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July 2015,

Since its inception in 2010 and its launch in 2012, The Foundational Studies Program has been at the forefront of an institutional change that many see as “disruptive.” The curriculum disrupts students’ expectations of classes by emphasizing engagement in addition to content. The faculty teach courses that cross traditional lines (transdisciplinary, thematic, and team taught). All of this is occurring in a disruptive time (intrusive technology, unsteady economics, changing career landscapes). Indeed, the innovative curriculum that over 300 faculty and staff designed between 2007 and 2010 is as needed today as it was determined to be when it was crafted.

Delivering the Foundational Studies Program, as the cornerstone and spine of the undergraduate curriculum with its associated University Learning Outcomes challenges us to think and operate non-traditionally relative to the established traditions of universities. It is big and it is bold and teaching in the program, as many faculty will attest, is the hardest AND most rewarding work that they do at the university.

This year has been one that has challenged our university’s commitment to the dreams and visions that we had at the inception of the Foundational Studies Program. We looked hard at our progress toward our goals. When we focused our gaze intently to understand what was happening in the classes and listened carefully to our critics we found areas that need tuning, sharpening, and pruning. Looking simultaneously back over the year and forward into the coming year, the summer of 2015 has been one of tremendous industry for the UF 100 faculty in particular and the FSP staff as well. We have redefined roles and responsibilities. We have revised courses, procedures, and training. We have engaged campus partners (advisors, admissions representatives, students, and faculty) in a conversation about the purpose and the promise of teaching and learning that is not backward looking, but forward thinking.

As we look ahead to 2015-2016, we are energized by the commitment of our campus community to the Foundational Studies Program and excited about the opportunities the program affords for our students, faculty, and community in the year to come.

Vicki Stieha, Ph.D.
Director, Foundational Studies Program

Riley Caldwell-O’Keete, Ph.D.
Associate Director, Foundational Studies Program
I. The Foundational Studies Program

“It is high time to break free of the old ‘breadth first, depth second’ model for college learning. Instead, we need guided pathways to integrative and adaptive learning. We must ensure that all students are given opportunities to tackle complex questions—from first to final year.” -- Carol Geary Schneider, President AAC&U (2015)

When the Boise State Core Reform Task Force finalized the legislation forming the Foundational Studies Program they wrote, “The Task Force’s goal has been to develop a highly effective general education program that supports the desired learning outcomes of academic majors, and one that addresses the shortcomings of the current Core curriculum that are identified in the Task Force’s 2009 Progress Report: lack of vision, inadequate coherence and oversight at the curricular level, and insufficient attention to outcomes and assessment at the course level.” (See the full document at http://goo.gl/0grASd.) The features and goals of the program, which are ambitious and provided a way for Boise State to “break free” of old models, are now being seen elsewhere in higher education.

Even before the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) outlined a curriculum that would provide the “guided pathways to integrative and adaptive learning” that Schneider references above (Schneider, 2015), Boise State had moved in this integrated and coherent direction. Boise State’s Foundational Studies Program delivers evidence based structures and supports appropriate to our institutional context which respond to this 21st century challenge. (See more at: https://www.aacu.org/sites/default/files/files/LEAP/LEAPChallengeBrochure.pdf)

Figure 1: Boise State’s FSP mapped to the AAC&U Adaptive Learning Model
In “The LEAP Challenge” (Schneider, 2015) Universities are asked to consider how students will build upon their learning from the first year they enter the university through the culmination of their undergraduate degree. As shown in the figure above, Boise State’s curriculum articulates the pathways AAC&U recommends for integrative and adaptive learning.

The redesign of the Boise State Undergraduate curriculum in 2011-12 was a first step toward the infrastructure to support more integrated and intentional learning within general education and the majors. The introduction of university wide learning outcomes, a common set of Disciplinary Lens courses, a consistent first-year (Intellectual Foundations and First-Year Writing) and second year experience (Civic and Ethical Foundations) provide the structures for establishing such pathways. In all of these first and second year courses, students are invited to pursue lines of inquiry that are both general and lead to their professional and career interests.

The introduction of the e-portfolio in all Intellectual Foundations (UF 100) courses this year and in most First-Year Writing courses provided the framework for our students to begin developing their own narrative of the pathway they’ll take through their educational career at Boise State. In the LEAP Challenge model, these courses represent First-Year Inquiry and College Writing. Civic and Ethical Foundations (UF 200) is equivalent to the Cross-Cultural and Global Studies and serves as our Second-Year Seminar with high impact practice feature in AAC&U’s model. The inclusion of civic engagement, linking theory to practice through community engagement, service learning, and civic inquiry enriches the student experience in this class. Students work in Disciplinary Lens categories supports exploration of disciplines, quantitative analysis, science explorations, as well as inquiry in the arts, humanities, and social sciences.
Boise State’s upper division work to help students polish written and oral communication skills in their major as well as to engage in high level inquiry, teamwork and innovation (our Communication in the Disciplines and Finishing Foundations courses) represent the high impact practices that have been correlated with deeper learning. Again, the e-portfolio provides the framework for students’ individual expressions of their learning through this pathway.

*Boise State Integrative and Adaptive Learning Model*

Throughout the 2014-2015 academic year, we have been working with our faculty and staff colleagues to realize the potential that our program structure affords. Continuous improvement efforts this year and into the future are both necessary and anticipated as the program is, by design, a dynamic and developing framework to support student learning.
II. 2014-2015 Foundational Studies Program Goals in Review

Foundational Studies Goals for 2014-15

1. Develop e-Portfolio as a means to collect direct evidence of student learning and faculty reported assessment of student learning.  
   Evidence of Success:
   - FSP created a section on our website to showcase e-portfolios created by students across the university. In addition, several programs have adopted the Digication platform for e-portfolios (see MDS and Spanish). Anthropology began moving their paper portfolio requirement into the e-portfolio this year.
   - 8501 e-portfolios were created by students and 451 were created by faculty in the last year. Use in First-Year Writing and UF 100 increased in accordance with our implementation plan.
   - FSP collaborated with the IDEA Shop to design and deliver workshops for faculty and professional staff. We stepped up our original timeline to shift institutional support of e-portfolio to the IDEA Shop to June 2015.
   - Created user survey to gather feedback on the platform (see e-portfolio section for survey results)
   - Identified an embedded faculty member to support integration of the e-portfolio into first-year writing.
   - Identified team leaders on each UF 100 plenary team to facilitate the use of e-portfolios in UF 100 discussion groups.

2. Collaborate with Institutional Research to kick off the University Learning Outcomes assessment process including annual faculty assessment of direct evidence of student learning.  
   Evidence of Success:
   - Restructured departmental roles and personnel to build capacity for assessment and e-portfolio. Created a “Project Coordinator” professional to support these initiatives as well as promoting assessment and e-portfolio.
   - Continued vetting and revision of the assessment plan with faculty (Faculty Senate and FSP Council) and Department Chairs.
   - An assessment feedback survey was launched with Disciplinary Lens Literature and Humanities and Visual and Performing Arts faculty participating. See assessment section for details.
   - DL, CID, and FF Course Design Documents were updated on the FSP website.
   - First-Year Writing, UF 100, 200, and 300 continued their ULO assessment processes.

3. Continue creating and refining clear and consistent communication with all program constituents regarding UF courses (advising and student success, students, faculty, staff in co-curricular programs).  
   Evidence of Success:
   - Course specific brochures were developed for UF 100, 200, and 300 to clarify what the course is and who takes it. See UF Course section for details.
   - Utilized the university advising network meetings and email list for timely updates.
UF Faculty served as FSP ambassadors by presenting at “Coffee and Conversations” sessions and various departmental meetings.

Utilized webpage “blog” feature to capture and promote UF course activities.

4. Maintain supports, structures, and assurances of highly effective teaching practices in UF 100, 200, and 300 with the explicit intention of fostering a consistently high level of course quality.

Evidence of Success:
- A blend of FSP specific faculty development sessions were offered in addition to our collaboration with the CTL to encourage our faculty to attend CTL sessions.
- Achieved an increase in integrated Civic Engagement activities in UF 200 and 300.
- Integrated e-portfolios into the UF 100 and 200 classes.
- Collected direct assessment of student learning in targeted criteria for ULO 1-6.
- Established a system to review course evaluations for focused faculty improvement efforts.

5. Support the development of new thematic teams for UF 100 for the 2015 cohort

Evidence of Success:
- One of the new UF 100 teams participated in the CTL Course Design Workshop. The other two worked in conjunction with the Director for support.
- A narrative “what supports the team” document has been created including interview responses from all of the UF 100 teams.
- Enhanced approach to support for lead faculty and discussion group leaders was established for the coming year.
- Partnering new UF 100 Lead faculty with experienced faculty to support more successful new course launches.

6. Take steps in building a national reputation as a leader in reformed general education and the undergraduate experience.

Evidence of Success:
- Boise State continues to serve on the Idaho statewide General Education Council.
- FSP was included in panel sessions at two national conferences (Lilly Teaching and Learning, Association for General and Liberal Studies)
- Guest blog “Creating a State GEM -- Revisited” as part of the AGLS “Gen Ed on my Mind” blog by V. Stieha
- Vicki Stieha was asked to join the panel presenting “Welcome Aboard” at the Annual AAC&U General Education Meeting -- designed to on-board new directors of general education.
- Riley Caldwell-O'Keefe serves on the Professional and Organizational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education Diversity Committee
- FSP continued collaborating on the third year of the CALIPER grant and was included as a co-PI on a grant proposal to the NSF for the SciFi class.
- Supported FSP faculty presentations at national conferences in the DL areas.
## III. Foundational Studies Program Staff and Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vicki Stieha</td>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Riley Caldwell-O'Keefe</td>
<td>Associate Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kay Wingert</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joy Roberts</td>
<td>Management Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elizabeth Cook</td>
<td>Lecturer (Joint Position with English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Heinzman</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisa Meierotto</td>
<td>Lecturer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Recla</td>
<td>Lecturer (Joint Position with History)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elaina Rudder</td>
<td>Student Office Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cameron Shoemaker</td>
<td>e-Portfolio Student Assistant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Continuous Improvement, Assessment of the University Learning Outcomes

The heart of University Learning Outcomes (ULO) assessment at Boise State is the direct assessment of student learning. Our assessment plan specifies the use of assessment that is intentionally integrated into the curriculum and individual courses and is assessed by faculty teaching the Foundational Studies courses inclusive of DL, CID, and the UF courses.

