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Communicating a Message: Active Teaching & Learning for a New Era

We are keenly aware that most of today’s college students have been raised with the Internet and they have not known a time when computers were not in every business and increasingly in every classroom. They are called “digital natives” and teaching them is distinct from teaching students from prior generations. Foundational Studies has actively embraced technology and social media to help students adjust their expectations for UF courses and their engagement in learning -- we expect students to connect to content and to their peers, to work collaboratively, and do more than “show up.”

Through our collaboration with New Student and Family Programs and the University advising network, we worked to help students understand the focus and purpose of Foundational Studies and how the combination of Foundational Studies courses, electives, and courses in their major combine with out of class experiences to build the skills and habits of mind that our graduates need to demonstrate.

Turning the tide to foster students’ active engagement in their learning and faculty’s work to transform their pedagogies is a lengthy process. We continue to work toward a learning-centered curriculum by supporting the scholarship of teaching and learning, community engagement in our courses, ongoing applied research in teaching and learning, and through a variety of workshops and seminars. Our integrated digital literacy curriculum is supported through our collaboration with Albertsons Library. We have also introduced e-Portfolios at the university with an initial focus on Foundational Studies courses and are working with others across campus to expand their use into all academic programs to support active and engaged teaching and learning informed by authentic assessment.

Connecting Courses and Community

Applying learning from the classroom to the community and bringing community experiences into the classroom for students’ academic inquiry amplifies the learning experience. Our UF 200 classes emphasize community engaged learning through a number of strategies and several projects have garnered accolades from the higher education community including winning the Excellence in Engaged Scholarship Award. Civic engagement in UF 200 classes last year included experiential learning in through the following:

- Integration of author visit and garden or food bank service work into courses utilizing the text, Tomatoland
• Mapping the Bronco Stadium for accessibility (safe space and disability) and submitting a letter to Boise State facilities which resulted in significant changes to stadium accessibility.
• Idaho Human Rights Education Center projects
• Participant observation and research projects based on local and global ethical issues

Students feedback following community engagement experiences demonstrate how essential it is to introduce them to learning that moves them beyond their “own little bubble.” As one student said, “Researching and writing about civic engagement stretched my mind and understanding of my topic. It caused me to think deeper than normal and articulate it into words.” Another, whose class included service learning commented, “It was so uplifting and it was a nice reminder what doing something for others makes you feel. I hope that I get chances or opportunities to do more community service for any of my classes. Being able to physically act upon something we learned in our discussions is nice because it helps us realize at a small scale that these issues are happening in our world.”

Act Now

In conjunction with the Campus Read, Foundational Studies supported the Act Now Project bringing together campus and community with an awareness of human rights. Students enrolled in UF 200 and UF 300 were encouraged to participate and expand upon their classroom learning experiential opportunities though and joined other students across campus participating in the many events.

Maintaining Foundational Studies’ Connection to the Undergraduate Experience

Engaging faculty and staff in the Foundational Studies Program and ensuring that their voices remain central as the program continues to grow is essential. The FSP Program Council was endorsed by the Faculty Senate this year and 14 faculty and staff members were invited to serve. The council’s initial focus was to put forth an approach to assessment of the University Learning Outcomes in the Foundational Studies Program. See the Continuous Improvement section in this document for details on the plan they produced. Additionally, the Council provides advisory support to the program regarding the way we support the ULOs within the curriculum and the co-curriculum.
2013-2014 Foundational Studies Program Goals in Review

Goal 1: Launch ULO assessment including e-Portfolio and end-of-semester survey.

Evidence of Success:

- Digication site was created with Boise State specific content including templates, rubrics for ULOs as well as program specific standards (CAEP and ABET)
- 41,974 student e-Portfolios have been created in the last year including students in UF 300, selected ENGL 101, Spanish Education Majors, and Mechanical Engineering majors. Additional e-Portfolios supported by Service Learning and Career Services will be uploaded.
- 9 Workshops and training sessions were held in the spring to support faculty and staff involved in the initiative.
- Student survey regarding e-Portfolio learning was launched through Digication during the summer of 2014 to begin collecting data during the fall 2014 semester.
- In conjunction with the CALIPER study, developed an end of the semester DL survey and identified insights regarding ULO assessment strategies that will be useful in DL courses. See Disciplinary Lens discussion in this report.
- Course design documents were posted online and clearly identified on the FSP website.
- Collaborated with Institutional Research to draft structures for ULO assessment support within and beyond FSP. See Assessment of the University Learning Outcomes section in this document.

