion at this time.
- ENGL 1101/1101P Assessment plan
 - There was a very brief, positive, discussion.
 - **Motion** (Tokle, second Attebery) Approve assessment plan. **Motion passed, Assessment Plan was approved.**
- The faculty survey still resides in unfinished business

Meeting adjourned: 4:24 pm

Approved by GERC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot
 Accepted by UCC: October 21, 2021 via email ballot
 Accepted by Faculty Senate: October 25, 2021
 Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 5, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, October 26th, 2021

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Joann Trimmer, Catherine Read
Excused: Sacha Johnson, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements:

- ISU received two Commendations and two Recommendations from the accreditors after their site visit. Nothing directly about Gen Ed, but GERC could be affected by the recommendation to disaggregate student outcomes.
- A call will soon go out to departments to revisit their Assessment Plans. There are three reasons for potential revisions: process drift from approved plans, align with SBOE's revised learning outcomes, and departments' desire to update their plans. Revised Plans will be due February 28, 2022.
- Annual Assessment reports are due this Monday, November 1. GERC will be reviewing those reports in early Spring.

2. Council **approved via email vote** the Minutes for [August 31, 2021](#), [September 14, 2021](#), [September 28, 2021](#) and [October 12, 2021](#). UCC has accepted the Minutes and forwarded them to Faculty Senate and Associate Deans/Academic Affairs.

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
- Members encouraged to read the full report from NWCCU when it becomes available; the information may be very helpful for GERC.
 - Have departments work with Ann Hackert as they work on revising Assessment Plans.
 - Ann Hackert and Matt Wilson will get together sometime in the next month or so to go through the Assessment Manual they've been working on.
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson
- Provost Karen Appleby will be hosting a faculty town hall on Academic Freedom on Friday, November 5 at 1:00 p.m. providing updates on the recent legislative changes and how those will impact faculty.
 - Confirmed the SBOE did have the second reading of the GEM outcomes but not sure whether any last-minute changes were made.
- c. UCC update – Carmen Febles
- UCC changed its proposal form this Spring, adding Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) on a course level and program level. However, this is an information gathering step at the moment, so UCC will not be holding up proposals for incomplete SLOs.
 - Biology's proposal to remove BIOL 1100L lab course only from the catalog altogether is still in development; it will come to GERC for their consideration and approval before UCC will take it up.
 - If student learning outcomes become more integral to the catalog process, GERC might become more involved with course-level outcomes. The option of UCC creating a new subcommittee to oversee assessment and learning outcomes is also on the table for discussion

- As soon as the UCC proposal to delete BIOL 1100L is submitted and processed it will come to GERC for consideration.

4 Unfinished Business:

a. [Faculty Survey re: Gen Ed Program and Assessment](#) – reformatted for GERC to mark up

Subcommittee Members: Joanne Tokle, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (PoliSci)

Joanne Tokle suggested members go back to their constituent faculty and ask for their input before GERC progresses much further with this survey. This is a good time to consider making changes to the Gen Ed program since GERC is wrapping up the first Gen Ed assessment cycle. Discussion.

- Some concern about the length of the survey, and whether the questions being posed are still relevant.
- Suggestion to ask faculty whether they would like a new or different Objective.
- Another suggestion to eliminate the survey questions about Objectives 1 through 6 since those are not under ISU's control. However, ISU faculty do have input on the Objectives, and GERC does have purview over which courses belong in each Objective (other than the Common Courses).
- Broad and guiding question about the purpose of general education might be useful to ask.
- Consider moving forward with the summit or workshops as discussed a couple of years ago with the NIOLA coach. The data that could be gathered from such a workshop could be quite useful.
- Languages are difficult to fit into the current gen ed structure. Many faculty still see a lot of value of students learning a foreign language.
- Some concerns whether faculty understanding about general education is too broad to be useful; programs traditionally associated with general education could value a well-rounded education versus professional programs may have a more narrow focus on preparing students for their future occupations.
- Seeking faculty input is a good step, but GERC has the ultimate responsibility for shaping and overseeing the gen ed program.
- Invite faculty to think creatively about what a gen ed program should look like rather than be critically focused on the existing structure.

ACTION: Joanne Tokle volunteered to come up with a revised draft for members to consider next time.

- b. [SOWK 1101 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 6; **Plan** awaiting revisions.
 - Ann Hackert is working with the Social Work faculty on revisions.
- c. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
- d. [ENGL 2215 proposal](#) as new Objective 9 course (corresponds to [AY 2022-23 UCC Proposal #51](#)). **Entire proposal** was remanded last meeting, awaiting revisions. Unclear whether course is better suited for Objective 4 or Objective 9.
 - Response from Tom Klein indicated they intend to revise the course from the ground up
- e. [ANTH 2203 proposal](#) existing course as new Objective 8 course (no UCC proposal required). Entire proposal **remanded** last meeting, awaiting revisions
 - The impetus behind this proposal is to help students master skills they haven't been learning as well as needed.

ACTION: Matt Wilson will contact the POs on these proposals and request they resubmit in time for GERC to consider on November 12 in order to meet UCC's catalog deadline.

5. New Business:

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

- concerns raised re: Director of Composition for Obj. 1; filling mid-term vacancies; Obj 1 & 2 only have 1 dept. each (ENGL & CMP)
- follow original protocol for filling Fall 2021 vacancies, start new election process this Spring

Matt Wilson briefly reviewed the reasons the process was developed, and the problems that have been subsequently identified that need to be addressed. The process was modeled on how other committee representatives are selected. They are essentially a subcommittee of GERC, though GERC will not be reviewing and accepting their work or their minutes.

Problems are that the English department's Director of Composition and CMP's Speech Communications Director have traditionally been the representatives for Objectives 1 and 2. Changing this practice would be detrimental to those two Objectives. The departments have systems in place for choosing their Directors. Discussion. Term limits have some definite drawbacks with continuity, forcing someone off even though they may be very well suited and would prefer to continue serving. On the other hand, there is some value in ensuring someone less suited does not stay on indefinitely, and there is enough turnover that more faculty are involved and become familiar with the work. Electing replacements is a good idea. Consider revising the eligibility requirements to encourage tenured faculty to serve on this committee.

ACTION: Matt Wilson will contact Jim DiSanza and ask whether he has any concerns about the process for selecting Objective 2 rep. Matt will revise the process document to address the concerns about Objectives 1 and 2, and adjust the term limit language as discussed. Still need to address mid-term replacements in the document, calling for emergency elections when needed outside the regular elections.

Current Discipline Group Reps with suggested rotation to be discussed

Margaret Johnson: Obj. 1: Written Communication (CAL) Dir. Of Composition -- **replace Spring 2022**
Hal Hellwig: Obj. 1: Written Communication (CAL) -- seat goes away, no replacement?? Or, have the new Dir. of Comp serve now and take over for Margaret next year?

Jim DiSanza: Obj. 2: Oral Communication (CAL) – **replace Spring 2023**

Robert Fisher: Obj. 3: Mathematical (COSE, RCET, TGE, MGT) -- **replaced for Fall 2021-Spring 2024**

Jim Wolper: Obj. 3: Mathematical (COSE, RCET, TGE, MGT) – **2-Year replaced for Fall 2021-Sp 2023**

Xiao Xia (Jessica) Xie, (CoSE) -- *which term should she get: 3-Year or 2-Year?*

Don Allen, (CoT) - *which term should he get: 3-Year or 2-Year?*

Ryan Babcock (CAL) Obj. 4: Humanistic and Artistic (CAL, CSD, TGE) -- **Fall 2021 -Spring 2024**
replaced Pat Brooks in Fall 2021

Tom Klein: Obj. 4: Humanistic and Artistic (CAL, CSD, TGE) – **replace Spring 2023**

Andy Holland: Objective 5: Scientific (COSE, ANTH, NTD) -- **replace Spring 2022**

Eddie Tatar: Objective 5: Scientific (COSE, ANTH, NTD) – **replace Spring 2023**

Kevin Marsh (CAL): Objective 6: Social and Behavioral (CAL, ECON, EDUC, TGE)- **Fall 2021-Sp 2024**
replaced Gesine Hearn in Fall 2021

Erika Fulton: Objective 6: Social and Behavioral (CAL, ECON, EDUC, TGE) – **replace Spring 2022**

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- Revisit [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)
- [Objective Review Committee](#) (ORC) Report Action Items
 - 1) Consider suggested changes to [Objective 7](#) Outcomes 4 and 5
 - 2) Consider creating subcommittee to update [Objective 8](#) outcomes
- Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine
- Pilot assessment project
- Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
- Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and

UCC/Faculty Senate approval.

- h. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- i. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:40 p.m.