The charter documents for the Foundational Studies Program included the explicit instruction for a variety of assessment related features:

Courses structured around a small number of specific, clearly-articulated learning outcomes to inspire confidence that the goals of general education are being met.

In addition, the assessment plan features:

- Inclusive and relevant learning outcomes: ethics, diversity, internationalization, teamwork and innovation are fully integrated with traditional academic learning outcomes
- Built-in assessment process for learning outcomes to foster efficient program review for improvement and accreditation.
- ULO’s are “university-level” enhancing the general education and majors connection.

A primary rationale for assessment to be “built-in” to our courses was to ensure that faculty members remain central to the assessment process and that assessment is integral to the continuous improvement process at the course and program level. The consensus of the faculty was that external measures (e.g. standardized test) could make assessment less relevant to the content and pedagogical choices faculty made. Course design institutes were offered at the inception of the new program to ensure that “all course types are organized around carefully-articulated, course-level learning outcomes with associated assessment rubrics designed to determine a student’s level of success in achieving the target outcomes” (Boise State University Foundational Studies Program Legislation, 2010). The resulting course design tables are publicly posted on the University’s website. They are referenced during assessment activities and updated to ensure that the delivered course matches the planned course. All new courses added to the Foundational Studies curriculum are required to submit a course design table which is reviewed by at least two members of our general education council, the Foundational Studies Program Council, plus the director of the Foundational Studies Program using a rubric for approval.
The work of developing the most fitting approach for our assessment tools has been firmly placed in the hands of faculty. An exciting intersection of research and development enabled us to develop our assessment reporting survey at the same time we focused on enhancing high impact instructional practices (active learning) when we received a grant involving faculty teaching STEM courses in the Foundational Studies Program in 2013. The project (CALIPER), an NSF funded study designed to explore the connection between teaching activities and learning outcomes assessment, has involved almost 50 faculty teaching general education (100 and 200 level) courses in STEM. This group of faculty helped us design a system to collect ULO assessment data that they evaluated against the institutional ULO rubrics. The project activities included faculty development to connect teaching activities to assessment activities, teaching observations, plus individual or focus group interviews to better understand the teaching and assessment choices faculty were making. The project also focuses on the high impact practice of active learning for student engagement. The resulting instrument asks faculty to report on the class average proficiency on ULO criteria and to reply to three open ended questions:

1. Please provide a summary of the reporting data collected during this semester (e.g. what types of student artifacts did you assess, roughly how many times did you collect it?)
2. What conclusions have you drawn from your assessment data about the students’ learning?
3. Describe the ways in which the conclusions that you have drawn above have implications for future course planning or instructional methods.

In order to determine how a reporting form designed to be used by STEM faculty would be interpreted by faculty in other disciplines, the Foundational Studies Program Council asked faculty teaching in our Literature and Humanities (DLL) area to pilot the form for Fall 2014 assessment reporting. Reporting was optional and assessment reports were submitted by 39 faculty. Based on this pilot launch of the assessment reporting form, a larger implementation took place in Spring 2015.

Our assessment process is steeped in approaches that will generate conversations between faculty about assessment, pedagogies, and curriculum design. That is why the feature of our assessment plan that seems to be helping us make the most progress toward learning goals is the conversations the process fosters. The assessment plan details the process of reviewing artifacts, synthesizing results and providing feedback to stakeholders. Individual faculty are responsible for periodic reporting of assessment results in the phases discussed above. A summary of the process that takes place during reporting years follows:

1. Faculty provide a report summarizing assessment results for the course, assignment(s) used to assess ULOs, examples of student work (along with the associated assignment), evaluation criteria. [Phase 1]
2. If teaching in an e-Portfolio program, faculty may submit assessment rubrics through Digication. First-Year Writing, UF 100, UF 200, and UF 300 use e-Portfolios. [Phase 1]
3. FSP collaborates with Institutional Research to synthesize assessment reports. [Phase 2]
4. Assessment reports are returned to academic departments for faculty conversations. [Phase 2]
5. A report summarizing the assessment synthesis and the faculty report from their “community sense making” regarding proposed improvements and next steps is sent back to FSP Council so that faculty development and other supports can be planned. The Center for Teaching and Learning is a partner in needed faculty development. [Phase 3]
6. Reassessment of changes instituted by the faculty take place as described in the steps above feeding into a continuous improvement cycle. [Phases 3-4]

Assessment was conducted this year in the following areas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course/category</th>
<th>ULO(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UF 100</td>
<td>ULO 2: Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 300</td>
<td>ULO 2: Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLV</td>
<td>ULO 9: Visual and Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLL</td>
<td>ULO 10: Literature and Humanities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A full assessment report is provided in the Disciplinary Lens section of this document (see Disciplinary Lens Assessment.)
V. Collaborations with the Campus Community

Building curriculum coherence and fostering collaboration were key goals of the Foundational Studies Program development (See especially, Section I of the Approved Foundational Studies Program documents, October 2010). Our intentional work to build partnerships with academic and student affairs departments as well as reaching out into the community helps us reach these initial objectives and expand the possibilities of effective, cooperative achievements in education at Boise State. In addition to working with faculty from every college who teach University Foundations courses, we work closely to support the missions and learning outcomes of each department across campus. The below table identifies some key partnership activities over the 2014 – 2015 academic year. Student and faculty experiences are enriched through these partnerships.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Department</th>
<th>Nature of Collaboration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agency for New Americans</td>
<td>UF200 and UF300 faculty/organization partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising and Academic Enhancement</td>
<td>Conducted workshops for advisors, built UF informational brochures for advisors and students and served on the First-Year Success search committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albertson’s Library</td>
<td>Significantly revised library curriculum for UF100 and updated library curriculum for UF200.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associated Students</td>
<td>Conducted regular meetings over the course of the Spring semester with both leadership and student representatives with the goal of improving communication about general education with the student body.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Teaching and Learning</td>
<td>Partnered to build targeted UF200/300 course design workshops and guest lecture on teaching first year students for the Graduate Certificate in College Teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Studies</td>
<td>Expanded online and hybrid options, worked on online support for UF200/300 faculty, including recommending eQIP training and creating online experiential learning course design support, and supported Boise State Center at CWI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Senate Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Collaboration on assessment of ULO6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Year Writing</td>
<td>Coordination of first-year e-portfolio and building plan for implementation of cross-class e-portfolio assignment between ENG102 and UF200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA Shop</td>
<td>Taught e-portfolio and turning point and other pedagogy workshops, and continuously strategize for effective use of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Design</td>
<td>Instructional design in UF classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Learning Opportunities</td>
<td>Conversation about supporting the Internationalization portion of ULO 6 more intentionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Student Services</td>
<td>International Student Learning Survey to assess most effective pedagogical strategies and supporting exhibit “A is for Arab”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Student Family Programs</td>
<td>Participation in Bronco Day (Recruitment Fair) and Bronco Venture Faculty Panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>Partnered to effectively support Experiential Learning in UF 200 and 300 including hiring of an AmeriCorps VISTA, Served on the successful Coordinator Search Committee, co-organized an “Integrating Service Learning into online courses” workshop and created a poster session for the CTL’s Great Ideas for Teaching and Learning Symposium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran Student Services</td>
<td>Created process to translate military service into streamlining veterans’ UF300 qualification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista Neighborhood Project</td>
<td>UF200 faculty/organization partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wassmuth Center for Human Rights</td>
<td>Continued partnership for UF200 and UF300 Anne Frank Memorial/human rights docent tour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Center</td>
<td>Collaboration on nationally recognized Bystander Intervention Program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**V.a. Foundational Studies Program Council**

An important aspect of our university collaboration efforts is the work that we do with the Foundational Studies Program Council. This body was created in 2014 to ensure that the wider faculty body had ongoing input into the Foundational Studies Program. Its representatives include all of the Disciplinary Lens areas, as well as faculty who teach in Communication in the Disciplines and Finishing Foundations. In 2014-15 we determined that there were still unrepresented areas of the faculty and we sought additional representatives from the colleges. We are still seeking faculty to fill these seats.

The following report provides a summary of FSP Council activities in 2014-15.


The FSP Council met, as specified in its charter documents, three times per semester in 2014-15. The primary accomplishments of the Council included:
● Review of all of our Disciplinary Lens courses and “Gem Stamping” those courses by verifying alignment to the Idaho General Education Matriculation (GEM) Learning Outcomes, in accordance with Policy III. N. of the Idaho State Board of Education.

● 11 new courses were reviewed by the FSP Council for inclusion in the program (4 DLN courses, 3 DLS courses, 2 DLL courses, 1 CID, 1 FF). Additional courses were reviewed for modifications to the course design table.

● The rubric used to review new course proposals was revised based on the feedback from FSP Council members.

● An assessment pilot for DLL courses (Fall 2014), revision of the DL Assessment Reporting Form, and DLL and DLV Assessment Reporting in Spring 2015.

● Review and revision of the Oral Communication rubric (ULO 2) in order to bring that document into alignment with the GEM Learning Outcome.

● The FSP Council provided input on a proposed “assessment day” – which later was renamed as the “Connected Learning Conference” – with the intent of sponsoring a daylong institution-wide conference for faculty to focus on our learning goals for students. While there was wide support for this on conference, we were unable to identify individuals who could serve on a planning committee to carry out such an endeavor. We will reconsider the conference as part phase II of the assessment cycle for ULO 9 (DLV) and ULO 10 (DLL).