Goal 2: Continue creating and refining clear and consistent communication with all program constituents (advising and student success, students, faculty, staff in co-curricular programs).

Evidence of Success:

- The FSP website was reviewed and reorganized to increase its user-friendliness. Special attention was paid to avoid multiple click throughs (e.g. reduce the number of clicks required to get to information from the home page) and we added a section supporting and showcasing e-Portfolios.
- FSP contributed to the planning of the academic introduction for Bronco Venture and provided back-up to the Vice Provost for the academic welcome at Bronco Venture and TNT presentations. Additionally, Vicki served on the faculty panel for Bronco Venture speaking directly to new students’ parents.
- FSP contributed to AAE newsletters (November 2013, April 2014, July 2014)
- FSP is using social media (Twitter, Google+, and Facebook) to communicate to faculty, staff, students, and the community and to drive these communities to additional program and event information on our website.
- The new FSP Blog was launched featuring “good news” and exciting class related stories from the program. (see http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/foundational-studies-program/)
Goal 3: Develop and 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:
- Established a faculty development series for UF 100, 200, and 300 faculty and discussion group leaders regarding active learning for fall and spring. Collected data on the use of active learning and learning outcomes in UF 100, 200, and 300 classes.
- Publicized and encouraged faculty to attend the Great Ideas Teaching Symposium (19 attended).
- Collaborated with Service Learning to provide faculty development for integrating experiential learning into UF 200.
- Emphasized integrating co-curricular experiences with curriculum (e.g. Campus Read, Diversity and International opportunities) in all UF courses
- Refined UF 100 course rubric for ULOs 1, 3, 4 based on assessment review
- Identified key ULO criteria for UF 200 and 300 learning outcomes based on 2013-2014 assessment and drafted course level rubrics that more readily apply ULO key criteria to UF 200 and 300 assignments.
- Featured standout student work on our website and social media to promoted excellence and engaged teaching and learning.
- Defined signature assignments for UF 100, 200, and 300.

Goal 4: Develop a sustainable structure that serves to increase the ability of the FSP program to deliver on the University’s strategic plan.

Evidence of Success:
- Established targets for ratio of full time faculty and staff teaching UF courses
- Established partnerships with Service Learning to support expansion of community engaged learning in UF 200 and 300.
- Launched projects linking the campus to the community strengthening the interconnection between Boise State and the community.
- Created an organizational chart to support primary mission of FSP and related initiatives
- Demonstrated sustainable enrollment management and budgeting practices by creating tracking sheets updated monthly (budget) and utilizing data warehouse to more accurately predict the number of seats required for UF 100, 200, and 300.
- Solicited new course proposals from interdisciplinary teams for Intellectual Foundations courses (UF 100) and supported cross listing Civic and Ethical Foundations with the Global Learning Initiative.

Goal 5: Take steps in building a national reputation as a leader in reformed general education and the undergraduate experience.

Evidence of Success:
- Participated in Idaho’s LEAP State efforts and continued to support the statewide general education reform efforts
- Presented about FSP at national General Education conferences (AGLS, AAC&U) and Higher Education conferences (two presentations at HETL)
- Collaborated on grant supported projects regarding assessment and higher education practices (CALIPER)
- Supported FSP faculty and staff to publish articles in national higher education media outlets (UF 200 Award for SoTL work)
- Supported FSP faculty and staff to present at regional, national, and international conferences and publish in higher education journals
The Foundational Studies Program