Approved by GERC: November 3, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: November 4, 2021

Accepted by Faculty Senate: November 8, 2021

Accepted by Academic Affairs: November 12, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, November 9th, 2021

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby,
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Joann Trimmer, Sacha Johnson, Catherine Read
Excused: Erika Fulton, Matt Wilson, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements – none

2. Council **approved** the Minutes for **October 26, 2021** via email vote 11/3/2021

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - Ann is working with the assessment plan writers for Physics and SOWK 1101; revised plans should be coming through soon
 - Matt and Ann have a little more work to do on the Gen Ed Assessment Manual they wrote this summer; will bring it to GERC for members to look over soon.
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson -- none this week
 - SBOE approved revised GEM outcomes, will need to update the Gen Ed section of the catalog via Proposal #70 below.
 - No decision from OSBE yet whether the GEM Rubric will be mandated by the state. The answer will determine how much departments will need to update their assessment plans.
- c. UCC update –
Proposals are coming through more slowly this year, but will get done in time for the catalog. As several proposals are still being developed, unclear at this time whether further changes to gen ed courses will need GERC's review and approval.
- d. English has WITHDRAWN the [ENGL 2215 proposal](#). Since the new course would not be suited for Objective 9, and the department already has several Objective 4 Gen Ed courses, they have decided not to create the course at this time. The department may bring a revised proposal to GERC in the future.
- e. Anthropology has WITHDRAWN, for now at least, their [ANTH 2203 proposal](#) existing course as new Objective 8 course (no UCC proposal required). They may bring a revised proposal back to GERC in the future.
- f. Patty Sanchez from OSBE is checking with OSBE staff on status of [GEM Rubrics](#) and whether they will be/are mandated for use by institutions. [SBOE Policy III.N.2.b](#): "Establish shared rubrics that guide course/general education program assessment;" – this **did not change** in the revised policy approved by SBOE in October 2021. OSBE's answer will affect how departments will need to revise their Assessment Plans this Fall/early Spring in accordance with the newly approved revisions to GEM Objective Competencies.

4 Unfinished Business:

- a. [SOWK 1101 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 6; **Plan** has been revised

and is ready for consideration.

GERC members wanted more time to consider the revisions; deferred until the next meeting.

- b. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
No progress on this one yet; still awaiting revisions.
- c. Revisions to [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)
Some discussion of the proposed revisions, but no action taken; deferred until the next meeting.

Current Discipline Group Reps with suggested rotation to be discussed

Margaret Johnson: Obj. 1: Written Communication (CAL) Dir. Of Composition -- ~~replace Spring 2022~~
~~Hal Hellwig: Obj. 1: Written Communication (CAL)~~ -- seat goes away, no replacement?? Or, have the
new Dir. of Comp serve now and take over for Margaret next year?

Jim DiSanza: Obj. 2: Oral Communication (CAL) – ~~replace Spring 2023~~

~~Robert Fisher: Obj. 3: Mathematical (COSE, RCET, TGE, MGT) -- replaced for Fall 2021-Spring 2024~~

~~Jim Wolper: Obj. 3: Mathematical (COSE, RCET, TGE, MGT) – 2-Year replaced for Fall 2021-Sp 2023~~

Xiao Xia (Jessica) Xie, (CoSE) - ~~which term should she get: 3-Year or 2-Year?~~

Don Allen, (CoT) –~~which term should he get: 3-Year or 2-Year?~~

Ryan Babcock (CAL) Obj. 4: Humanistic and Artistic (CAL, CSD, TGE) -- ~~Fall 2021 -Spring 2024~~
replaced **Pat Brooks** in Fall 2021

Tom Klein: Obj. 4: Humanistic and Artistic (CAL, CSD, TGE) –~~replace Spring 2023~~

Andy Holland: Objective 5: Scientific (COSE, ANTH, NTD) –~~replace Spring 2022~~

Eddie Tatar: Objective 5: Scientific (COSE, ANTH, NTD) –~~replace Spring 2023~~

Kevin Marsh (CAL): Objective 6: Social and Behavioral (CAL, ECON, EDUC, TGE)- ~~Fall 2021-Sp 2024~~
replaced **Gesine Hearn** in Fall 2021

Erika Fulton: Objective 6: Social and Behavioral (CAL, ECON, EDUC, TGE) – ~~replace Spring 2022~~

5. New Business:

- a. [Draft GERC email to departments soliciting input on Gen Ed Program](#) – from Joanne Tokle as discussed last meeting
Subcommittee Members: Joanne Tokle, Abbey Hadlich, Jim Stoutenborough (PoliSci)
Original [Faculty Survey re: Gen Ed Program and Assessment](#). See Oct. 26 Minutes for GERC's concerns.
Members made a few adjustments to the wording. Each representative will distribute the message to their individual constituents and collect the faculty responses, which they will provide to GERC members.

ACTION: Moved and seconded to approve the email to constituents as revised. Motion **passed**.

Members will email the message to their respective constituent faculty (not just department chairs).
Joanne Tokle will distribute to faculty in College of Health and College of Pharmacy, since the two Health Science seats on GERC are both vacant.

ACTION: Council decided to meet on November 30, in lieu of November 23 that falls during Thanksgiving Break.

- b. Objective Review Committee (ORC) Report Action Items - develop a plan and timeline
 - 1) Consider suggested changes to [Objective 7](#) Outcomes 4 and 5:

The committee suggests slight changes in verbage to Outcomes 4 and 5

- 4. Create, analyze, and ~~evaluate/interpret~~ **evaluate and/or interpret** diverse perspectives and solutions. (The committee agreed that not all courses in Objective 7 can accomplish all aspects of this outcome so “and/or” was inserted for flexibility)

5. ~~Establish~~ **Articulate** a reasoned framework for drawing conclusions and/or recommending solutions. (The committee agreed that “articulate” is more measurable than “establish”)
- 2) Consider creating subcommittee to update **Objective 8** outcomes [bolded emphasis added] Considering the significant development of the technologies that have mediated and continue to mediate the creation, distribution, and use of information over the past 20 years, **the committee would recommend that GERC consider updating Objective 8 outcomes.** Since the conception of this Objective at ISU, the Association of College and Research Libraries’ (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education (2000) (pp. 2-3) from which the Objective 8 outcomes were derived have been supplanted by a new set of standards, the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (2016); **in light of this, the GERC may wish to revise the current Objective 8 competencies to conform to the ACRL’s new information literacy standards.**

Current competencies:

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

ACTION: Motion and seconded to **approve the Objective 7 changes** for inclusion in Proposal #70 **and table the Objective 8 changes** until the new semester after faculty feedback on the Gen Ed program is received and reviewed. Motion **passed** unanimously; the changes to Objective 7 were entered into Proposal #70,

- c. UCC **Proposal #70 DRAFT** from **GERC** to update the Gen Ed Program section of the catalog with new Gen Ed courses and GEM Outcomes.
So far, the new Gen Ed courses PHIL 2260 and SOWK 1101 added, GEM Competencies updated to match revised SBOE Policy III.N. *Unknown as yet whether UCC Proposals still in development will affect Gen Ed courses or Program – Catherine will check on this.*
Not ready for consideration yet. The changes to Objective 7 competencies as approved above were added to the proposal.
- d. UCC **Proposal #30** from **Biology** to remove BIOL 1100L lab only from the catalog. Requires GERC approval to approve removing the lab from the Gen Ed program.
Much discussion on the broader ramifications of removing one of the few lab courses available to students in non-science majors with weaker Math skills, and on the Gen Ed program as whole. Another week of thoughtful consideration and discussion with faculty constituents is warranted before voting on this proposal. Many courses in Objective 5 are heavily skewed toward students with better math and science skills and interests.

ACTION: Members decided to **postpone** this proposal until next meeting on November 30 to allow more time to assess the impact of removing this lab option from the Gen Ed program. Joanne Tokle will check with the affected programs to make sure they have carefully considered the broader implications on their students, particularly where the MATH 1108 placement prerequisite in many labs could preclude many students from taking those courses.

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- b. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine

- c. Pilot assessment project
- d. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
- e. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- f. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- g. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:38 p.m.

Approved by GERC: November 30, 2021

Accepted by UCC: December 2, 2021

Accepted by Faculty Senate: December 15, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: December 22, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, November 30th, 2021

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby; Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Margaret Johnson, Abbey Hadlich, Joann Trimmer, Carmen Febles (UCC), Catherine Read
Excused: Ann Hackert, Sacha Johnson
Guest: none

1. Announcements –

- No revised Physics assessment plans will be submitted this fall, probably coming in Spring.
- A blanket call will be going out to faculty to revisit their assessment plans. Departments' practices have drifted away from their assessment plans; also need to align with new SBOE outcomes.
- GERC needs to decide whether to change the assessment reporting form to ask for tiered reporting of student mastery of competencies rather than binary "meets/does not meet."