In addition to the above accomplishments and major activities, the FSP Council in its capacity as an advisory body for the Foundational Studies Program was briefed on the following issues:

1. Communication in the Disciplines (CID) and Finishing Foundations (FF) assessment cycles: The FSP leadership sought input from Department Chairs and the Administrative Council on timing for CID and FF courses. Since these courses are tied to the majors, it was recommended that assessment of the courses be paired with Program Assessment for those areas. Therefore, the CID and FF course ULO assessment will not follow the same pattern as that used for the DL courses. The Council suggested that, rather than the model used for assessing aggregate data used by the DL courses, faculty could create a teaching e-Portfolio including the course alignment in the academic program, indicate how the ULOs are supported with sample artifacts, and provide updated course design tables. Another recommendation was that we could conduct a syllabus review to compare CID syllabi to the approved course design tables on record for those courses.

2. UF 200 and 300: Riley Caldwell-O’Keefe provided an update on these courses and included feedback from faculty about support structures needed for faculty and students. There is still a heavy reliance upon adjunct faculty. She shared an early draft of a UF300 brochure aimed at educating students and advisors of the course goals.

3. E-Portfolio update: Barbara Schroeder provided an update to the FSP Council on the implementation of the e-Portfolio program (see details in the 2014-15 FSP Annual Report). Programs currently using e-Portfolio include Spanish, English, First-Year Writing, UF Courses. Additional work is beginning in Anthropology, Nursing, and in some Education courses.
4. Shari Ellertson shared six main takeaways from the mid-cycle review report from the Northwest Conference on Colleges and Universities:
   a. Course learning outcomes should be consistently placed on course syllabi
   b. We need to make sure we are publishing program level learning outcomes
   c. All program (undergraduate and graduate) must have relevant and pragmatic learning goals (outcomes) and that knowledge and skill outcomes must be identified at the program level
   d. Systematic assessment of evidence of outcomes across the university (not just at the academic program level) is needed for continuous improvement.
   e. Implications for the use of e-Portfolios by adjunct faculty and courses on remote sites must be considered
   f. Streamlining and converging plans, processes, and metrics is needed – it is recommended that the number and complexity of metrics be reduced and/or better defined in terms of their relationship to the various plans and processes on campus.

Finally, in order to ensure faculty voice in matters the Foundational Studies Program addresses, the FSP Council membership expanded to include an at-large representative from each of the undergraduate colleges and a liaison from the Faculty Senate. The membership roster from 2014-15 (noting vacancies) is included below. The Council will need new representatives for 2015-16 from the departments/areas highlighted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Representative 1</th>
<th>Representative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLN</td>
<td>Daryl Macomb, Physics</td>
<td>Kristin Mitchell, Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLS</td>
<td>vacant, Psychology</td>
<td>Eric Landrum, Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLL</td>
<td>Carrie Seymour, English</td>
<td>Adrian Kane, World Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLV</td>
<td>Brian Hodges, Music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLM</td>
<td>Sasha Wang, Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYW</td>
<td>Whitney Douglas, English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 100</td>
<td>John Bieter, History</td>
<td>Caile Spear, UF 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULO Assessment</td>
<td>Barbara Schroeder, E-Portfolio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC</td>
<td>Heidi Estrem, FYW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular</td>
<td>Debbie Kaylor, Career Center</td>
<td>Vacant, Student Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VI. Foundational Studies Program Courses

VI. a. Focus on Excellence

Regardless of rank or years of experience, Foundational Studies takes seriously the need for our entire faculty to collaborate with one another, to continuously develop their pedagogical skills, and to expand their understanding of the content areas that contribute to our courses. We design faculty development specifically for our faculty and we collaborate with The Center for Teaching and Learning and The IDEA Shop to make sure our faculty have ample opportunities for learning and development. Over 70% of our UF faculty regularly participate in professional development opportunities offered by the Foundational Studies Program.

I do sincerely appreciate the "care and feeding" you provide for us. It does really help one feel connected to a larger picture as opposed to just slugging away out there and wondering if anyone notices.

- UF300 Faculty Member

Thank you for the "Educating Citizens" text and ULO course design templates. [...] Last spring I wanted to have students do some in-class self-assessment of their ethical thinking & reasoning, but never wrapped my head around how to do it. With some minor tweaking, the course design template will work wonderfully for student reflection after some in-class activities regarding ethics.

- UF 200 Faculty Member

Our faculty are committed to pedagogical excellence and we were thrilled that one of our UF200 faculty received the 2015 Golden Apple Award.
### 2014-15 Foundational Studies Specific Meetings and Faculty Development Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Topic/Description</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>UF 100 Discussion Group Leader Workshop</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>UF 200 Ethics Workshop</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/24</td>
<td>Managing Challenging Students</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/20</td>
<td>Student Ethics in Student Research</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/20</td>
<td>Integrating Community Engagement into Online Classes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/16</td>
<td>UF 100 Assessment Review</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/17</td>
<td>UF 200 Assessment Conversation</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/18</td>
<td>UF 300 Assessment Conversation</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/2</td>
<td>Coffee and Conversation</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/6</td>
<td>Coffee and Conversation</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/9</td>
<td>Wi-Fi War: Is Mobile Technology Helping Us or Hurting Us?</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/4</td>
<td>Civic Engagement Workshop</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/12</td>
<td>Ethics Workshop</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13</td>
<td>UF 100 Lead Faculty Course Review</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/13</td>
<td>FSP Barbeque</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/22</td>
<td>UF 300 Assessment Conversation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Foundational Studies also encourages our faculty to attend Center for Teaching and Learning workshops and institutes and they were well represented at the Great Ideas Symposium as well as in workshops throughout the year. In addition, four UF faculty participated in the Center for Teaching and Learning Course Design Institute in May 2015 to either design or redesign a course.

### VI. b. UF 100, 200, & 300 Faculty by Rank

Foundational Studies continues to work toward increasing the number of full time faculty teaching our courses. The charts below illustrate the breakdown of faculty teaching UF 100, 200, and 300 by their rank. We were fortunate to be able to add two new lecturers this year who hold a joint appointment in Foundational Studies and another academic department teaching Disciplinary Lens courses. Overall, our percentage of full time faculty teaching in the course falls below our goal of 70%. The current budget outlook for the university suggests that new faculty lines are not realistic, yet we continue to look for innovative approaches to build our full time faculty. We are concentrating on working with academic departments to engage full time faculty in teaching the UF courses. We are also recruiting full time professional staff including professional advisors to teach the courses in the coming year.
### 2014-2015 UF 100 faculty*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time Faculty</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Lead Faculty and Discussion Group Leaders

### 2014-2015 UF 200 faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time Faculty</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2014-2015 UF 300 faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full time Faculty</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct Faculty</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intellectual Foundations (UF 100) and Civic and Ethical Foundations (UF 200) courses are truly a cross-campus collaborative effort. We have faculty from every college and many professional departments. We also offer courses at Extended Studies supported sites (CSI, CWI) to serve our 2+2 programs and transfer student population. The table below represents all Foundational Studies Program faculty, regardless of rank and full-time status, who also regularly teach or work in other departments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College or Department</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs*</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Economics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Administration</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors College</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences and Public Affairs**</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Southern Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Western Idaho</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This number represents faculty and staff who work in departments across academic affairs as well as adjunct or full-time faculty who only hold positions with the Foundational Studies Program.

**The College of Social Sciences and Public Affairs was eliminated on June 30, 2015. Departments are now located either within the new School of Public Service or the College of Arts and Sciences.
VI. c. Student enrollment by course

We have continued to work toward shifting more UF 100 and 300 seats into the fall semester and more UF200 seats into the spring semester, fine tuning seat availability for student demand. We attend to this demand while optimizing the course for success and considering the availability of qualified faculty.

In the fall of 2013 we attempted to reduce the capacity on UF100 plenaries that were building active learning into the course from 248 to 216. Two plenaries (East/West Competition and Human Situation) tend to include more lecture thus they were held at 248. Other sections, however, were reduced to provide room for students to cluster in small groups in the plenary and to accommodate active lecture styles. Still, we increased DG enrollment from 24 to 25 and by adding a DG section in those plenaries to expand at the margins. The challenge, however, is to find a balance between offering enough seats and keeping the course manageable. The plenary class size (225-250) has been identified by students as a negative variable in focus groups and in course evaluation comments. As student success is our ultimate goal, we have continued to work toward a strategy that both maximizes reasonable efficiencies and presents an excellent environment for learning.

In fall 2014 we remained firm in our commitment to honor active learning in the plenary and a manageable team (Lead faculty + Discussion Group Leaders). We are continuing to experiment with adjustments in staffing and capacity to “right size” the course.

As illustrated below, the general pattern of seats offered and timing of the courses remained steady for UF 100 between 2013-14 and 2014-15. During the schedule planning process for Fall 2015 we were able to work with our faculty to shift another plenary into the fall semester so that in the fall we will offer nine face to face plenaries and four online sections. We anticipate that the shift will better enable us to support the incoming first-year students in UF 100.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Summer 2013</th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th>Spring 2014</th>
<th>Summer 2014</th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th>Spring 2015</th>
<th>Summer 2015</th>
<th>Fall 2015 (projected)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UF 100 (DG + online)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1299</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1895</td>
<td>1369</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 200</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>804</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1047</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 300</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>3241</td>
<td>2614</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>3553</td>
<td>2860</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>3198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures above reflect census enrollments in UF courses for Fall 2013 - Spring 2015. Summer 2015 and Fall 2015 enrollments reflect seats offered.
As has been the case in previous years, anticipating demand and providing capacity for our incoming transfer students is a challenge. Still, based on the total number of first time undergraduate degree seeking students (2297) and transfer undergraduate degree seeking (1378) students entering in 2014*, the seats we offered in Fall (2014) and Spring (2015) should meet that demand.

*See http://goo.gl/qKzwuH for Boise State Census date enrollment data.

We continue to pay close attention to the demand for seats in UF 300, which is a more difficult number to anticipate. Because students' transfer work is evaluated against requirements to be core certified according to Idaho State Board of Education core requirements if they have not earned an associate's degree upon transfer, we need to address student questions about placement on an individual basis. The number of students challenging the determination that they have not completed the core has increased each semester and we now have a student worker dedicated to first review of the requests coming to our office via a Qualtrics survey to review their eligibility for UF 300. In 2014 we reviewed 201 petitions to review students transfer placement (up from 165). These numbers do not take into account students who walk in or call whose requests are handled on the spot. We currently have 621 students eligible to enroll but not currently enrolled in UF300.