During the Boise State University Program Prioritization Process, The Foundational Studies Program examined the extent to which we have integrated the “high impact practices” identified by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AAC&U) as associated with student learning and retention gains. As the table below indicates, the FSP supports Boise State’s ability to integrate the high impact practices for ALL students (an emphasis that the AAC&U sees as essential to ensure that excellence is inclusive, not preserved for a limited population.) Our focus for continued development stays within the range of high impact practices discussed here. The FSP continues to collaborate with campus partners to adopt evidence-based practices that support students’ learning and persistence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AACU High Impact Practice</th>
<th>Foundational Studies element</th>
<th>Level of integration by FSP and at Boise State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Year Seminar and Experiences</td>
<td>UF 100 as an academic orientation to the university</td>
<td>High. Required course for all students without a complete core or AA degree. The addition of a Transfer Experience via UF 300 is also a strength in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Intellectual Experiences (curricular and co-curricular)</td>
<td>Common Read; consistent integrated library curriculum; intentional curriculum, signature assignments.</td>
<td>High. All incoming students experience the elements in UF 100 &amp; 200, or UF 300)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities</td>
<td>Living Learning Communities; community of learners in UF 100</td>
<td>Medium. FSP links a few UF 100 courses to the residential LLCs. Some Discussion Groups in UF 100 fulfill this community vision better than others. This is an area of opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive Courses</td>
<td>The writing outcome (ULO 1) is integrated throughout the 4 year undergraduate curriculum in ENGL 101, 102, UF 200, CIDs, and FF courses.</td>
<td>High. Writing across the curriculum is an emphasis of the FSP and writing courses are included both in general education as well as in the major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Projects and Assignments</td>
<td>UF 100 Digital Projects all have a team element. UF 300 incorporates team projects and assignments</td>
<td>High. The inclusion of ULO 4, teamwork and innovation, in our FSP is a strong lever for the inclusion of collaboration. Strong support from the CTL for Team Based learning is an important contributor to our achievement in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Research</td>
<td>Boise State has established a</td>
<td>Low for FSP; High for Boise State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity/Global Learning</td>
<td>FSP includes UF 200 &amp; 300 with an emphasis on Diversity and Global Learning</td>
<td>High. All incoming students take either UF 200 or 300. FSP collaborated multiple campus and community programs to hold “Act Now” this spring to support students’ community engagement. E-Portfolios also support development in this area (see example).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Learning</td>
<td>FSP includes Community Based Learning in UF 200 and is building it in to UF 300.</td>
<td>Medium As UF 200 and 300 continue to be developed this is an area of emphasis and opportunity. We are collaborating with Service Learning to increase our impact in this area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internships</td>
<td>No FSP courses are designated as internships. See The Career Center for information on Boise State Internship data.</td>
<td>See Achieving the ULOs for collaborations with The Career Center via Digication e-Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Courses and Projects</td>
<td>The FSP includes a required Finishing Foundations course for all majors. The courses are housed in departments.</td>
<td>High All majors have a capstone course a Boise State. FSP collaborates to support departments with faculty development, curriculum development, and assessment support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University Foundations Courses**

At their inception, the University Foundations courses were conceived using Fink’s (2003) “backward design” approach so that the learning outcomes were linked to the pedagogies and the assessment. Our program has supported that continuous improvement design through the examination of learning outcomes assessment and student experience data. With each year we examine the data and make adjustments to the courses to maximize the student learning and engagement. One key to our annual assessment cycle is the use of *signature assignments*, which are tasks, activities, projects, or exams purposefully created to collect evidence for a
specific learning outcome or outcomes. They are created collaboratively by the faculty who teach a particular course and are most often used with minimal variation across sections of the same course. Additionally, faculty share course level learning outcomes. That is, we have interpreted the broad ULOs to apply to the courses we are teaching. A set of course level rubrics with the proficiency level for “satisfactory” performance is collaboratively determined by the faculty for each course. UF 100, 200, and 300 all include signature assignments (e.g. Global Solutions Project) which assists our faculty in their learning outcomes assessment process. A discussion of the courses and assessment efforts for our UF courses is discussed below.

Focus on excellence

Foundational Studies, working with the Office of the Provost, created two full time lectureships last year and will fill another two full time faculty positions. These positions, along with collaborative agreements with the Colleges, help us recruit full time faculty to teach UF 100, 200, and 300 sections. Our goal is to achieve 70% of our sections being taught by full time faculty and staff at Boise State. Highly qualified instructors, whether professors or professional staff, have the opportunity to engage in faculty development and collaborate with other faculty, and are able to create the conditions that are more likely to foster student success. The Foundational Studies Program is committed to ensuring that our courses are staffed with the most highly qualified instructional staff possible. We also understand that adjunct faculty can and do support student success when provided with opportunities for professional growth and collaboration. We seek all opportunities to engage all of our instructors in these enriching experiences.