2. Council approved the Minutes for [November 9, 2021](#)

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Faculty Feedback regarding Gen Ed Program – a couple of faculty responses were posted
- b. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert: no report
- c. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson
Nothing in addition to Provost's recent Town Hall. Working on sabbatical requests. No update yet on Provost search or possible start date for new Provost.
- d. UCC update – Carmen Febles
UCC met just before Thanksgiving Break, and Executive Committee met and discussed Biology Proposal #30, which was remanded back to Biology to reconsider and to collect impacts from departments offering the alternative lab courses that students would likely take. Carmen will check with the Biology Chair to find out whether they would be willing to hold off a year on this proposal.
- e. Catherine following up with Patty Sanchez from OSBE whether proposed [GEM Rubrics](#) will be/are mandated for use by institutions. [SBOE Policy III.N.2.b](#): "Establish shared rubrics that guide course/general education program assessment;" – this **did not change** in the revised policy approved by SBOE in October 2021. OSBE's answer will affect how departments will need to revise their Assessment Plans this Fall/early Spring in accordance with the newly approved revisions to GEM Objective Competencies.
Matt Wilson reported that GERC's Executive Committee has decided not to ask departments to incorporate SBOE Rubrics at this time, since those Rubrics are not finalized yet, and it is still an open question whether the Rubrics will be mandated or not. GERC will be considering whether to require tiered reporting of student learning when departments submit their annual assessment reports.

4 Unfinished Business:

- a. Revisions to [Process for Selecting ISU's State Gen Ed Discipline Group Reps](#)
ACTION: Motion to approve the revised process. Motion **passed**. This document will be forwarded to UCC for their acceptance, then on to Faculty Senate and Associate Deans/Academic Affairs for acceptance.

- b. UCC [Proposal #30](#) from **Biology** to remove BIOL 1100L lab only from the catalog. Requires GERC approval to approve removing the lab from the Gen Ed program.
- Discussion. Analysis of Math requirements for all existing labs: several of the courses have MATH 1108 as pre-requisites. Math Dept. does not want non-STEM students taking MATH 1108 anyway, so suggests changing that prerequisite to simply require Objective 3 have been met. This point of view is also supported by Complete College of America.

Regarding this proposal, a few years ago Biology was mandated to offer BIOL 2227/2228, which is taking the resources that had been devoted to BIOL 1100/1100L. This is a staffing and resource problem for the department. There are other Objective 5 lab options for non-science majors; will impact those other courses since they will need to absorb the students that would have otherwise taken BIOL 1100L.

Once a course is dropped from the catalog, it is hard to reinstate it later. It is not an unusual practice to keep a course on the books but not teach it while assessing the actual impact of its absence. GEOL 1101/1101L is a case in point; the department has not offered it for a few years now, as the department has been evaluating the impact of its absence. GERC members were generally supportive of keeping the course on the books if Biology were to choose to hold off on eliminating this lab for another year or two.

Discussion also raised the issue of the university not adequately supporting departments offering large-enrollment service courses in the Gen Ed program that benefit other programs by not ensuring those departments receive the necessary funding and resources to continually offer those courses.

ACTION: Motion and seconded to **endorse** Biology's proposal to remove the BIOL 1100L lab from the catalog. Discussion. Vote: 4 in favor and 3 opposed, motion **passed**.

- c. UCC [Proposal #70](#) from **GERC** to update the Gen Ed Program section of the catalog with new Gen Ed courses and GEM Outcomes.

The new Gen Ed courses PHIL 2260 and SOWK 1101 were added, and GEM Competencies were updated to match revised SBOE Policy III.N. BIOL 1100L was removed from Objective 5 in accordance with GERC's motion approved above, *contingent upon approval of [Proposal #30](#)*.

ACTION: Motion and seconded to **approve** Proposal #70 with the corrections and use of lower case Roman numerals for all Objective competencies instead of bullet points to align with SBOE and GERC usage. Motion **passed** unanimously, proposal was approved.

- d. [SOWK 1101 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 6; **Plan** has been revised and is ready for consideration.

Discussion. Still some doubt that a final exam grade is sufficiently reflective of student achievement of each outcome. Plan needs a rubric showing how the exams will be used to evaluate student performance separate from the grade. Also, need to show how the loop will be closed when an inadequacy is identified and a solution is implemented: what process will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of that solution and over what timeframe. Need to better differentiate grading from assessment. Students' ability to do well on a test is not really reflective of how well they have mastered the material.

GERC's consensus was that all departments need to pay more attention to reviewing their assessment process and outcome results, and ensure they are taking actions to close the loop.

ACTION: Motion to **remand** with the request for the department to add an assessment schedule and not to conflate grading with assessment. Seconded. Motion **passed**.

Next meeting is **December 14** to finish off the remaining items for this semester.

- e. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions

5. New Business:

- a. Gen Ed Assessment Training Manual – Ann Hackert and Matt Wilson – *not received yet*
- b. Revised Physics Assessment Plans – *have not been received yet*
- c. Potential revisions to Qualtrics survey: GERC had concerns that annual assessment reporting is binary (S/U) whereas many dept. rubrics in their assessment plans are multi-tiered
 - Binary does not show progress in student learning, whereas 3- or 4-tier reporting does
 - Departments will need to revisit their Assessment Plans this year
 - Any changes to report questions will create a new spreadsheet, not add to existing cumulative spreadsheet Vince currently provides to GERC

Draft SBOE Rubrics for reference: all have 3-tiered levels:

[Objective 1 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds

[Objective 2 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds

[Objective 3 Rubrics](#): Does Not Meet, Partially Meets, Meets

[Objective 4 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds

[Objective 5 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds

[Objective 6 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds

- d. [Gen Ed Program Feedback from Faculty](#)

Reminder to Obj. 9 departments that 5-Year Reports are due Jan 18, need to select their ORC reps

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- b. Objective 8 outcome changes – early Spring 2022 after faculty feedback is received
- c. Objective 8 Working Group update – Spencer Jardine
- d. Pilot assessment project
- e. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
- f. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- g. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- h. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:33 p.m.

Approved by GERC: December 14, 2021

Accepted by UCC: December 14, 2021

Accepted by Faculty Senate: December 15, 2021 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: December 22, 2021

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, December 14th, 2021

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby; Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Sacha Johnson, Catherine Read
Excused: Margaret Johnson, Joann Trimmer, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements – none

2. Council approved the Minutes for [November 30, 2021](#)

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - Next semester departments will turn in their annual reports, and will develop rubrics to evaluate those reports and their program reviews. Ann Hackert is working with the University Assessment Committee, and is hoping to provide feedback to departments by the end of January.
 - Please read the NWCCU report shared with GERC members.
 - The Office of Assessment is still planning to pilot an assessment system for a couple of Gen Ed Objectives, and will bring the ideas to GERC later this spring.
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson: none
- c. UCC update – Carmen Febles: none

4 Unfinished Business:

- a. Resolve whether to change annual assessment reporting from binary “meets/does not meet” to 3-or 4-tier reporting.
 - GERC had concerns that annual assessment reporting is binary (S/U) whereas many dept. rubrics in their assessment plans are multi-tiered
 - Binary does not show progress in student learning, whereas 3- or 4-tier reporting does

Reference documents to help guide this discussion:

- [List of Gen Ed Course Rubrics](#) from departments' Assessment Plans - compiled by Joanne Tokle
- **Draft** SBOE Rubrics for reference: all have **3-tiered** levels as confirmed with Patty Sanchez at the Office of the State Board of Education:
 - [Objective 1 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds
 - [Objective 2 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds
 - [Objective 3 Rubrics](#): Does Not Meet, Partially Meets, Meets
 - [Objective 4 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds
 - [Objective 5 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds
 - [Objective 6 Rubrics](#): Entry-Level, Meets, Exceeds

A call to departments needs to go out this week to revisit their Gen Ed Courses Assessment Plans to ensure the plans are up-to-date with current practice and align with the updated learning outcomes revised this semester. Question to resolve today is to decide whether to change from binary reporting to more scalar multi-tier reporting, and standardizing the tiers to be used. The Gen Ed assessment reporting questions will be changed in Qualtrics this summer to match the updated GEM outcomes anyway, so GERC has this spring to finalize all changes they want to make to those questions. Discussion ensued debating the merits and practicality of binary versus scalar reporting. Grades are not appropriate for assessing the outcomes since grades reflect the entire course not just the gen ed learning outcomes. Good support for making all changes at once rather than piecemeal over the next few years. Departments use their own category tiers in evaluating how well their

students are performing and improving, but those tiers may differ from anything GERC or the State might ask for. Unclear whether that degree of granularity is necessary in what is reported to GERC since departments will use their own metrics to inform their decision-making.

ACTION: Consensus was to leave the binary reporting in place, at least for now.

This concluded the important business for this fall; the remaining items will be taken up next semester.