VI. d. UF 100: Intellectual Foundations

Gathering feedback, formally and informally, from students who are enrolled in UF 100 helps us understand the strengths and weaknesses of the course. As indicated at earlier in this report, Intellectual Foundations, in terms of content and course structure, is a recent innovation and one that has few semblances in higher education. Although there has been a national trend toward academic interdisciplinary first-year courses, only 9.6% of the public institutions offering a first-year seminar (FYS) feature courses with an enrollment above 30 (Griffin, Romm, & Tobolowsky, 2008). Further, as a team-taught course, UF 100 is also in the minority; 11.4% of responding institutions report that their FYS sections are team-taught (Tobolowsky & Griffin, 2008). As a new course at Boise State, our faculty continue to "learn" how to teach the course effectively and how to help discussion group leaders do so as well.

We have three primary sources of data that tell the story of UF 100 this year: our annual ULO assessment, student focus group data (December 2014), and an analysis of course evaluations conducted by FSP along with a comparison study conducted by Institutional Research. Additionally, we have benefitted by feedback from our student leaders in the Associated Students of Boise State University (ASBSU) who conducted their own survey gathering students’ opinions about Intellectual Foundations. All of the data combined, in addition to anecdotal data from students, staff, and faculty, inform our plans for the coming year.

Focus Group

In December 2014 The Foundational Studies Program held a focus group with 15 students who were all over 25 years old to find out more about their experiences. The questions ranged from
the general ("Essentially, what did you get out of the class?" and "what are the challenges faced as a non-traditional students at Boise State and in UF 100 in specific") to specifics focusing on whether they would prefer non-traditional only sections, if there were particular readings or assignments that were effective, and if there were particular themes that they’d like to see in the future.

Overall, the students’ comments were valuable information for the UF 100 faculty as we continually seek to support all of our students’ learning and growth. The report from the UF 100 focus group is available online at http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/2015/01/15/focus-group/.

Oral Communication Learning Outcome Assessment

UF 100 Assessment Report
Spring 2015

UF 100 Faculty met on July 1st to review artifacts and to reflect on our evaluation of students’ performance on ULO 2 – Oral Communication. While we used the Digication Assessment site, our efforts were stymied by (1) a system issue limiting our access to the data and (2) the inconsistency in the way each team identified and uploaded the artifacts. As a result, two of the 5 plenaries’ assessment took place within the e-portfolio environment. The remaining 3 plenaries plus the two online sections reported assessment findings subsequent to our meeting. Those reports are compiled below along with faculty insights upon assessing the Oral Communication ULO.

ULO Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULO</th>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>2.2</th>
<th>2.3</th>
<th>2.4</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>2.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History-Future</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rifts-Shifts</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sci-Fi</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East/West</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invention &amp; Discovery</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of the difficulty standardizing our assessment process, each team reported in a different manner. The discussion that follows includes comments made by faculty during our assessment review and those submitted by individual teams.

Methods used to support and assess ULO 2

History and Future of Education

Students practice giving no-stakes presentations each week in Discussion Groups. At least one plenary activity focuses directly on oral communication and the importance and difficulty of listening. Rubrics for the midterm and final presentations are available weeks before the presentation due date. Direct instruction and practice with presentation style and communication tips provided in plenaries. Assessment: via formal rubrics for both the midterm and final presentations.

Rifts and Shifts: Investigating Social Change

Our faculty team assigns oral communication skills readings and in-discussion group practice of informal presentations. A rubric for the mid-semester project and final project was used to assess students’ oral communication. This provides a scaffolding assignment prior to completion of their final project. Students’ average for oral communication on the midterm assignment increased slightly on the final project.

Nightmares and Visions: Exploring Science Fiction and the Role of Science in our Lives

Preparing, implementing, reviewing and assessing the Panel Discussion assignment was the central means of support and assessment for oral communication. One preparatory activity was to view and analyze a video of a successful panel discussion. The Final Project was also relevant to Oral Communication, as students had to use oral language effectively in their videos. Informal discussions, debates, activities such as write-pair-share, and other group activities were also used to support oral communication outcomes.
Working Expectations and Experiences

Course content emphasized the connection between developing oral communication skills in college and the demands of the working world. Students worked in teams to create presentations four times during the semester covering several weeks of their research and discussion on a particular topic. Requirements for the oral presentation increased with each subsequent assignment. The rubric criteria for the team presentations was consistent with the requirements for the final individual presentation, which was a 5 minute Power Point Talk using supporting evidence recorded with a voice over.

Competition: Why the West Modernized before Asia & How Asia Caught Up

Course content emphasized the importance of developing soft skills, such as good communication. The instructional team stressed using the Socratic Method in class to the idea that interrogating a question requires clear definitions, logical analysis, and open discussion. A grading rubric for the final presentation is provided to the students well in advance of the team presentation to provide a clear understanding of the expectations as students work on their projects.

Invention and Discovery in History and Society

The primary means of assessment of oral communication is through a 5 minute oral presentation completed by each student during the semester. The teaching team uses this daily exercise in discussion sessions to encourage students to continually return to the rubric and hopefully ingrain the core elements of successful oral communication. Students are engaged in peer assessment of the presentations (increasing critical comprehension of oral communication skills).

The Human Situation

The teaching team utilized small group and whole class discussion activities to support oral communication skills development. Students were randomly called upon to report out group conversations during plenary. Students are also required to complete a single short formal oral presentation. Assessment of the formal presentation was done via rubric. Assessment of regular oral interactions was informal, formative, and ongoing.

Reflection on ULO Criteria
How can DGLs help students learn to be flexible in discussion and use public discussion to explore? Students need to articulate their ideas in public, revise their opinions in public, do oral meaning making, and deal with disagreement.

It is difficult to teach and assess listening. The faculty questioned whether the skill of “listening” is being intentionally taught? They suggested that we pay attention to the ways Discussion Group Leaders can bring listening skills into the foreground for students. In terms of more adequately assessing listening skills, teams are considering where they can “see” students listening (to teacher, students/peers) during the course.

Delivery techniques (2.5) are challenging. How do we help students become more skilled presenters? Many students do not practice or prepare for their speeches and presentations have a robotic, wooden, reading from script quality. How do we teach students to be more engaging and conversational? Suggestion that we should explicitly instruct students to prepare for performance and plan places in their speeches to change vocal inflection, introduce humor, etc. Additional suggestions – using critique of presentations (e.g. TED or Ignite talks) to draw attention to good/poor practices.

Commentary that Lead Faculty and DGLs have no formal education/background in teaching and assessing oral communication (or teamwork). Can we suggest strategies for teaching specific oral communication skills? [See action steps below]

Several plenary teams design multiple opportunities for students to “pitch ideas” or practice on low risk assignments so that they can build skills in oral communication and become more comfortable. These practices are also used to support experience giving and responding to critical feedback and is a way to teach “listening.”

A suggestion was made to use rubrics during presentations that can then be shared with students as part of helping them develop oral communication skills. These rubric sheets can also be included as artifacts of learning in our assessment process.

Creating an atmosphere and an understanding of what we mean by “a good academic conversation” is a helpful foundation for oral communication. Additionally, providing frequent informal, formative, and ongoing assessment of students’ oral communication in class may not be captured in the assessment data, but supports the development of oral communication skills.

High grades on oral communication might suggest that the discussion group leaders need more experience norming to guide their expectations and their grading on the oral communication project.

Changes that the program and teams will be implementing to better support oral communication skill development:

- Oral Communication will be one of the featured topics in our faculty development series next fall.
- Building a practice of listening and reflecting into the discussion groups by adopting a practice of having students reflect back the name of the person who just spoke in class before them and re-articulating the student’s main point (listening and message).
- Continue to use opportunities to practice oral communication in class and collecting the assessments that they are already conducting (rubrics and notes).
Lead faculty are gathering materials to support DGL’s use of group activities to support learning.

“Panel” discussions were cited by several teams as a strategy to either begin using or to continue using.

Building in opportunities for students to self-evaluate their oral communication skills, with this reflection as a graded assignment. This could also include responding to recordings of individual or team presentations.

More opportunities for norming expectations for oral communication amongst those teaching the course.

Adding more oral communication assignments during the semester to increase students’ performance on oral communication. One team will be using 1-2 minute videos, for example, asking students to reflect on their progress toward “becoming learners” – a reading many sections will be incorporating.

Adopt a single student e-portfolio template to use across multiple courses in a student's undergraduate career.

Suggestion/Resources:
1. Faculty Development Sessions in the Fall, “Presentation Zen: What I Learned from Garr Reynolds” for DGs and Faculty about teaching oral communication in UF 100.
2. In The History and Future of Education the Amy Cuddy TED talk (https://youtu.be/Ks-Mh1QhMc) has been an effective tool to boost students’ confidence in oral communication. They also show oral communication tutorials from Rice University (http://www.ruf.rice.edu/~comcoach/).
3. The Working teaching team adopted Presentation Zen (http://www.amazon.com/Presentation-Zen-Simple-Design-Delivery/dp/0321525655) for their class and had students use it as a guide to create presentations (oral and visual).
4. Providing a rubric well in advance of a required presentation is a strategy used by most of our plenary teams. This strategy prepares students for the criteria by which they will be judged.
5. For assessment purposes, clearly separating out oral communication criteria will support our ability to better assess that criteria. The use of the Blackboard rubric tool may be helpful to many teams.
6. The First-Year Student template will be used next year in addition to a single assignment to submit e-portfolios at the end of the semester. Such consistency will support our efforts to collect artifacts that can be assessed across sections.

Course Evaluation Analysis

Two studies were conducted by Institutional Research in 2015 which shed light on UF 100 course evaluations (1) in comparison to other 100 level general education courses and (2) comparing plenary ratings with those of the associated discussion group sections.

When comparing UF 100 course evaluations to those of comparable 100 level general education that utilize the standard university course evaluation questions, the mean evaluation scores on two questions (“The instructor seemed prepared for class” and “The instructor
fostered learning in this course”) were no different than comparison courses. On two questions ("The assessment methods were clearly explained" and “The objectives of the course were clearly explained”) were found to be lower, a difference that was significant. This analysis has been helpful as we consider course improvements and program supports for 2015.