An analysis of our UF 100, 200, and 300 instructors breaks down the faculty status for those instructors by course. In the table below we have broken out the faculty teaching in the UF 100 Discussion groups, UF 200 classes, and UF 300 classes. It is our goal to have 70% of our UF 100 plenary, UF 200, and UF 300 sections taught by full time faculty or professional staff. We will seek to continue to increase the percentage of full time faculty and staff teaching in the Discussion Groups, however, we also promote the idea that teaching within the UF 100 team is an excellent faculty development opportunity because of the mentoring relationship on the UF 100 teams. Therefore it is an excellent mechanism to recruit and train new faculty in the program.
UF 100, 200, & 300 Faculty by Rank:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Fall 2013</th>
<th>Faculty Fall 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FT Fac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 100 Lead Faculty</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 100 DGs*</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 200</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 300</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% FT Fac + Staff excluding DGs</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* DG sections are not included in our 70% goal. Please see rationale above.

Student enrollment by course:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2013</th>
<th></th>
<th>Fall 2014</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td># sections</td>
<td># enrollments</td>
<td># sections</td>
<td># enrollments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 100 Plenaries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1776**</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1862**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 100 DGs*</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 200</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF 300</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3401 non-duplicated</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* UF 100 DG figure includes online sections of UF 100 which are taught in 25 student sections by one faculty member.
** The total enrollment total for UF 100 is not duplicated. Enrollment for UF 100 is only counted by Discussion Group and online section. E.g. 1776 students enrolled in plenary are excluded in the total for the Fall 2013 figure.

Foundational Studies has also been working to expand the connections that we have with the faculty in all of our colleges. As we recover from the recession and more full time faculty are added to the university’s ranks the departments capacity to support faculty who wish to teach in Foundational Studies is growing. Another source of expertise and support for student success can be found in our student affairs departments. Many of our professional staff are highly qualified to teach and enjoy adding the classroom experience to their 9 to 5 work lives. While we have been actively recruiting, we are also working with our colleagues to recommend the program to their departmental peers. The current distribution of full time faculty by college and full time staff by department is included in the table below.

2013-14 Full time Faculty and Professional Staff by Department/Program and College
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Academic Department</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Professional Staff Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>COAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>COAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>COBE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>COHS</td>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Community &amp; Environmental Health</td>
<td>COHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Respiratory Care</td>
<td>COHS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
<td>COE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Curriculum &amp; Instruction</td>
<td>COE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>COEN</td>
<td>Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Material Science</td>
<td>COEN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extended Studies</td>
<td>eCampus Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>SSPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>SSPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>SSPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Registrar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Affairs</td>
<td>Diversity and Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Honors</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>International Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Foundational Studies</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>Center for Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regardless of their rank, Foundational Studies works with those who are teaching in our courses to provide development opportunities. 19 Foundational Studies faculty attended the Great Ideas Teaching and Learning Symposium in January, 2014 focusing on engaging students in critical thinking in the classroom. These workshops and symposia had a tremendous impact on many faculty members, encouraging them to stretch beyond their traditional pedagogical routines to try a new approach in the classroom. Within our program we have offered workshops and training sessions (described below) that are tailored to the particular challenges of each course. These sessions are well attended and faculty find them supportive of their growth and development.

“The two big messages for me were 1) the importance of "working up an appetite" in students before "feeding" them with information, and 2) the importance of active reflection on their part about what they are doing, in order to make the lessons and practice they're getting more generalizable to other situations.”

– UF faculty participant from the Great Ideas Symposium
The pedagogical and assessment focus in our UF 100 courses this year has been to enhance our students' engagement in our classes through critical inquiry. Our intent was to increase the level of critical inquiry throughout the course – in both the plenary and the discussion group. We understood from our prior evaluation of students’ experiences in UF 100 that students found it challenging to see a connection between the plenary and discussion group sections. We also knew that for many students “learning” seemed to happen in the Discussion Group section – and we needed to provide support for Discussion Group leaders to facilitate teachable moments.