5. Deferred until next semester (placeholders):

- a. [SOWK 1101 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 6; **Plan** was **remanded** for revision in accordance with GERC's suggestions, and to include an assessment schedule, and not conflate grading with assessment.
- b. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
- c. Gen Ed Assessment Training Manual – Ann Hackert and Matt Wilson – *not received yet*
- d. Revised Physics Assessment Plans – *have not been received yet*
- e. [Gen Ed Program Feedback from Faculty](#)

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- b. Objective 8 outcome changes – early Spring 2022 after faculty feedback is received
- c. Pilot assessment project
- e. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
 - Changes to report questions will create a new spreadsheet, not add to existing cumulative spreadsheet Vince currently provides to GERC
- f. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- g. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- h. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 3:50 pm

Approved by GERC: January 25, 2022

Accepted by UCC: February 2, 2022 via email vote

Accepted by Faculty Senate: February 7, 2022

Accepted by Academic Affairs: February 9, 2022

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, January 25, 2022

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Sacha Johnson, Margaret Johnson, Joann Trimmer, Catherine Read
Excused: Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements –

- **Information item:** [GERC Assessment Reporting Status](#) – new 5-Year Reports are linked, and annual 2020-21 assessment reports received so far are indicated by “X”s in the first column (ignore color-coding for now).
- Executive Committee met with Ann Hackert to coordinate assessment plan revisions; turns out there are only a few courses in Objective 6 that will require updated plans to meet new GEM learning outcomes. The call will go out this week once the current plans are archived and standardized for the new assessment cycle. GERC representatives should work with the Objective 6 departments as they update their plans.
- Ann Hackert intends to hold an assessment workshop to help departments and faculty understand what they need to do.

Matt turned the meeting over to Joanne to chair the remainder of this meeting.

2. Council **approved** the Minutes for [December 14, 2021](#)

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - Once the call for revised assessment plans goes out, Ann will work with the GERC Executive Committee to ensure her workshops fit with GERC's objectives.
 - Ann plans to propose implementing a summer stipend for the GERC chair because she has work for GERC to coordinate during the summer break
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson

Margaret displayed the agenda for the upcoming General Education Summit scheduled for April 4-5, which had been postponed from October 2021. The first day will focus on assessment, and dual credit will be discussed during the second day. The Discipline Groups will be working in February and March on discipline-specific tasks they identify in preparation for the Summit.
- c. UCC update –

The updated proposal form and tracking sheet for the new catalog cycle will be available sometime in mid-February. The Registrar's Office is still busy finishing up the Fall 2022 catalog. Colleges are working on the 2022 Three-Year Plan right now, so departments should be coordinating their program changes with their deans and associate deans.

4 Unfinished Business:

- a. [SOWK 1101 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 6; **Plan** was **remanded** for revision in accordance with GERC's suggestions, and to include an assessment schedule, and not conflate grading with assessment.

No revisions received yet, so this item was deferred for a subsequent meeting.

- b. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
No revisions received yet, so this item was deferred for a subsequent meeting.
- c. Gen Ed Assessment Training Manual – Ann Hackert and Matt Wilson – *not received yet*
- d. Revised Physics Assessment Plans – *have not been received yet*

e. [Gen Ed Program Feedback from Faculty](#)

Three of the comments received were from the same person. Language courses at the 1000 level are GEM Common Courses, so have to stay within Objective 4 to be consistent statewide. ISU's subdesignations (Fine Arts, Humanities, Languages) within Objective 4 are not shared by all institutions statewide. The question for GERC now to consider is whether and how to proceed with a survey.

ACTION: Joanne Tokle and Abbey Hadlich will work together to figure out the next steps and have something for the full committee next time.

- f. Create subcommittee to revise Objective 8 competencies – after faculty feedback received and reviewed (*Objective Review Committee (ORC) Report Action Item*)

Objective 8 ORC: Matt Wilson, chair

... the committee would recommend that GERC consider updating Objective 8 outcomes. Since the conception of this Objective at ISU, the Association of College and Research Libraries' (ACRL) Information Literacy Competency Standards for Higher Education (2000) (pp. 2-3) from which the Objective 8 outcomes were derived have been supplanted by a new set of standards, the Framework for Information Literacy for Higher Education (2016); in light of this, the GERC may wish to revise the current Objective 8 competencies to conform to the ACRL's new information literacy standards.

Current outcomes:

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

ACTION: **Cathy Gray and Ann Hackert** (in her role as faculty teaching an Objective 8 course) **volunteered** to serve on this subcommittee.

Last year Ann Hackert and Spencer Jardine continued to collaborate together after the original working group fell apart. This subcommittee can coordinate with the working group members to pick up where they left off. It makes sense for someone from the library to chair this committee but does not have to be a GERC member.

ACTION: Matt will reach out to Spencer Jardine and Phil Homan to see whether they are willing serve on, or coordinate with, this subcommittee.

5. New Business

- a. Select a GERC member to chair the [Objective 9 ORC Review Committee](#)

The criteria GERC has used in the past for selecting the ORC chair is preferring a GERC member who does not have a vested interest in the committee's work, but that is not a precluding factor. The chair mostly coordinates the efforts, but delegates most of the ORC committee's work to the other members. The main criteria is some expertise in the Objective's subject matters.

ACTION: **Shu-Yuan volunteered** to serve as ORC Objective 9 Chair.

The ORC Report is due on April 1 to be submitted to GERC.

- i. Formally task the ORC Committee with reviewing the Objective 9 outcomes; revise if needed

Objective 9 current outcomes – for consideration:

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

- b. Discuss developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

This idea has been on GERC's back-burner for a few years, and is basically developing a big-picture overview of what GERC does and its purpose that could be helpful to future GERC members as well as the university community. This should include updating GERC's website to make it more informative and user-friendly. The faculty survey and updating the Objective learning outcomes are steps GERC is already taking that will help shape a future strategic plan. This item should also wait until the revisions to the university's strategic plan and mission statement are completed and finalized. Suggest members review GERC's website with an eye toward potential changes and improvements.

- c. Matt suggested considering next year's Officer elections for next meeting

Members rotating off this spring are: Jennifer Attebery, Ben Crosby, and Matt Wilson.

Remaining **eligible** members are: **Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yua Lin, Cathy Gray, and DeWayne Derryberry.**

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- b. Pilot assessment project
- c. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
 - Changes to report questions will create a new spreadsheet, not add to existing cumulative spreadsheet
Vince currently provides to GERC
- d. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- e. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- f. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 3:33 p.m.

Approved by GERC: February 8, 2022
Accepted by UCC: February 10, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by Faculty Senate: February 28, 2022
Accepted by Academic Affairs: April 22, 2022

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, February 8, 2022

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Sacha Johnson, Carmen Febles (UCC), Catherine Read
Excused: Joann Trimmer, Margaret Johnson
Guest: none

1. Announcements –

- **Information item:** [GERC Assessment Reporting Status](#) – new 5-Year Reports are linked, and annual 2020-21 assessment reports received so far are indicated by “X”s in the first column (ignore color-coding for now). Some annual reports are still missing; they were due January 18. The available 2020-21 reports will be provided to GERC members soon to start working on the annual Feedback Summaries.
- Elections are being initiated through Faculty Senate to select two Discipline Group reps: one rep for Objective 1 and one rep for Objective 5. Nominations are open to all eligible faculty in the relevant departments.

2. Council approved the Minutes for [January 25, 2022](#)

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - Members were informed Ann Hackert plans to include a screenshot of this GERC meeting in the Assessment Manual. No objections registered.
 - [Gen Ed Workshop: Streamlining Gen Ed Assessment Plans](#)
 - All interested faculty encouraged to attend. The workshop will be recorded, and potentially may be posted on GERC's website as a helpful resource.
 - A Math faculty member has developed a website and initiative to communicate workshop information to Early College faculty asynchronously.
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson

The annual Statewide Gen Ed Summit has been canceled this year. The next Summit will be held this Fall on October 5-7, 2022.
- c. UCC update – Carmen Febles

New proposal form for the 2023-24 catalog cycle is being developed. UCC is still on hiatus until the new cycle begins in a few weeks.

4 Unfinished Business:

- a. [Gen Ed Assessment Training Manual](#) – Ann Hackert and Matt Wilson

Ann Hackert explained she and Matt Wilson wrote this manual last summer as a tool that can be distributed to faculty to help them understand the purpose of assessing Gen Ed courses, GERC's role in assessment, and what the expectations are. Members made a few suggestions to be incorporated. To ensure this manual is ready for use in the upcoming Workshop, any revisions to this document should be finalized at the next GERC meeting. It would be helpful to include a timeline of GERC's assessment process.

ACTION: Members will review the manual between now and next meeting and register suggested edits, comments, concerns, etc.

- b. [SOWK 1101 Assessment Plan](#) – Plan revisions are ready for GERC’s review
- Discussion. Much focus on the problematic use of grades and rubrics in assessment.
- Criteria used to evaluate grades would have to be geared solely toward the criteria for the given outcome. Grades cannot include any other factors unrelated to that particular outcome.
 - As a good example, SBOE’s rubrics use very good verbs that accurately describe student achievement at the various levels. SBOE Obj 6 Rubric:
 - <https://boardofed.idaho.gov/resources/social-and-behavioral-ways-of-knowing/>
 - Make sure the learning outcomes have been updated to match the recently revised GEM outcomes as approved by SBOE.

No action taken on this Plan yet. Matt Wilson will contact the department with GERC’s concerns and suggestions.