We are pleased that, in comparison to other general education courses, students report UF 100 fostering learning higher or at the same level. We want to continue to strengthen our impact on student learning. One approach that is being taken this year is the adoption of the text, Becoming a Learner, by Matthew Sanders ([http://www.becomingalearner.com/](http://www.becomingalearner.com/)). Faculty are also refining course assignments and readings in light of these and other pieces of feedback.

Our faculty has given consideration to the evaluation criteria that were statistically lower than comparison courses. In UF 100 students do not generally have tests (there was only one section that had tests -- The Human Situation). Regardless of the section, students' grades are the product of work that is evaluated in the Discussion Group and in Plenary. Our structure (the separate lecture and discussion components) is similar to the DLN courses, which have similar scores on this question. Providing better communication of the grading practices and assignments is one step that we will take to address this weakness. Another is to use a single Blackboard site for all sections of the course (not separating the DG Blackboard sites), to help students see all of their grade components in one place.

The second question on which course evaluations reflected a lower mean than comparison courses pertained to UF 100 having clearly defined objectives. Understanding the students’ response to this question is slightly more challenging. If students do not understand the purpose of the course, they may indicate that there are "no objectives" or that they are "unclear." It would make sense that students are not defining "objective" in the same way as we do. There is a pattern of questions about the "purpose" of the course that does not get attached to other disciplinary courses in the same way. They don't ask, "why History?" We are attending to this gap as we prepare for 2015 and will be intentional in our work to help the students understand the "why" of the course. Additionally, through our newly developed marketing material and communication efforts, we are increasing our efforts to help students choose the thematic section of UF 100 that interests them the most.

**VI. e. UF200: Civic and Ethical Foundations: “With Liberty and Justice for All…”**

UF200 students and faculty continue making pivotal contributions to Foundational Studies’ curriculum. We continue to be challenged by the tall task of building an engaging, academically rigorous, student relevant course which covers writing, ethics, diversity and internationalization learning outcomes while intentionally incorporating experiential learning. Drawing on the recommendations from 2013 - 2014 assessment of ULOs 1 (Writing) and 5 (Ethics) during the 2013 – 14 academic year, we focused on faculty development and shaping specific plans for implementing change. Major achievements included implementing faculty-led workshops and solidifying civic engagement and course expectations which will be fully implemented Fall 2015.
Additionally we worked with the Honors College to add one honors section in the Fall and two in Spring.

**Lead Faculty Contributions**
Robin Allen (Social Work), Mark Buchanan (Business), Dora Ramirez-Dhoore (English) and Justin Vaughn (Political Science) served in the lead faculty positions. They each are leaders in their respective fields and manage responsibilities in their home departments as well as those for Foundational Studies. They each led a workshop during the academic year, facilitated a faculty cluster, led assessment conversations, as well as provided advice and feedback on the UF200 curriculum. They hold a valuable position, maintaining a strong faculty voice in shaping the course and directly communicating with and advocating for the remaining faculty teaching UF200.

**Incorporation of e-portfolio**
Several UF200 faculty piloted ways of incorporating e-portfolios during Fall 2014 and the faculty experimented more broadly during Spring 2015. They serve as models for full implementation of e-portfolios across all UF200 courses which will happen Fall 2015 (See UF200 Course Design Table, linked below). We are collaborating with the IDEA shop to support integrated implementation. Two examples which reflect the incorporation of civic engagement are linked here:


**Assessment**

December 17th UF200 and UF300 faculty gathered to reflect on their Fall courses. They were initially asked three questions:

- What is working well in your class?
- What was the biggest obstacle or challenge?
- If you could change one thing in your class for next semester, what would it be?

Overall, faculty reflected that discussions, community building and civic engagement were incredibly positive and that readings and assignments were supporting positive learning. Some faculty continued to struggle with classroom management and managing student expectations. In addition, the complexity of the course (both UF200 and UF300) continues to be a challenge. Effectively teaching ethics was one of the most consistent challenges noted by faculty.
Prior to the meeting, faculty submitted assignments they use to assess students’ ability to navigate ethical case studies. They conducted a peer feedback session with these assignments and then discussed assessment strategies.

Building on the recommended actions from Spring 2014 assessment of ULO5 (Ethics), all faculty incorporated readings from the common texts and implemented signature assignments. Faculty were given an assignment framework with some latitude for adapting the assignments to fit their individual courses. We incorporated end-of-course evaluation questions which asked students to reflect on the learning outcomes. Students reported 3.87 and 3.97 in Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 respectively on the following statement, “This course had a positive impact on my ability to understand ethical issues and make more informed ethical choices.” While there was a slight improvement between semesters, we hope that the 2014 – 2015 focus on ULO 5 & 6 (Diversity) assessment as well as strengthened faculty support for teaching ethics will improve these evaluation scores.

Action

● “Moral Imagination” workshop on understanding and teaching ethical frameworks was offered Spring 2015 due to the need which surfaced during the conversation.
● Updated UF200 course design table clarifies expectations and resources for support.
● Revision of faculty support to include faculty learning communities, compensated faculty development and e-portfolio creation
● Lead faculty will fine tune more specific learning outcome language that is measurable and yet flexible

VI. f. UF 300: Transitional Foundations
“Personal Responsibility in a Global Community: Create, Innovate, Problem-Solve”

This was an exciting year for UF300 faculty who implemented the new curriculum designed Summer 2014 and reflected that their courses felt like a stronger, more authentic learning environment. Students reflected a relatively stable course satisfaction rating from Spring 2014 to Spring 2015.

E-portfolios
UF300 faculty paved the way for the use of E-Portfolios in University Foundations courses. Faculty continued to fine-tune the ways they meaningfully integrate e-portfolios within the new UF300 curriculum as a tool for team problem-solving as well as professional development.

Below are two examples of the approaches UF300 faculty have taken with incorporating e-portfolios into their sections.

https://boisestate.digication.com/the_protection_of_children_on_the_world_wide_web/Our_Team
https://boisestate.digication.com/uf300_brianna_dill/Welcome/published
Assessment
We undertook section level assessment Fall 2014 and conducted course-wide assessment Spring 2015. All but two faculty participated in spring ULO 2 assessment through artifacts students submitted to Digication. The remaining two conducted manual learning outcome assessment ratings. Each faculty assessed individually and then we reflected in community May 22nd with the following insights and proposals. The assessment report is included in Appendix A of this document.

Note: The self-support programs conduct independent assessment for their UF300 courses.

Insights about areas for improvement:
● Need for more intentional teaching of ULO 2 as well as support to do so
● Use of various technologies for student assignments presents challenges of teaching students the technology as well as norming assessment, especially considering that some projects are individual and some are team projects
● Good models improved the quality of student work

Action
● Professional development will be provided next year for faculty to build their knowledge and skills about teaching communication
● Faculty support will be provided next year on e-portfolios. This will address the special issues confronted with team portfolios and effective student artifact collection and assessment.
● Updated course design table clarifies course expectations.

We will be conducting assessment of ULOs 5 and 6 in both UF200 and UF300 during the 2015–2016 academic year. Fall semester will focus on reporting out section level assessment with the goal of implementing individual improvements and then conducting more formal course-wide assessment Spring 2016.

VI. g. Civic Engagement (CE)

This high-impact aspect of our courses grew out of the Core Reform expectations for experiential learning. Our understanding of civic engagement goes back to the original FSP legislation regarding experiential learning, "Documentation of an experiential learning activity related to ULO’s 5 and 6 is required of every student." (Excerpted from October 2010 Approved FSP.) We have collaborated with Service Learning and the Center for Teaching and Learning to define and support sustainable experiential learning experiences in all of our UF200 and UF300 courses.
We understand this expectation as one pedagogical tool toward helping students develop “civic mindedness.” The goal is to meaningfully connect content with real world, relevant assignments. In addition to being shaped by the initial program objectives, this framework is derived from evidence-based research on high impact practices as well as Boise State student and faculty feedback gathered over the 2014 – 2015 academic year.

Civic Engagement may happen as a one-time service, or it may be incorporated through multiple assignments in multiple ways. It may be working with a community partner or it may be doing active research through taking pictures, doing interviews, or being a participant observer. It may be working at a community garden or it may be designing an experiment or survey that students implement. There is not a time expectation, though faculty who incorporate one-time service generally expect students to participate for 2 - 3 hours. A few faculty require a larger commitment and many students voluntarily participate in a more invested manner.

Faculty have incorporated many creative and impactful civic engagement experiences.

- Partnering with the Agency for New Americans, students promoted and supported the movie *Playing with Fire*. This included designing and presenting an informational display, helping to promote the event, selling tickets and selling raffle items. They raised over $3000 for this organization that helps refugees achieve self-sufficiency.
- Students attended rallies and other local events of socio-political importance, including legislative sessions. These students then staged debates in their class on the issues at the core of each event.
- Considering the impact of socially constructed, self-directed and externally imposed censorship on the experience of movie watching, students identified a movie, created questions and interviewed movie-goers to determine the impact of personal identity on the perception of the movie, particularly in relation to its rating.

---

*My experience in this project and in this class was 100% positive. I have always valued being an invested member of my community, and I think this class reflects on that principle.*

- UF 300 student

*It was wonderful to get my hands dirty in a way that I knew was impacting my community. Working in a community garden got my classmates talking to each other and laughing together. I learned as much through that experience as in the classroom.*

- UF 200 student
• We have continued to partner with the Boise State Women’s Center to foster active citizenship through the specially designed Bystander Intervention workshop. Over 700 students participated and they demonstrated movement of 0.85 and 0.65 for the following statements, “I have a clear understanding of what an active bystander does,” and “I have the information I need to intervene as a bystander,” respectively on a five point Likert scale.

• Students working with Interfaith Sanctuary organized local partners to donate cakes, toys and other items to support a monthly birthday celebration for one year.
  
  o Note: Interfaith Sanctuary won the first annual Foundational Studies Community Partner Award for significant contribution to students’ educational experience at Boise State.