Our fall pre-semester UF 100 workshop in Fall 2013 focused on active engagement in discussion groups to enhance students’ critical inquiry into the text. We examined students’ responses to NSSE questions connected to critical inquiry and brainstormed pedagogical approaches that would be useful to increase the students’ level of engagement relative to each question. Additionally, we provided two “FSP Conversations” series – one in the fall and one in the spring. Four sessions were offered (two times each) in the fall and three in the spring semester (see Appendix A for session descriptions). Some sessions featured our own faculty and some were connected with CTL workshops that were being offered to the general faculty.

As we began the spring semester, the Center for Teaching and Learning brought Dr. Bill Roberson to campus to talk about engaging students in critical thinking. Dr. Roberson’s ideas about the “interactive lecture” were impactful and found their way into several of our more traditional lecturers’ pedagogical toolbox.

A second notable enhancement in our courses was the development of weekly assignments designed to guide students to “pull” content from the plenary into the discussion groups or vice versa. Each plenary team applies a varied strategy (e.g. History/Future of Education uses discussion boards; Competition uses shared discussion prompts, Working, Story, and Genius use “critical inquiry” forms or “critical response” forms). A key to supporting students in this area of development seems to be providing structures to guide their development of strategies for analysis and evaluation of ideas.

Our annual assessment of the ULOs in UF 100 was held in June 2014 and the assessment summary report is included in Appendix B of this document. The primary findings from our learning assessment in UF 100 pertained to our expectations for our students’ ability to enact critical inquiry and their level of proficiency. While our expectation was that we should strive for “Good” (3), the way that we are teaching the course includes a scaffolding for critical inquiry. During our assessment, the faculty agreed that carrying out an excellent analysis using the provided pneumatic for critical analysis is not a high enough level of performance to equate to “Good” on the ULO rubrics. Rather, that outcome should be seen in the Developing range. The
faculty will continue to assess critical inquiry this fall and begin focusing on Oral Communication in the spring semester.

**Student Comments from UF 100**

- “I learned that people have just as great ideas as I think I do and that trusting your team members helps the collaboration grow”
- “I found, through the process of creating a documentary, that teamwork indeed does make the dream work.”
- “I still have a long way to come in becoming confident and comfortable in front of people and getting my point across...I plan on taking the opportunity to speak in front of larger groups in order to overcome this fear.”
- “I will definitely apply the skill of speaking up in other future classes and remember that I did it in front of a large lecture hall so I can do it again.”
- “I changed my way of researching by making more use of visual evidence.”

For more information about the approach for research analysis and the way that it is being used in the Library led Digital Literacy sessions, please see [http://libraries.boisestate.edu/foundations/pdf/UF100_Session_2.pdf](http://libraries.boisestate.edu/foundations/pdf/UF100_Session_2.pdf)

**Continuity**

Intellectual Foundations continues to mature and we are learning as we continue to cultivate students’ inquiry and engagement. The faculty teams are also learning how to work effectively as teams and refining the pedagogies and content of our courses. We’ve captured the lessons in a series of interviews with the lead faculty. These interviews will be “published” locally to share the lessons learned with our new instructional teams.

In the spring semester, the UF 100 Lead Faculty reviewed new UF 100 applications and accepted the following themes which will be developed this year (all of the following are working titles):

- Thinking Carefully about Climate Change: Foundational Colloquium on Science, Society, and Sustainability (Stewart Gardner, Stephen Crowley & colleagues)
- Nightmares and Visions: Exploring Science Fiction and the Role of Science in our Lives (Petros Panaou, Joe Champion, and colleagues)
- Becoming American: The Basque Experience/Case (John Ysursa & colleagues)
- God? (Shelton Woods & colleagues)

Course descriptions and proposals for these courses are included in Appendix C.
UF 200: Civic and Ethical Foundations

During the fall 2013 we launched 34 face-to-face and two online courses of UF200, up from our Spring 2013 pilot of eight face-to-face and one online course. Now over 25 faculty, including four lead faculty, teach 35 UF200 classes each semester to over 2000 students each year. This passionate and generative faculty accomplished a tremendous amount over the academic year. Major achievements included course and faculty development, multiple collaborations, development of community engagement practices across all courses, and thoughtful assessment.