- c. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
No action; still awaiting revisions from department.
- d. Revised Physics Assessment Plans – *have not been received yet, but are under way.*
Physics has a new department chair; suggestion made to reach out to him and offer help.
- e. Subcommittee to revise Objective 8 competencies – after faculty feedback received and reviewed
Phil Homan from the Library has agreed to Chair this subcommittee – revisions due end of March
Cathy Gray and Ann Hackert are GERC reps on that subcommittee.

ACTION: Matt Wilson will reach out to Phil Homan and set up a meeting with this subcommittee.

5. New Business

- a. Gen Ed Courses slated for removal from Catalog and from the Gen Ed Program for Fall 2023
Global Studies & Languages department wants to drop obsolete language courses that are no longer being taught. A UCC proposal will be coming through later in the semester for GERC’s consideration.
- | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|
| ARBC 2201, 2202 | GLBL 2207, 2270 |
| CHNS 2201, 2202 | LATN 2201, 2202 |
| CMLT 2207 | RUSS 2201, 2202 |
| GERM 2201, 2202 | |

Carmen Febles met with GERC’s Executive Committee last Friday and explained the upper division language courses that are not part of majors are being slated for elimination. The CMLT courses are likely to change to GLBL prefix. The department is currently in transition. Suggest creating a departmental assessment committee to coordinate among the various language instructors to assure consistency. Assessing for Gen Ed learning outcomes could possibly be done by faculty regardless of language proficiency. GERC does not expect annual or five-year reports for these obsolete courses not being taught.

- b. [Gen Ed Survey](#) draft – Joanne Tokle – *deferred until next meeting for discussion*
- c. Nominations for next year’s Officers: Chair, Vice Chair, Executive Secretary
eligible members: Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry
Consider whom to nominate for next year’s officers; make sure the nominees are willing.
- d. Divide up Feedback Summary workload – *deferred until next meeting for discussion*
Use the template to be provided, and create separate documents for each course.

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC

- b. Annual Gen Ed Feedback Summaries
- c. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- d. Pilot assessment project
- e. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
 - Changes to report questions will create a new spreadsheet, not add to existing cumulative spreadsheet
Vince currently provides to GERC
- f. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- g. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:31 pm

Approved by GERC: April 15, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by UCC: April 18, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 25, 2022
Accepted by Academic Affairs: April 22, 2022

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, February 22, 2022

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Sacha Johnson, Joann Trimmer, Margaret Johnson, Catherine Read
Excused: Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements –

- **Information item:** [GERC Assessment Reporting Status](#) – new 5-Year Reports are linked, and annual 2020-21 assessment reports received so far are indicated by “X”s in the first column (ignore color-coding for now). More reports will be coming in this week. Still waiting for a few straggling annual assessment reports before Vince Miller can run the big spreadsheet. In mid-March faculty reporting access to the Qualtrics Gen Ed assessment survey will be shut off to close this first 5-Year Cycle. The survey will be updated this summer with the new GEM outcomes and GERC’s revised questions, and will be ready in Fall for the 2021-22 assessment reports. Last call for any outstanding assessment reports for this first cycle.

2. Minutes for February 8, 2022 – *forthcoming for next time*

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - [Gen Ed Workshop: Streamlining Gen Ed Assessment Plans](#)
 - Workshop flyer will be sent out next week by Academic Affairs, so watch for that email
 - [GEM Objectives 1-6 Rubrics](#) are now in Google Docs and are linked within the manual. Workshop is next week. Examples and “homework” for a single Objective, and for pieces of several Objectives will be shared with participants. Ann has also created a “crosswalk” for the workshop showing Bloom’s taxonomy. Randa Kress from Math will help Ann with the workshop.
 - Please encourage faculty to attend the assessment workshop.
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson – none this week
- c. UCC update – Carmen Febles – none
New UCC proposal form came out last week; the Registrar’s Office is preparing customized proposals for those who requested them. UCC will not meet until there is business for them later this semester.

4 Unfinished Business:

- a.. Nominations for next year’s Officers: Chair, Vice Chair, Executive Secretary
eligible members: Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry
Chair: nomination and second for Joanne Tokle; she accepted the nomination.
ACTION: Council elected **Joanne Tokle as Chair** for next year.

Secretary: nomination and second for DeWayne Derryberry; he accepted the nomination
ACTION: Council elected **DeWayne Derryberry as Executive Secretary** for next year.

Vice Chair: nomination and second for Shu-Yuan Lin; she accepted the nomination
ACTION: Council elected **Shu-Yuan Lin as Vice Chair** for next year.
- b. [Gen Ed Survey](#) draft – Joanne Tokle

Joanne Tokle and Abbey Hadlich worked together to cut back the original survey and focus on Objectives 7, 8, and 9 since those are ISU's discretionary objectives.

- Suggest adding a “not enough information” option, and a link to the gen ed objectives
- Shorter length is good, survey tone is also good
- Suggest putting the assessment questions into a separate block from the gen ed objectives
- Suggest asking faculty for suggestions for different objectives to be considered for ISU's discretionary objectives other than the current Critical Thinking, Information Literacy, and Cultural Diversity.

Members should post additional comments to this survey for Joanne and Abbey to consider and revise accordingly for next time.

- c. [Gen Ed Assessment Training Manual](#) – Ann Hackert and Matt Wilson
Updated draft was provided for members to review; final version will be prepared for next week's workshop.
- d.. [SOWK 1101 Assessment Plan](#) - department was asked to address GERC concerns last time – still in revision
- e. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
Department is working on this; had some questions; Matt Wilson will work with them.
- f. Revised Physics Assessment Plans – *have not been received yet*
- g. Objective 8 Competencies Review Subcommittee – update (revisions are due to GERC end of March)
Members: **Phil Homan (Chair), Cathy Gray, Ann Hackert**
Subcommittee hasn't had a chance to meet yet.
- h. Establish assessment standards to provide consistent guidance to departments
Need to iron out some discrepancies encountered among different assessment plans in order to give consistent guidance to departments as they work on revisions to their plans. Much discussion ensued.
 - “assess, change, reassess, change, repeat” is the essence of this process
 - [GERC's website](#) describes in [Departmental Obligations: Create Plans](#) what points should be included in assessment plans.
 - the original idea at the beginning of this assessment project is that a department only needs to report assessment of one or two learning outcome(s) each year, but should conduct assessment of all outcomes every year. Assessing all outcomes each year ensures the department identifies problem areas and takes corrective action in a timely manner, then closes the loop. Assessment the following year can show whether or not the corrective actions were effective.

GERC's Executive Committee met last Friday and came up with the following questions for the full committee to discuss and determine some consistent guidance that can be given to departments. Members discussed each question, and made the following motions once a consensus was reached.

Frequency of assessing outcomes, versus annual assessment reporting:

MOTION: Each competency must be assessed at least once in a five year period, but units are encouraged to assess more often. Competencies for which targets are not met should reassess and report within one year after making changes. Motion seconded. **Motion passed.**

How should grades be intertwined with assessment, if at all?

MOTION: Grades on assignments, labs, or exam questions that are uniquely aligned with a competency may be used for assessment. Course grades should not be used for assessment. Motion seconded. **Motion passed.**

Require rubrics? If so, what should they be?

Prospective MOTION for next meeting:

Assessment plans should include procedures, guidelines, or rubrics to evaluate whether targets have been met. Units are encouraged to consider using SBOE or American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) rubrics that are readily available. *No second nor vote taken yet.*

Due to time constraints, this discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

The remaining agenda items were deferred until next meeting:

- i. Divide up Feedback Summary workload – 2 GERC faculty members per group
Use the template to be provided (*forthcoming*) and create separate documents for each course.

Group 1: [Objective 1](#) (3) [Objective 4: Fine Arts](#) (10+2) [Objective 7](#) (7+5)

[Objective 2](#) (1) [Objective 4: Humanities](#) (7+2)

Group 2: [Objective 3](#) (12) [Objective 6](#) (16+4)

Group 3: [Objective 9](#) (16) [Objective 4: Languages](#) (14+1)

Group 4: [Objective 5](#) (17+3) [Objective 8](#) (5+1)

5. New Business

- a. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a.. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
- Changes to report questions will create a new spreadsheet, not add to existing cumulative spreadsheet
Vince currently provides to GERC
- b. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- c. Pilot assessment project
- d. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- f. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC:	April 15, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by UCC:	April 18, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by Faculty Senate:	April 25, 2022
Accepted by Academic Affairs:	April 22, 2022

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, March 8, 2022

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson

Ex-officio: Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Sacha Johnson, Catherine Read

Excused: Margaret Johnson, Joann Trimmer, Carmen Febles (UCC)