• Students worked with the Vista Neighborhood Project to assess neighborhood needs and to build and install little libraries in that as well as some of their own neighborhoods.
The second student organization is the Students Against Sweatshops. They are making significant headway on getting the Boise State University Bookstore onboard with fair trade awareness and practices. We featured them in a short “Pause for Pedagogy” video.

**CE Process Improvement**

December 2014 we conducted an online faculty survey about civic engagement in UF200 and UF300 courses.* We asked the following questions:

- What level did you students participate in community engagement?
- How many hours of community engagement were required or expected for your course?
- How did you prepare your students for participation in community engagement?
- How did you hold students responsible for completing their community engagement requirement?
- What was the involvement of community organizations?
- How did students reflect on their experience of their community engagement?

*Prior to Spring 2015, the experiential component was referred to as community engagement.

We found varying levels of implementation and support. 78% of students participated in CE and these students completed over 3,000 project hours. While 6% of students participating in CE did not receive intentional support in preparation, all students participated in a reflection assignment. All UF200 and 300 courses were required to implement civic engagement during the Spring 2015 semester and students’ evaluation reflection regarding the impact of that experience remained relatively stable from Fall to Spring semester (3.71 to 3.79). This is a positive indicator that scaling up is supportable within the framework established.

Foundational Studies needs to maximize available resources to help faculty integrate Civic Engagement into their courses. Prior to creating resources, we needed to understand what faculty need and what has been useful in the past. Spring semester, Foundational Studies reached out to each UF 200 & 300 Faculty member to conduct interviews in which faculty shared their experiences integrating Civic Engagement into their UF courses. Each faculty member was contacted via email to schedule an interview time; 24 out of 33 faculty members participated in a short interview. Foundational Studies enlisted the help of an AmeriCorps VISTA member to conduct and record each interview. We asked the following questions:

- How do you define Civic Engagement for students in your course?
- What are the most important ideas/themes that help you teach civic and ethical foundations?
- How do you introduce these ideas to students in your course?
- How do students reflect on their Civic Engagement experience after they’ve completed it?
- What resources have you used and what resources would you like to see made available to support civic engagement?
Faculty Civic Engagement Interviews Summary

Faculty members approach the class differently. When asked to describe the main ideas/themes of their course two overarching approaches to the class emerged: a more theoretical/idea framework and an issue/thematic driven framework. All classes had a combination of issues and theory to varying degrees, but these two approach categories are based on the ways in which faculty most clearly articulated their course. Faculty expressed a range of definitions for civic engagement as well as how they introduced the ideas to students and integrated it into their course design.

Research indicates that when students reflect about their experiences, it positively impacts learning and retention (Bain, 2012; Colby et al., 2003; Weimer, 2002). This led us to ask about faculty’s methods for having students reflect on their civic engagement experiences. The most common reflection method for civic engagement was a reflection paper; however, faculty had various methods of asking their students to reflect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did students reflect on their experience of their civic engagement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Choosing all that applied)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014 (25 faculty responding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015 (24 faculty responding)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE was not required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not intentionally reflect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essay or other written assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social/Interactive (e-portfolio, website, social action, video, &quot;speed dating,&quot; in-class reflection/discussion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main resources faculty expressed a desire for were: lists of community partners and community opportunities, a compilation of previous civic engagement projects, access to speakers in the community and at Boise State, and faculty collaboration.

Student Feedback Summary

Foundational Studies conducted two 1.5 hour focus groups in which students expressed their experiences with CE in UF200 and UF300 as well as their visions for what it could or should be. Email invitations were sent to 3146 students who were enrolled in UF 200 or 300 including face to face, hybrid, and online sections during Fall 2014 or Spring 2015 (self-support sections of UF 300 were not included). 66 students replied to our message and 33 attended one of two sessions on April 15th and April 17th. The student participants were enrolled in 14 faculty members’ classes and were evenly distributed between 200 and 300. This distribution means that the feedback may slightly over represent UF 300 curriculum. Though we focused on civic engagement, some of the conversation spoke to the courses as a whole and virtually all of the
feedback is applicable to overall course design. We were able to synthesize student comments into the ways CE was seen as relevant or irrelevant.

How did students feel that CE was relevant or disconnected?

We sought to understand students’ perception of the relevance of CE to their academic experience. Their comments were split between positive and negative feedback, however, when we look closely at these comments we see the importance of faculty supporting students to connect to their interests and to connect the experience to the course content. CE activities that are not connected to the course community are less impactful and perhaps even counterproductive. In general, the comments regarding the relevance and connection of CE to the course curriculum clustered around the following ideas:

- Having choice helps connect to personal interests and future plans
- and reflecting about them helped learning and “fun” factor
- Fun when experience outside the classroom relates meaningfully with course content
- It helped when instructor was passionate, connected and fully understood and conveyed the "why"

The University Learning Outcomes of ethics and diversity for these courses encourage faculty to design their courses in a way that affords examining questions of justice and injustice. Some students respond to the essential nature of the class as “biased” (“the class is very liberal, which makes it hard for students who are conservative,” “the class is biased,” “forced to feel empathy”). Several comments suggested that the time for the project was “rushed” or that it was not integrated into the course enough, which resulted in a comment we have identified as “disconnected” or “irrelevant” to the course itself (“there wasn’t enough time and it was tough to schedule,” “civic engagement was positive but limited” “more time [is needed] to find a good fit”). These issues are both structural (ULO alignment) and pertain to course design on the part of the faculty. In the section below we discuss our plans to address these issues. The general tenor of the comments that were seen as negative toward the CE curriculum in UF 200 and 300 can be summed up as:

- Perspectives presented felt biased
- Balancing work and demands of other classes with expectations of UF is challenging (assignments not clearly connected to big picture of the course felt like busy work)
- Civic Engagement felt like being "voluntold" if it wasn't fully integrated or didn't have adequate time dedicated to it both in and out of the classroom
- Wanted to have more latitude in choosing projects to make it personally meaningful
- Felt disconnected without an understanding of the big picture or if the class did not have clear continuity

General comments about the courses

The students described CE pedagogy as something that could build relationships between students and community partners as well as among students in the class. This community
building element was generally desired and, when negative comments were offered, they pertained largely to the desire for time to build relationships, to have in-depth conversations, and to have a voice or a say in the way they could engage.

As we see elsewhere in the Boise State curriculum, many students bring a highly pragmatic sense to the courses that they “should” or “should not” have to take. They continue to see a course “outside their major” as something that is “extra” or the “university taking their money.” Other students who are engaged in the course see the lack of engagement of peers as a deterrent to their own learning.

There were many comments about providing more consistency across classes and a few students indicated that they felt their faculty members needed more “training” or assistance with “organization” prior to teaching the course (“we had so many projects going on at once that it was hard to keep them straight”)

*Points of overlap between student and faculty feedback to consider*

We found it intriguing that students and faculty had similar reactions and perceptions to their structural needs for a positive Civic Engagement as well as whole course experience.

- **Desire for community:** Students and faculty both expressed a desire for community – students within the classroom, and faculty within the program.
- **Choice:** Faculty and students both wanted to be able to choose from a variety of opportunities. Faculty wanted broader lists (than what was previously provided on OrgSync) for opportunities to offer their students. Students wanted to be provided with a variety of opportunities so they could choose something meaningful to them.
- **Connection:** Faculty and students both wanted access to opportunities that have a clear connection to a student’s life and future

*Action Steps*

- **Sharing findings:** We presented the initial findings through a civic engagement workshop with UF200 and UF300 faculty and opened up an ongoing conversation with Associated Students of Boise State University (ASBSU) regarding student investment in these courses. We utilized a Prezi to visually convey the information. It is linked [here](#).
- **Course expectations and descriptions:** Distribution of clarifying language and expectations, including the increased focus on building active learning which may or may not be traditionally community service oriented. We established a process for differentiation and identification of sections which require more than 2 – 3 hours of CE. These sections are required to work with Service Learning to create an SL designation. These courses are indicated on the newly scripted course descriptions made available to students in April 2015, and will be available before registration each subsequent semester. We hope this will help students self-select into section themes and CE expectations to which they feel connected.
- **Faculty Development:** See information under UF200 Action above.
• **Digication:** The Foundational Studies Program has created a Digication site that will feature examples of previous civic engagement projects from UF 200/300 classes as well as databases for searching for community opportunities and community partners. Additionally, the site will feature a blog where faculty can share ideas, successes, and challenges. This will ideally serve to enhance a sense of community within Foundational Studies faculty and provide resources in one central location.

• **Civic Engagement Assessment:** We are working to build rubrics and assessment tools to measure the impact of civic engagement assignments on students’ perception of their community role (“civic mindedness”) and their ability to articulate how course content connects with real-world decision making. We are drawing on the AAC&U Civic Engagement Value Rubric, *Educating Citizens* (Colby et al, 2003), Westheimer and Kahne’s "What Kind of Citizen? The Politics of Educating for Democracy" (2004) and our own faculty’s peer-reviewed work on cultivating citizenship.

• **Program Coordinator:** Foundational Studies hired a full time Program Coordinator, Kay Wingert, who will support e-Portfolios and Civic Engagement assessment.

**VII. e-Portfolio Initiative Update**

The FSP continued its role as the “incubator” for our institutional implementation of the e-portfolio platform during 2014-15. The program was well positioned to do so as our emphasis has been to support the integration of e-portfolio teaching and learning practices in the “super user” departments including Foundational Studies (supporting UF 100, 200, and 300 courses) and First-Year Writing (focusing on ENGL 101, 101P, and 102). These programs make up the vast majority of portfolios created in the system.

The structure for support of the e-Portfolio in 2014-15 is modeled in the figure below. The e-Portfolio Director was responsible for direct support of faculty teaching UF 200 and 300 and indirect support for those teaching UF 100 and in the identified courses within First-Year Writing. In turn, intermediary, embedded faculty members were identified to work directly with the faculty...
teaching first-year writing and in the UF 100 discussion groups. The assumption was that through this distributed model, the end users (faculty) would have more ready access to expertise which was not only knowledgeable about the technology, but also regarding to the way it was being pedagogically employed in the course.