Course and Faculty Development
This was a pivotal year for piloting signature assignments assessing ethics and diversity, community engagement and faculty collaborations. Our lead faculty are responsible for mentorship, leading faculty cluster meetings (small groups of UF 200 faculty), participating in collaborative assessment of the course and guiding continuous course development. They found that cluster meetings are challenging due to schedules, but the small groups fostered great conversation and collaborations. These discoveries impacted our faculty support structure for the 2014-15 academic year which will consist of six interactive topical workshops and open “collaborative conversation” sessions throughout the semester.

In order to foster continuous course and faculty development we accomplished the following:

- Piloting and assessment of signature assignments. (See Appendix D)
- In addition to the regular lead faculty and faculty cluster meetings, we held trainings and workshops:
  - “Welcome Back” meeting in the Fall which included a practical workshop on teaching ethics. (23 faculty participated)
  - UF 200 course development workshop (20 faculty participated)
  - Workshop for existing and new UF 200 and 300 faculty to prepare them for integrating Community Engagement and E-Portfolio into all UF 200 and 300 courses during the next academic year. (25 faculty participated, Overall satisfaction rating of 3.63 on a 4 point scale)
  - UF200 and 300 workshop focused on developing courses around ULO 6 (Diversity) and ULO 5 (Ethics) (25 faculty participated)
- Classroom observation and feedback for all courses with the intention of providing faculty useful pedagogical feedback.
Collaborations
The focus of the course, civic and ethical foundations with an emphasis on living and engaging with a diverse world, lends itself to partnerships across campus including the following:

- Diversity (ULO 6) assessment review with the Faculty Senate Diversity Committee and support of ULO 6 through co-sponsoring to bring Brenda Allen to campus for the “Difference Matters” conversations.
- Creation of cross listed UF 200 sections featuring high impact practices including a Belize Spring Break Study Abroad
- Coordinating the "Do One Thing: Make a Difference" Fall event in partnership with Service Learning, BSU Women's Center, Multicultural Student Services, Pride Alliance, and several community organizations. Over 100 students participated in the event which allowed students to participate in and become more involved with multiple civic engagement opportunities. The event was organized due to student response to the Campus Read and Tunnel of Oppression. Students expressed a desire to get involved and know “what’s next” after learning about difficult issues.
- “Do One Thing” expanded to a daylong event reaching over 350 students. The “Act Now Project” included partnerships with seven campus organizations and more than 15 community partners.
- Leadership on the Undergraduate Studies’ Core Team for Community Engagement; solidifying what community engaged learning will look like in our UF 200 and 300 classes and across campus. This was instigated in part by the application for Carnegie Community Engagement classification. Boise State was one of the first institutions to receive this classification in 2006. The experiential learning aspect of UF200 and 300 courses are key to Boise State’s ongoing commitment to community engagement.
- Designed UF200 curriculum to integrate the Women’s Center’s Bystander training in 38 UF200 sections reaching 958 students. This program is based on a nationally recognized, assessed program and promotes responsible community engagement focused on co-creating a safe environment for all people, especially focused on sexual violence. Due to the success of implementing this in our classes, the Women’s Center is developing a UF200 and 300 specific Bystander Training which intentionally incorporates the language of ethical frameworks and decision making. Participants demonstrated movement of 1.27 and 1.31 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.
Community Engagement

Experiential Learning is “Learning by doing.” The UF200 course is committed to developing strong, sustainable civic and community engagement practices in all courses. For FSP, this means students are actively engaged in an activity outside the classroom which helps build their sense of community and responsibility to that community. Experiential learning contains some element of self-directed learning, a reflective component and is fully integrated into the course curriculum. We piloted community engagement in multiple classes and have been able to develop guidelines for all faculty to build this expectation into their courses. The minimum time commitment is 2 – 3 hours and may take any number of engagement avenues. Here are a few examples of community engagement projects conducted during the 2013-14 academic year:

- Integration of author visit and garden or food bank service work into courses utilizing the text, Tomatoland
- Mapping the Bronco Stadium for accessibility (safe space and disability) and submitting a letter to Boise State facilities which resulted in significant changes to stadium accessibility.
- Idaho Human Rights Education Center projects
- Participant observation and research projects based on local and global ethical issues

Working with Service Learning, Foundational Studies has developed trainings and support systems including “open house” conversations and one-on-one meetings with faculty for the full implementation of experiential learning in every UF200 course for the 2014-15 academic year. Faculty answer the a set of experiential learning reflection questions and submit this to FSP with a copy of their syllabus. Contact FSP for access to these documents.