Guest: Iris Buder

1. Announcements –

- **Information item:** [GERC Assessment Reporting Status](#) – new 5-Year Reports are linked, and annual 2020-21 assessment reports received so far are indicated by “X”s in the first column (ignore color-coding for now). Still awaiting for one more assessment report; the faculty member is working hard to get it done and submitted. Two more Objective 9 Five-Year Reports came in, also. The Qualtrics Gen Ed survey will be shut off on or about March 20 to close out this reporting cycle. An updated survey will be prepared over the summer for implementation in Fall 2022.
- **Meeting schedule adjustment:** Next regular meeting falls during Spring Break, will likely need to schedule an additional meeting at the end of March to make up for Spring Break. Then only two more meetings in April before the semester ends.
- [Gen Ed Assessment Training Manual](#) - completed and put in a Box folder with other training resources for faculty to reference. Link to the Box folder will be on both GERC website and Assessment website.
- [OER Resources Presentation](#) – **Iris Buder - guest speaker**
Iris is on the SBOE and university-wide Open Educational Resource committees that have been working on identifying and implementing high-quality free or affordable textbooks and class materials. Faculty survey collected feedback from faculty, which the committee compiled into specific recommendations for implementing OER resources beginning Spring 2023. Committee is now asking for additional feedback from GERC, Faculty Senate, Department Chairs, Deans, etc. for the committee to incorporate into final recommendations. Internally ISU is looking for high returns on investment. Iris Buder answered members' questions.
- **FIN 1115 Assessment Plan revisions – New Business item below on this agenda**
As a preliminary overview, Iris Buder explained the changes made to the plan and the rationale for them. As this is new business, GERC members have a couple of weeks to review and prepare before this plan comes up for consideration. Bear in mind the Objective 8 Competencies Review subcommittee is working on potential revisions to the Objective 8 learning outcomes that will be coming to GERC for consideration in the next couple of weeks. The revised learning outcomes may have a bearing on this Plan. Discussion.

Iris Buder left the meeting at this time as she had to get to class.

2. Minutes for February 8, 2022 and February 22, 2022– *forthcoming*

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
Assessment Workshop recap: The workshop went well, and Ann Hackert was quite pleased with the questions and ideas shared by the participants. The workshop was recorded and will be close-captioned. The Assessment Office's newsletter will come out after Spring Break, and will include a link to the workshop video and materials.
- b. Academic Affairs update – none
- c. UCC update – UCC is still on hiatus for now.

4 Unfinished Business:

- a.. [Gen Ed Survey](#) draft – Joanne Tokle

Members discussed the document and suggested a few wording changes. The open-ended questions will help get a better understanding of how faculty perceive the gen ed program and what changes they would like to see, if any.

ACTION: Joanne Tokle will make the suggested changes and send a Beta test of the survey to GERC members to fill out and see how the survey works. The test results will be prepared and discussed at the next meeting.

- b. [SOWK 1101 Assessment Plan](#) - revised and ready for GERC's review
The revisions look good.

MOTION: to **approve** the SOWK 1101 Assessment Plan. Motion seconded. Motion **passed**.

- e. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
Nothing new on this one yet.

- f. Revised Physics Assessment Plans – *have not been received yet; the department is working on these.*

- g. Objective 8 Competencies Review Subcommittee – update (revisions are due to GERC end of March)
Members: **Phil Homan (Chair), Cathy Gray, Ann Hackert**
The working group will be meeting tomorrow, so their report should be coming through soon.

Some further discussion ensued about the problematic use of multiple choice questions in measuring student understanding. Recognition expressed that long answers and essays are not practical for large class sizes. GERC should come up with some consistent guidance that can be applied to most assessment plans.

- h. Establish assessment standards to provide consistent guidance to departments

Require rubrics? If so, what should they be?

Prospective MOTION for consideration

Assessment plans should include procedures, guidelines, or rubrics to evaluate whether targets have been met. Units are encouraged to consider using SBOE or AAC&U American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) rubrics that are readily available.

Discussion continued. Wording needs to clearly communicate what is expected in assessment plans. Debated pros and cons of analytic rubrics versus descriptive rubrics.

Suggested language: Assessment plans should include procedures and guidelines or descriptive rubrics to evaluate whether targets have been met. Units developing rubrics are suggested to model them after SBOE or AAC&U American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) rubrics that are readily available, paying particular attention to

OR:

Assessment plans should include procedures and guidelines or rubrics, descriptive or analytic, to evaluate whether targets have been met.

Due to time constraints, this discussion will be continued at the next meeting.

The remaining agenda items were deferred until next meeting:

- i. Divide up Feedback Summary workload – 2 GERC faculty members per group

Use the template to be provided (*forthcoming*) and create separate documents for each course.

Group 1 (31): [Objective 4: Fine Arts](#) (11) [Objective 4: Humanities](#) (9) [Objective 7](#) (11)

Group 2 (31): [Objective 3](#) (13) [Objective 6](#) (16+2)

Group 3 (31): [Objective 9](#) (16) [Objective 4: Languages](#) (14+1)

Group 4 (28): [Objective 1](#) (3) [Objective 2](#) (1) [Objective 5](#) (18) [Objective 8](#) (5+1)

5. New Business

- a. [FIN 1115 Assessment Plan](#) – revised and ready for GERC’s review
- b. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a.. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics
 - Changes to report questions will create a new spreadsheet, not add to existing cumulative spreadsheet
Vince currently provides to GERC
- b. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- c. Pilot assessment project
- d. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- f. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:33 p.m.

Approved by GERC: April 15, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by UCC: April 18, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by Faculty Senate: April 25, 2022
Accepted by Academic Affairs: April 22, 2022

APPENDIX

OER Presentation with Recommendations

State Board of Education OER Report

Information Gathering and Recommendations
Spring 2022

ROAR

Committee Members

Co-Chairs: Cindy Hill & Jeremy Thomas
College of Arts and Letters: Jeremy Thomas
College of Business: Iris Buder
College of Education: John Curry
College of Science and Engineering: Todd Morris
College of Technology: Mona Doan
Division of Health Sciences: Mary Van Donsel
Library: Kristin Whitman/Sandra Shropshire
ITRC: Kim Tomkinson
Faculty Senate: Dave Bagley
Academic Affairs Administration: Stefanie Shaddock

ROAR

Purpose of the Committee

- The Idaho State Board of Education has directed Idaho's eight public institutions of higher education to submit an initial Open Educational Resource report by June 1, 2022 as part of [SBOE Policy III.U. - Instructional Material Access and Affordability](#).
- The report communicates each institution's implementation plans and goals for Instructional Material Access and Affordability.

ROAR

Achievements

- Regular committee meetings since last Fall
- Presented to Faculty Senate & Dean's Council
- A Qualtrics OER survey went out to all instructors in November 2021.
- From this, recommendations constructed.
- Literature review conducted to confirm OER efficacy and overall quality.
- <https://openedgroup.org/review>

ROAR

Survey

- November 16 – December 3, 2021
- 15 questions
- Received 272 complete responses
 - A total of 310 responses were received
 - 11 responses were 40% complete
 - 27 responses were 67% complete

ROAR

Survey Results

- Top priorities when selecting or adopting course materials
 - Educational quality
 - Cost to students
- 105 instructors said they were not involved in textbook affordability activities.
- 208 instructors were interested in creating new free/affordable materials or using existing materials to develop or update a course.

ROAR

Survey Results

- Top incentives for creating new free or open course materials
 - Stipend
 - Professional development funds
 - Consideration of efforts on Annual Evaluation Reports and/or promotion processes
- Top incentives for adopting new free or open course materials
 - Stipend
 - Professional development funds

ROAR

Recommendations

1. Update course schedule to include OER course markings (beginning Spring 2023, \$0 and \$1-30)
2. Create stipend opportunities for: (1) OER creation and (2) course development affordability projects (already underway this Spring)
3. Identify courses at ISU with high return on investment for OER or affordability projects
4. Promote the inclusion of OER/affordability work in Annual Evaluation Reports and P/T processes

ROAR

Recommendations

5. Offer professional development opportunities related to OER and affordability
6. Address misconceptions and increase awareness of OER and affordability work on campus
7. Encourage the adoption of affordability values in ISU leadership and faculty

ROAR

Next Steps

- Committee continuing to meet and complete draft of report for the SBOE.
- Asking for feedback from:
 - Colleges, department chairs, faculty
 - Deans Council - March 1, 2022
 - Faculty Senate - April 11, 2022
 - Leadership Council - April 18, 2022
 - Administrative Council - May 9, 2022
- Submit report to the State Board of Education - May 23, 2022 (due by June 1)

ROAR

Questions and Feedback

1. Suggestions or concerns?
2. Ways to encourage adoption/creation of OER and/or more affordable course materials?
3. Ways to best communicate to faculty and programs/departments about these initiatives?

ROAR

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, March 29, 2022

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Abbey Hadlich, Joann Trimmer, Ann Hackert, Sacha Johnson, Margaret Johnson, Catherine Read
Excused: Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements –

- **Information item:** [GERC Assessment Reporting Status](#) – new 5-Year Reports are linked, and annual 2020-21 assessment reports received so far are indicated by “X”s in the first column (ignore color-coding for now).
- Question for the council: are there asynchronous online offerings of Gen Ed courses in each of the Objectives that students could take and finish the gen ed program? No one knew offhand; however, the class schedule can be filtered by “**Attribute**” at the bottom to sort out each Objective.