While the 2014-15 structure sufficed in 2014-15, working in conjunction with the IDEA Shop and the Learning Technology Solutions Group (LTS) we have adjusted responsibilities to support the growth of the e-portfolio from its incubation model to an enterprise model which will serve the full university. The organizational structure modeled below will enable us to grow the number of departments/programs using the e-portfolio.

Moving forward, in 2015-16, responsibility for curricular integration of e-portfolio pedagogy will be shared by the Director of First-Year Writing, the Director of Foundational Studies, and the IDEA Shop Director. Structures that support integration into the Foundational Studies Program (including First-Year Writing and UF courses) will be supported by leaders within each program. Funding for First-Year Writing will be provided through FSP. The IDEA Shop Instructional Design Consultants (IDC’s) will provide pedagogical support for faculty across the university, including within FSP and FYP. Oversight of technical integration (data transfer between Boise State and Digication) and oversight of daily integration logs will be shifted to LTS for support as is consistent with other enterprise platforms on campus.

An area of emphasis in the coming year will be appealing directly to students to build their e-portfolios. A new template (see below) has been developed which will better support our goals
of integrating learning across courses and experiences. Students will build one e-portfolio and share it with multiple courses. Faculty will help students add sections and content to their portfolio. In the coming year, we will work with upper division faculty and co-curricular programs to encourage integration of the e-portfolio as well. Initial conversations have already begun with Student Involvement to support students to document their leadership and involvement experiences in their e-portfolios.

This template can be viewed online at:
https://boisestate.digication.com/my_academic_journey_at_boise_state/Home/published

First-Year Writing

Dr. Whitney Douglas was identified as a leader in First-Year Writing e-Portfolio usage in 2013-14. In collaboration with English Chair, Dr. Michelle Payne, and Director of First-Year Writing, Dr. Heidi Estrem, a memorandum was drafted so that Whitney could be released from two of her courses in the Spring semester of 2015 and be able to focus on supporting faculty in that department to integrated Digication e-Portfolios into their teaching. Whitney’s accomplishments in this position included:

● Review of Fall 2014 English 101 e-portfolios with 15 101 professors. The involved faculty emerged from that process with a clearer understanding of ways to support faculty use of e-portfolios in more “generative ways” (Personal Communication).

● In partnership with English professors Tiffany Hitesman and Christi Nogle, offered two Digication workshops for English faculty.

● Created a Digication e-portfolio containing pedagogical and technical resources for First-Year Writing faculty.

● Provided one-on-one support for FYW instructors as requested. These meetings were deemed the most productive approach.

● Conducted research on e-Portfolios and first-year writing to share with faculty teaching in these courses.
Whitney recommends the continuation of the one-on-one workshops in the Fall of 2015, as this strategy proved most useful in onboarding new faculty into e-Portfolio pedagogies and encouraging integration of e-portfolios into their classes.

Due to her own pre-tenure requirements, Whitney will not be able to continue in this role for 2015-16. Through her involvement, however, we have seen that this is a viable model and FSP and FYW will identify another faculty member to take on this role for the coming year.


Amy Nixon, a graduate student in Community and Environmental Health, conducted a qualitative case study of our e-Portfolio program. The report, available online, details the strengths and limitations of the e-portfolio through the accounts of faculty and students. The report finds the following conclusions:

The five focus groups collected an abundant amount of information regarding the implementation and usage of e-portfolios at Boise State University. Positive and negative feedback regarding training, implementation and usage was identified. After analyzing the data the following recommendations related to e-portfolio implementation at Boise State University were identified:

- A clear and detailed description of the e-portfolio tool needs to be provided. This should include an overview of e-portfolios and a detailed description of the capacity of the tool, (e.g. storage of artifacts from multiple classes and the duration of access to the tool, student access after graduation). This information is critical to faculty understanding of the big picture and their communication with students about the tool.
- Clear goals need to be defined; university goals, department goals, faculty goals, and student goals. It is imperative that faculty have an overall understanding in order to invest their time and energy and create buy-in from students.
- Training and support needs to be monitored closely. When a department is first implementing e-portfolios training will need to be available to everyone within the department. Faculty need to have a person accessible to answer questions as they begin to learn the process.

Overall, there are many benefits for both students and faculty pertaining to e-portfolios. As expressed by one participant: “I mean nobody is questioning whether or not e-portfolios are beneficial for learning. All of the research out there shows that it is. So, it’s a matter of people just like getting their feet wet and experiencing these growing pains for just a little bit.”

We are grateful to Ms. Nixon and have used the findings of this report to inform the direction of our e-portfolio support model.
VIII. Disciplinary Lens Courses

2014-2015 Disciplinary Lens Assessment

Phase 1 of the ULO Assessment Plan for Boise State was launched in 2014-15 with a pilot assessment of ULOs 9 (Visual and Performing Arts) and 10 (Literature and Humanities). Faculty submitting data in the fall were told that they would not have to resubmit data in the spring. Small adjustments were made to the submission form between the fall and spring semesters based on the feedback of the pilot group. Table 1 indicates the number of courses that were represented in the response (faculty were encouraged to combine multiple course sections on one report). In Spring 2015, 112 course reports were requested and 76 were completed for a 68% response rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FA 14</th>
<th>SP 15</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ART</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIST</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHIL</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THEA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Reports per department

Faculty were asked to report on the average course proficiency based on their assessment of direct artifacts of learning collected during the semester. If courses had enrollment below 50 faculty were asked to randomly select a 5 sample artifacts for reporting. Classes with 51-11 were to review 10 randomly selected artifacts and those with more than 101 enrolled were asked to review 15 artifacts. Possible score range for proficiency is 1 (unsatisfactory) to 4 (exemplary).
A qualitative analysis of the assessment survey responses was conducted by the Foundational Studies Program. A departmental summary will be shared with each participating department in late summer 2015. In this report overarching themes are discussed.

**Critical Reasoning**
As can be clearly seen in the quantitative reporting, faculty proficiency assessment reports indicated the weakest student performance area in “Reasoning” (ULO 9.3 and 10.3 respectively). A focus of our phase two assessment activities will include engaging faculty in the DLL and DLV categories in a conversation about the assessment data will include an exploration of their understandings of students’ performance on reasoning related skills.
IX. Communication in the Disciplines and Finishing Foundations

The innovative structure of the Foundational Studies Program supports the vertical integration of communication (ULO’s 1 & 2), critical inquiry (ULO 3), and teamwork skills (ULO 4). While we have been devoting concentrated energies to the lower division courses developing these skills, we are just beginning to engage in the needed activities to pull these learning outcomes into the upper division courses (First Year Writing—ENGL 101, 102, 112, Intellectual Foundations—UF 100, Civic and Ethical Foundations—UF 200, Transitional Foundations—UF 300). Evidence for such attention can be found in the revisions to the major curricula including Communication in the Disciplines (CID) and Finishing Foundations (FF) courses, the integration of e-portfolios into courses that support these signature learning outcomes, and examination of the leadership structures needed to support achieving our ULO goals.

Students are creating e-portfolios in First Year Writing and UF courses, where they are beginning to develop and document their communication skills. Efforts to increase students’ proficiency (particularly in communication) can be fostered by drawing upon lower division written and oral communication in our upper division FSP courses (CID’s and FF’s). The table below provides details about the number of e-portfolios created in lower division communication focused courses:

As departments and majors have more and more students from the 2012 catalog move into upper division classes, the degree requirements established in the 2011-12 major and program revisions are being evaluated. FSP has supported the development and revision of 4 Communication in the Disciplines courses and 2 Finishing Foundations courses this year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014-15 courses</th>
<th>students</th>
<th># e-portfolios</th>
<th># assignments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FYW</td>
<td>4,998</td>
<td>2,317</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF100</td>
<td>6,043</td>
<td>4,032</td>
<td>397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF200</td>
<td>1,893</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF300</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14,084</td>
<td>7,481</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beginning in Fall 2015 (as referenced above in section VII) support for e-portfolios will be shifted to the IDEA Shop in order to support the meaningful integration of e-portfolios into upper division courses and program.

Additionally, the university will need to create a position so that consistent and ongoing attention can be paid to writing instruction across campus, particularly in the courses identified as supporting ULO 1 (written communication). While the Director of the Writing Center was initially asked to provide university level leadership for writing across the curriculum, demands on the Writing Center make such a divided focus a challenge. A proposal was developed by Dr. Heidi Estrem, First-Year Writing Program Director, to create a separate University Writing Director position to support writing – a Signature University Learning Outcome. Initial steps will be taken in 2015-16 to work toward establishing this position. The full proposal is included in Appendix B.
X. Strategic Challenges and Opportunities

The innovative structure of Boise State’s curriculum affords the opportunity for integrative and adaptive learning. Students can begin inquiry into questions that they find intriguing, often from the perspective of their future career interests, in their first year (or transitional year) FSP courses. These early inquiries are captured in many student e-portfolios and provide entre for faculty and advisors in the students’ majors to make connections with their majors even while students are enrolled in general education or pre-requisite courses. Continuing the steps that have begun to transform the culture of the university and to build structural and curricular supports for such integrative and adaptive learning will be essential in realizing the potential of the curriculum.

Ensuring the success of UF 100 and 200, in particular, as the cornerstone of this innovative curriculum cannot be understated. We understand that while innovations are exciting, they can also be confounding to those (students, faculty, administrators) who have come to appreciate the general acceptance of the “tried and true” curriculum which has been in place in higher education for decades. It is well documented that changing the curricular landscape of a university can be disruptive (e.g. Clark, 1995; Gano-Phillips & Barnett, 2010, Trowler & Knight, 2002) yet disruption is paradoxically what the public is seeking. Perhaps the greatest challenge and opportunity Foundational Studies faces is that working across disciplines challenges the tendency to prefer “contextual simplification” wherein “academic work is presumed to conventionally lie within the confines of departments” (Klein, 2010, p. 6). The Foundational Studies curriculum is not simple.

The same conservative forces that challenge us on the curricular level also challenge FSP faculty in their classrooms. We are asking faculty to develop courses outside their areas of expertise, to do so as part of a larger teaching team, and to do so against a questioning “consumer” of education. Yet, we have affirmed this year that the reasons the FSP, inclusive of the UF courses, was created was to engage students in courses that draw upon issues and topics that are encountered in the world around us – because such courses create the foundation for academic inquiry, discovery, and the cultivation of highly sought after “soft skills” including communication, critical thinking, teamwork, innovation, ethical thinking, and understanding diversity. We have also affirmed, through evaluations and focus groups, that students report the UF courses are “facilitating learning.” Thus, our challenge and opportunity is to help students better understand the benefits of challenging learning earlier in their academic career.

Keeping in mind these challenges and opportunities, the 2015-16 goals included below attend to the need for better communication and assuring structures and supports for the highest quality teaching and learning. Please see below for our goals for 2015-16 along with a sample of the action steps each will require.
XI. 2015 – 2016 Goals with selected action steps

1. Support Boise State student success goals by focusing on first and second year retention via UF 100 and 200 courses as well as transfer student retention through our UF 300 connections.
   • utilize dashboard and Pyramid data to monitor indicators of success (e.g. repeated courses, upper division students in lower division courses, differences in student success by student characteristic).
   • Connect students in UF courses to university programs and services designed to support their success
   • support faculty to employ high impact pedagogical practices to improve DFW rates and increase engagement thereby reducing attrition.

2. Maintain supports, structures, and assurances of highly effective teaching practices in UF 100, 200, and 300 with the explicit intention of fostering a consistently high level of course quality.
   • Establish and carryout faculty observations in UF 100 and UF 200 using a protocol
   • Adopt a system of grade norming across UF 100 discussion sections within each plenary to insure alignment of assessment practices
   • Continue ranking course evaluations and follow up with lowest quartile evaluations with an eye toward enhancing faculty teaching strategies.
   • Establish faculty development requirements for each of the courses and provide financial support for attendance
   • Recruit and retain high quality faculty from the permanent faculty ranks
   • Explore strategies to engage more departments in UF courses.

3. Continue creating and refining clear and consistent communication with all program constituents regarding UF courses (advising and student success, students, faculty, and staff in co-curricular programs).
   • Create a student advisory panel in conjunction with ASBSU
   • Survey advisors and key professional staff (e.g. University Housing, Involvement and Leadership) regarding the “buzz” about UF 100, 200, and 300
   • Expand representation of faculty on the FSP Council
   • Develop fliers and online content that is visually engaging to promote UF courses
   • Contribute content to NSFP and Advising newsletters
   • Utilize social media to share content and “good news” from UF courses.

4. Provide leadership and support for faculty assessment of the University Learning Outcomes.
   • Utilize e-portfolios and Qualtrics assessment survey to gather data
   • Provide reports and facilitation for departmental conversations and follow up
   • Work with the Assessment Coordinating Council to foster greater integration of assessment practices in the undergraduate curriculum.
5. Support the use of e-Portfolios for student and faculty learning and documentation of ULO attainment in UF and First Year Writing courses.
   • Collaborate with the IDEA Shop to support faculty integration of e-portfolios into the courses
   • Work with IDEA Shop and FYW to create and launch a new student e-portfolio template
   • Support student adoption of e-portfolios through an approach that directly targets students in addition to working with faculty.
References


Appendix A

UF300 ULO 2 Spring 2015 Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Message</th>
<th>Support</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F2F (27)</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online (14)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Twelve sections represented (41 Artifacts)
Appendix B.

To: Michelle Payne, Department of English Chair; Tony Roark, COAS Dean; Susan Shadle, CTL Director, and Vicki Stieha, FSP Director

From: Heidi Estrem, FYWP Director

Re: Proposal for University Writing Program/University Writing Director Position

Date: February 12, 2015

Context: Students are most likely to grow as writers when there is consistent attention to writing instruction across their university experience.\(^1\) Because of Boise State’s university-wide shared learning outcomes, writing is now visible in the undergraduate curriculum as never before. However, there has not been an opportunity for consistent attention to writing instruction across campus, either within “ULO 1,” the Written Communication student learning outcome, or in a range of courses beyond those officially identified via the ULOs.

Clearly, Boise State is a place where writing is valued. Now, we can become a place where writing is visible, where colleagues engage in purposeful and ongoing conversations about writing pedagogy and connections between courses, and where composing in new media and digital genres is a rewarding experience for faculty and students alike. The University Writing Director position and the University Writing Program proposed in this memo provide sustained support for faculty and students engaged with writing at Boise State University.

University Writing Director Position: (tenure-track faculty in Composition and Rhetoric; 1-1 reassigned time; funding sources/reporting lines TBD)

Responsibilities

- Provide leadership for writing across campus
  - Work with CTL leadership to offer development activities (offer workshops, summer seminars, or lead faculty development groups as appropriate)
  - Consult with appropriate University administrators on issues related to writing across Boise State
  - Advise faculty when they have questions related to writing in their disciplines or courses

---

• Provide leadership for writing instruction within the Foundational Studies Program, in particular with courses identified under University Learning Outcome 1, Written Communication
  o As part of Foundational Studies Council, provide faculty development on CID and FF400 integrating writing with course design and assessment, as needed
  o Advise departments on CID and FF400 course syllabi and pedagogical approaches
  o Offer faculty development opportunities to CID and FF400 faculty (workshops, departmental consultations, individual consultations, in consultation with FSP and CTL)

• Coordinate program activities
  o Manage budget
    ▪ Oversee budget (including base budget from COAS and contributions from client units) and expenditures
    ▪ Work with the Office of Development to secure additional funding for university-wide writing activities
    ▪ In consultation with others in the program, discuss and requisition needed items

• Serve on university committees
  o Serve on University Assessment Council
  o Serve on Foundational Studies Council
  o Work in coordination with CTL

**University Writing Program:** The University Writing Director serves as the director of the University Writing Program and chair of a university Writing Advisory Board. The Writing Advisory Board would have representation from diverse colleges and programs as well as at least two community members.

*In order to create a culture of writing at Boise State, the University Writing Program will:*
  • Advocate for writers and writing at Boise State
  • Seek opportunities to increase visibility for writers and writing at Boise State
  • Create opportunities for cross-course and cross-disciplinary conversations and connections w/r/t student writing
  • Investigate disciplinary and interdisciplinary communication and promote faculty research
  • Engage in long-term studies of writing to enhance writing instruction in all disciplines across campus.

While any plans are of course contingent on input from other stakeholders, this two-year timeline offers an example of what the work of the University Writing Program Director could look like.

**Action Items Year 1: (2015-2016)**
1. **Establish a Writing Advisory Board** (meets once/semester: early fall to set/discuss the year’s goals. Late spring to reflect and set goals for next year.)

   **Purpose:**
   - to offer a space for community-university interactions, initiatives, and idea-sharing
   - to provide recommendations, support, and strategies for faculty engaged in teaching disciplinary and professional writing
   - to establish and adjust initiative goals
   - to provide feedback to director on grant spending/budget goals
     - establish framework for Studying Writing mini-grants: descriptive. Pedagogical. What students can do and what we want to help them do better. Host a grant workshop in spring 16. Accept first proposals in spring 2016 to be done in 2016-7
   - to explore opportunities to highlight and support student writing on campus
   - to identify best ways to reach out to CID and FF faculty – and to provide the support and professional development they want or need.

2. **Lead a Boise State Teaching Scholars Faculty Inquiry Group Focused on Writing and Transfer**

   **Purpose:**
   - increase faculty knowledge about teaching writing as disciplinary practice
   - develop pedagogical strategies to enhance transfer in the vertical writing curriculum and networked among classes
   - provide faculty an opportunity to create sustainable and manageable research projects
   - develop research proposals for next year—mini-grants as needed

3. **Initiate Vertical Writing Curriculum Conversations:** Offer at least 2 workshops for CID faculty, at least one for Finishing Foundations, and at least one guest speaker/workshop leader for writing across campus each year.
   - Workshop 1 (CID): Teach for Transfer 1: what happens in 102? What happens in your courses?
   - Workshop 2 (CID):  Teach for Transfer 2: developing a shared vocabulary for how we talk about writing
   - Workshop 3: (FF): Helping Students Create Their Digital Self in Capstone Courses
   - Guest Speaker: Teach for Transfer via Threshold Concepts

4. **Prepare for a Writing the Blue** campaign (set aside some of the budget funds; figure out whether this year’s funds are available or not)
   - year-long undergraduate media intern
   - interview students and faculty for super brief clips about writing at Boise State
   - Develop Web presence/social media presence for university writing (and a plan for how to sustain it)
Year Two (2016-2017):
1. Writing Advisory Board meets in fall to discuss year’s goals, plan for year.
   a. Each Writing Advisory Board member researches a potential grant source
   b. And/or host a workshop with a grant writer.

2. Distribute Researching Writing @ Boise State mini-grants:
   o encourage faculty to do manageable teacher-research projects on writing (with guidance)
   o $250-750 for data management, student help, other.
   o Grants must meet Advisory Board-set parameters.
   o Grantees present to WAB and also at Great Ideas or elsewhere
   o Support long-term study of student writing at Boise State (example: Materials Science study proposed several years ago)

3. Sustain Vertical Writing Curriculum Conversations: Offer at least 2 workshops for CID faculty, at least one for Finishing Foundations, and at least one guest speaker/workshop leader for writing across campus.
   o Workshop 1 (CID): Teach for Transfer 1: What are threshold concepts for writing in CID courses? How can those build upon threshold concepts supported in FYW? How can they point to later courses?
   o Workshop 2 (CID): Teach for Transfer 2: Revisiting the shared vocabulary for how we talk about writing
   o Workshop 3: (FF): Enhancing transfer through guided reflection
   o Guest Speaker: Teach for Transfer via Genre Studies Across the Curriculum

4. Initiate the Writing the Blue campaign. Student intern program for writing visibility – continue with interviews or other efforts

Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program funds for professional development related to writing efforts</td>
<td>$6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>across campus</td>
<td>to fund mini-grants, guest speakers, and workshops (depending on additional funding)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed new funds:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-1 course reassignment</td>
<td>2@$2901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual speaker series</td>
<td>$4000$4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total new funds:</td>
<td>$9802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>