2. Minutes for February 8, 2022, February 22, 2022 and March 8, 2022 – *forthcoming for email vote*

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - Academic and non-academic program review notices are going out this week for those engaging in this process in the Academic year 2022-23
 - The Spring Assessment Office Newsletter is coming out next week and will feature GERC and Gen Eds
 - Ann should have an update by the end of the semester on the assessment software once she gets an idea about the budget for this
- b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson
ISU's Statewide GEM award nominee names are going forward to the state this week.
- c. UCC update – Carmen Febles
UCC's first meeting this spring is this Thursday,

4. Unfinished Business:

- a.. Divide up Feedback Summary workload – 2 GERC faculty members per group - **DUE April 12**
Use the Word template provided by email, and create a separate document for each course. Send all completed summaries to gercmail@isu.edu so Catherine can upload and organize the files for GERC's review and approval.

File Naming convention: PHIL 1101 20-21 AY Obj 4 GERC Assessment Feedback Summary

This naming convention groups each department and course together alphabetically and chronologically, which makes Catherine's life MUCH easier!

Comprehensive Assessment Reporting Spreadsheet from Qualtrics – *(forthcoming)*

Group 1 (31): [Objective 4: Fine Arts](#) (11) [Objective 4: Humanities](#) (9) [Objective 7](#) (11)
Jennifer Attebery, Cathy Gray

Group 2 (31): [Objective 3](#) (13) [Objective 6](#) (16+2)
Shu-Yuan Lin, Joanne Tokle

Group 3 (31): [Objective 9](#) (16) [Objective 4: Languages](#) (14+1)
Erika Fulton, Matt Wilson

Group 4 (28): [Objective 1](#) (3) [Objective 2](#) (1) [Objective 5](#) (18) [Objective 8](#) (5+1)
DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby

- b. Establish assessment standards to provide consistent guidance to departments
Require rubrics? If so, what should they be?

Prospective MOTION for consideration:

Assessment plans should include procedures **and** guidelines, or rubrics to evaluate whether targets have been met. Units are encouraged to consider using SBOE or AAC&U American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) rubrics that are readily available.

Discussion continued from last time. Assessment Plans are not consistent in their use of rubrics. GERC doesn't want to be overly prescriptive in requiring particular rubrics, but the SBOE and AAC&U rubrics are established and widely used.

Revised statement:

Assessment plans should include procedures and guidelines or rubrics to evaluate whether targets have been met. Units are encouraged to use or adapt State Board of Education (SBOE) or American Association of Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) rubrics that are readily available, or to generate a similarly thorough, descriptive rubric. Examples can be found here: <https://teachonline.asu.edu/2019/02/best-practices-for-designing-effective-rubrics/>

MOTION: to **adopt** the revised language with the appropriate links included. Motion seconded. Motion **passed**. *The link to the Box folder set up by the Office of Assessment will be added to this statement over the summer.*

- c. [Gen Ed Survey](#) draft – Joanne Tokle

Pilot test responses from GERC members: [General Education Requirements Committee Survey March 29, 2022 09.15](#)

Discussion. Members' consensus was that the survey was easy to use, didn't seem overburdensome, takes about 10 minutes to complete. To eliminate confusion, add the category of the objectives instead of just referencing the Objective numbers. With a few additional revisions, the survey is about ready to send out to faculty. Consider changing to an open ended question about how faculty share gen ed assessment tasks within their department. Give faculty about 2 weeks to complete the survey once it is finalized and sent out to faculty.

- d. [FIN 1115 Assessment Plan](#) – revised and ready for GERC's review

Discussion. Concerns about the extent of the changes and whether the intent and key concepts of the Objective have been sufficiently retained in the revisions. Joanne Tokle and Ann Hackert will work with the department to rework the Plan. Include a syllabus in the Plan to help flesh out the concepts being taught.

Due to time constraints the remaining items were deferred until later.

- e. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
Nothing new on this one yet.

- f. Revised Physics Assessment Plans – *have not been received yet*

g. Objective 8 Competencies Review Subcommittee – update (revisions are due to GERC end of March)
Members: **Phil Homan (Chair), Cathy Gray, Ann Hackert**

h. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC

5. New Business

a. [Objective 9 Review Committee Report](#) (Shu-Yuan)

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

a.. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics

- Changes to report questions will create a new spreadsheet, not add to existing cumulative spreadsheet
Vince currently provides to GERC

b. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations

c. Pilot assessment project

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

e. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:35 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 2, 2022 via email vote

Accepted by UCC: May 3, 2022 via email vote

Accepted by Faculty Senate: May 11, 2022 via email vote

Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 9, 2022 via email vote

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, April 12, 2022

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Joann Trimmer, Ann Hackert, Sacha Johnson, Catherine Read
Excused: Abbey Hadlich, Margaret Johnson, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements –

- a. [Assessment Plan Review Guide](#) is ready for use in reviewing the Physics Plans once they come through.
- b. Faculty Senate Chair wanted to know whether UCC and GERC need to use a conference room on campus for meetings. Discussion whether to continue meeting via Zoom next year or meet in person.

Committee's consensus was to continue meeting via Zoom; it is much easier to hear everyone than using DL for distant sites and to share documents with the committee. More convenient not to have to move to a different location when one has back-to-back meetings..

2. Minutes –

Council subsequently **approved** the Minutes for [February 8, 2022](#), [February 22, 2022](#), and [March 8, 2022](#) via email vote.

3. Updates and Information:

- a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert
 - Program Review notifications were sent to both academic and non-academic programs that have reviews due this year.
 - Ann is participating in some on-campus site visits from external reviewers for the self-study reports due this year.
 - Last Spring, the University Assessment Review Committee re-wrote the Academic Program Review document in response to lots of feedback received from those who use it. Hopefully that will soon be implemented by Academic Affairs.
 - The Office of Assessment Newsletter soon to be sent to the campus community will feature GERC, Gen Ed Assessment, and Program Review, and will link to the Gen Ed resources provided in the assessment workshop Ann held recently.
 - Please let your constituents know that Ann Hackert is willing and available to help departments with their assessment process and plans.
- b. Academic Affairs update – none this week
- c. UCC update –
Ann Hackert mentioned UCC is no longer requiring learning outcomes in their catalog proposals since assessment is not really part of their purview and no decisions have been made yet where outcomes should be posted or published.

4 Unfinished Business:

- a. Completed Feedback Summaries:
Members have been working on their summaries, but have not had a chance to work with their partners yet. Please finish writing the summaries as soon as possible so everyone has a chance to review the other groups' summaries as needed. Be prepared to vote whether to endorse them next time.

Group 1 (32): Jennifer Attebery, Cathy Gray

[Objective 4: Fine Arts Feedback Summaries](#) (11)
[Objective 4: Humanities Feedback Summaries](#) (9)
[Objective 7: Feedback Summaries](#) (12)

Group 2 (30): Shu-Yuan Lin, Joanne Tokle

[Objective 3 Feedback Summaries](#) (13)
[Objective 6 Feedback Summaries](#) (17)

Group 3 (31): Erika Fulton, Matt Wilson

[Objective 4: Languages Feedback Summaries](#) (15)
[Objective 9 Feedback Summaries](#) (16)

Group 4 (28): DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby

[Objective 1 Feedback Summaries](#) (3)
[Objective 2 Feedback Summaries](#) (1)
[Objective 5 Feedback Summaries](#) (18)
[Objective 8 Feedback Summaries](#) (6)

b. [Objective 9 Review Committee Report](#) (Shu-Yuan)

Discussion.

- Suggest encouraging the faculty who actually teach the courses in Objectives 7, 8, and 9 to get together periodically with their colleagues in each Objective to work out a cohesive approach to assessment, the purpose of the particular objective within the Gen Ed Program, and foster consistency within the Objective.
- Commendation: this working group dealt really well with syllabi in their work in reviewing this Objective.
- Should GERC be a bit more prescriptive regarding specific levels of achievement in rubrics? Good idea to have the faculty in the Objective discuss rubrics and what levels of achievement would be appropriate, though recognize it would be difficult to develop a single set of rubrics for the diverse courses in this Objective. The discussion could be beneficial to get everyone on the same page, and could serve as a model for other departments wanting to teach courses in this Objective.
- Danger of GERC prescribing particular categories of achievement and the number of levels could adversely affect those who are using a particular (in one case, a 4-level) rubric structure very effectively.
- The Value Rubrics are well thought out to cover all Humanities, or Social Sciences, etc. That type of overarching perspective would be a goal for Objectives 7, 8, and 9.

MOTION: to **approve** the Objective 9 ORC Report. Motion seconded. Motion **passed**. The report was approved.

c. [Objective 8 Competencies Review Subcommittee Report](#)– for GERC’s consideration

Subcommittee members: **Phil Homan (Chair), Cathy Gray, Ann Hackert**

GERC members discussed the report’s rubric and outcomes at some length, and made several suggested edits. No final decisions were made as yet. The motions and amendments below are still under consideration for next time.

Objective 8: Information Literacy

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

- i. Determine the nature and extent of the information/data needed to accomplish a specific purpose.
- ii. Identify sources and gather information/data effectively and efficiently.
- iii. Evaluate credibility of sources and information/data.

- iv. ~~Understand~~ Recognize and analyze the economics, ethical, legal, and social issues surrounding the creation, collection, and use of information/data.
- v. Use information/data effectively to accomplish a specific purpose.

MOTION: to approve the change from “Understand” to “Recognize” in outcome iv.
Motion seconded. *No vote taken.*

AMENDMENT: add **Recognize “and analyze”** Motion seconded. Amendment **passed.**

AMENDMENT: delete “Recognize” Motion seconded; friendly amendment accepted by original mover and second. *No vote taken.*

AMENDMENT: ~~Understand~~ Apply the economics, ethical, legal, and social ~~issues~~ (standards, strategies) surrounding the creation, collection, and use of information/data. **No second yet.**

Time ran out while these Motions and Amendments were still under discussion and consideration. No votes have been taken as yet. They will be on the next meeting agenda for further discussion and vote.

FULL AMENDED MOTION: to approve the change from “Understand” to “~~Recognize and Analyze~~” in outcome iv. Amended Motion seconded. *This motion is still subject to the Amendments above once they are finalized and voted upon. Then this motion will change to reflect the approved amendments into the whole so it is clear what is being approved before the final vote is taken.*

Due to time constraints, the rest of the agenda items were deferred until next meeting.

- d. Revisit Annual Assessment Report Questions in Qualtrics
Changes to report questions will create a new spreadsheet, not add to existing cumulative spreadsheet
Vince currently provides to GERC
- e. Bylaws Revisions – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
- f. Gen Ed Survey update – Joanne Tokle
- g.. FIN 1115 Assessment Plan – remanded for revisions
- h. PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
Nothing new on this one yet.
- i. Revised Physics Assessment Plans – *have not been received yet; Physics is working on them*

5. New Business – none this week

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a.. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- b. Pilot assessment project
- c. Consider revising GERC's purpose statement on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- d. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:37 p.m.

Approved by GERC: May 2, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by UCC: May 3, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by Faculty Senate: May 11, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by Academic Affairs: May 9, 2022 via email vote

Minutes

General Education Requirements Committee

Tuesday, April 26, 2022

Zoom link: <https://isu.zoom.us/j/84945656992>

2:30-4:30 p.m.

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

Attendance: Jennifer Attebery, Erika Fulton, Joanne Tokle, Shu-Yuan Lin, Cathy Gray, DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby, Matt Wilson
Ex-officio: Abbey Hadlich, Ann Hackert, Sacha Johnson, Margaret Johnson, Catherine Read
Excused: Joann Trimmer, Carmen Febles (UCC)
Guest: none

1. Announcements – today is the last meeting of the semester.

Today's agenda lists items first that could be taken care of quickly, then by higher priority. If an item takes longer than expected, Matt will move on to the next item to get it done and will circle back to the one requiring longer discussion.

2. Minutes for March 29, 2022 and April 12, 2022 - *will vote via email*

3. Updates and Information:

a. Program Review & Assessment updates – Ann Hackert

- Assessment Handbook will be provided to deans, associate deans, and department chairs in another week or so.
- Ann is working with Physics on their program reviews; she will let GERC know if she hears anything more about their assessment plans.
- Math Department recently had their program review visit; the discussion focused on gen eds.

b. Academic Affairs update – Margaret Johnson

- Please read the Idaho State Today newsletter message on the new [Learning Management System](#), and respond to the [survey](#) about Moodle by May 6.
- The Provost's Town Hall meeting is at 4:00 p.m. today, and will be videorecorded. Margaret encouraged GERC members to either attend the Town Hall if this meeting adjourns in time, or to view the video later.

c. UCC update – UCC does not plan to meet any more this semester; they are finishing up their business via email

4 Unfinished Business:

a. Completed Feedback Summaries:

Group 1 (32): Jennifer Attebery, Cathy Gray

[Objective 4: Fine Arts Feedback Summaries](#) (11)

[Objective 4: Humanities Feedback Summaries](#) (9)

[Objective 7: Feedback Summaries](#) (12)

Group 2 (30): Shu-Yuan Lin, Joanne Tokle

[Objective 3 Feedback Summaries](#) (13)

[Objective 6 Feedback Summaries](#) (17)

Group 3 (31): Erika Fulton, Matt Wilson

[Objective 4: Languages Feedback Summaries](#) (15)

[Objective 9 Feedback Summaries](#) (16)

Group 4 (28): DeWayne Derryberry, Ben Crosby

[Objective 1 Feedback Summaries](#) (3)

[Objective 2 Feedback Summaries](#) (1)

[Objective 5 Feedback Summaries](#) (18)

[Objective 8 Feedback Summaries](#) (6)

Jennifer Attebery noted several of the reports have not been completed, but those she reviewed that were completed looked fine, and she would be comfortable endorsing the completed summaries. A concern raised is not knowing how many students were in each course. That concern will be part of the discussion on the survey question revisions.

ACTION: The incomplete feedback summaries will be finished by next week, so GERC will vote on those via email.

MOTION: to **approve** all the feedback summaries that are complete. Seconded. Motion **passed**.

- b.. [Bylaws Revisions](#) – create State GEM Discipline Group as new standing subcommittee of GERC
The Bylaws revisions incorporate the procedures approved last fall to add the GEM Discipline Group reps as a standing subcommittee of GERC and the process for selecting those representatives.

MOTION: to **approve** the Bylaws as revised. Seconded. Motion **passed** unanimously..

- c. [Objective 8 Competencies Review Subcommittee Report](#)– for GERC’s consideration
Members: **Phil Homan (Chair), Cathy Gray, Ann Hackert**

Motions in progress carried over from last meeting for continued discussion, finalizing, and vote:

Objective 8: Information Literacy

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

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

MOTION: to approve the change from “**Understand**” to “**Recognize**” in outcome iv.

Motion seconded. *No vote taken.*

AMENDMENT: add **Recognize “and analyze”** Motion seconded. Amendment **passed**.

AMENDMENT: delete “**Recognize**” Motion seconded; friendly amendment accepted by original mover and second. *No vote taken.*

AMENDMENT: ~~Understand~~ **Apply** the economics, ethical, legal, and social ~~issues~~ (**standards, strategies**) surrounding the creation, collection, and use of information/data. Motion seconded; friendly amendment accepted by original mover and second. *No vote taken.*

Subsequent discussion last time had moved away from the “**apply**” wording. The main concern was whether to require the higher-level “**analyze**” as the minimum competency. Analysis requires the students to first recognize the issues; “**recognize**” being a lower level skill on Bloom’s Taxonomy. Members debated the question.

MOTION: to set aside all previous motions and simply change “**Understand**” to “**Explain**”.

Motion seconded. Motion **passed**.

FINAL MOTION: to **approve** the change from “Understand” to “Explain” in outcome iv.
Motion seconded. Motion **passed**.

~~Understand~~ **Explain** the economics, ethical, legal, and social issues surrounding the creation, collection, and use of information/data.

The amended language will be applied to the outcomes, rubrics and report. The rubrics are a separate question that could be taken up again in the fall, if needed..

- d. Revisit [Annual Assessment Report Questions](#) in Qualtrics

Changes to report questions will create a new spreadsheet, not add to the existing cumulative spreadsheet Vince currently provides to GERC. Members discussed the questions and the things they would like to see reported, and revised the questions accordingly. They recognized that asking for the total number of students in each course (from all sections) would require having the department chair access the information through the ARGOS system.

MOTION: to **approve** the document as revised. Motion seconded. Motion **passed**.

The revised questions will be incorporated this summer into the updated Qualtrics survey.

Due to time constraints, the remaining items will be carried over to the Fall semester:

- e. [Revised Physics Assessment Plans folder](#)
[Assessment Plan Review Guide](#) for use in reviewing the Physics Plans.

[PHYS 1100 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 1101 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 1111 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 1112 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 1152 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 2211 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 2212 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 1101L Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 1113 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 1114 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 1153 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 2213 Assessment Plan](#)

[PHYS 2214 Assessment Plan](#)

- f. [Gen Ed Survey](#) update – Joanne Tokle

- g. [FIN 1115 Assessment Plan](#) – remanded for revisions

- h. [PHIL 2260 Assessment Plan](#) - GERC has **approved the course** for Objective 7; **Plan** awaiting revisions
Nothing new on this one yet.

5. New Business – none this week

6. Placeholders for Unfinished Business for future agendas:

- a.. Assessment Plan Audit and Reporting Compilations
- b. Pilot assessment project
- c. Consider revising [GERC's purpose statement](#) on the website, which may require updating the Bylaws and UCC/Faculty Senate approval.
- d. Consider developing a Strategic Plan for GERC

7. Adjourn: 4:37 p.m.

Approved by GERC:	May 2, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by UCC:	May 3, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by Faculty Senate:	May 11, 2022 via email vote
Accepted by Academic Affairs:	May 9, 2022 via email vote