Assessment

Our assessment of the ULOs in UF 200 is conducted throughout the year, but most formally in December 2013 and June 2014 at the end of each semester. The assessment summary report is included in Appendix D of this document.

Overall Findings

- Writing: The range of criteria for ULO 1 (writing) is very wide and students’ learning from the course would be better served by focusing on criteria that are consistent with the “writing to learn” focus of UF 200.
- Ethics: Students seemed to have an implied understanding of ethical issues, though are generally less proficient in the area of clearly articulating the ethical implications and application of theories or principles to analysis of global issues.
- Diversity and Internationalization: Students’ scores on the criteria related to authentically incorporating multiple perspectives of complex global issues and analyzing potential solutions to global issues are less proficient than our goal.

Recommendations
- Faculty reviewed the writing learning outcomes and selected those criteria which were more closely associated with the “writing to learn” focus of the course.
- Revise the signature assignments to clarify the expectations regarding ethics and diversity learning outcomes.
- Recommendations provided for course development to build and scaffold understandings (ethics and diversity) throughout the semester.
- Offer faculty development focusing on ethics to ground the faculty in a few shared understandings of this multifaceted area of study. Dr. Tony Roark will be a guest presenter at the Fall 2014 UF 200 faculty meeting to support our work on this learning outcome.

UF 300: Transitional Foundations
This year our faculty cohort focused their efforts on reflective, formative assessment and made significant constructive revisions to the course design. Eleven faculty teach nine face-to-face and two online courses each semester to almost 800 students each year. Due to their implementation of high impact practices (community engagement, signature assignments, small group and team work) we have been able to drop the course from 40 to 30 students for the next academic year and, due to course demand, we have added an additional four courses with a need for still more capacity.

Course and Faculty Development
UF300 faculty meet regularly as a cohort throughout the semester with the FSP Assistant Director to discuss classroom management, curriculum, technology, and pedagogy. They have piloted meaningful Digication (e-portfolio) integration for Foundational Studies and wholeheartedly taken on the challenge of balancing individual faculty expertise and investment with the creation of a common course.

In order to foster continuous course and faculty development we accomplished the following:
- On-going e-Portfolio training and support

"A team project really opens up an opportunity for creativity and innovation in my opinion. When we work on our own, we may have a vision or idea that we think will be effective but we are limited to an individual perspective. Another person can offer a suggestion or propose an angle to the project that, overall, makes a more interesting project. This sort of interaction really helps you to see things differently and to also think outside the box."

–Spring 2014 UF 300 student comment.
- Continuous assessment of common assignments and pedagogical approaches,
- Work with a Master’s student to complete a study on the effectiveness and impact of UF300. Although conducted with a limited study pool, she concluded that students found the course had a positive impact on their preparation for upper-division courses, but that they wanted more “real world” application. This triangulated with our own assessment of course evaluations and faculty feedback and further supported our need for a course re-design.
- Collaboration with Extended Studies to expand capacity and consistent pedagogical quality for our UF300 courses.

Course Re-Design

Eight faculty participated in a five day intensive summer 2014 workshop to re-design the UF300 course. In preparation for this, faculty read several articles as well as Tina Seelig’s book InGenius. The new course, informed by Design Thinking principles, is highly pertinent for today’s students and asks them key questions that not only support the learning outcomes, but engage them on a personal level as well. The new focus for the course is captured in the title, “Personal Responsibility in a Global Community: Create, Innovate, Problem Solve.” More details about the redesigned course are available on our website at http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/students/uf300/.

Faculty felt that the re-design was extremely productive and rewarding. We created a new course question/theme, common learning outcomes, a signature end-of-course assignment, scaffolding assignments that aligned with the ULOs, and an assessment plan with specific projects designated for assessment in Fall 2014. (See UF300 Assessment Actions for these documents.) The faculty will meet at the end of Fall 2014 to reflect and discuss strategies for Spring 2015 assessment.

In anonymous feedback responses faculty stated:

“The exercises we did on creativity, innovation and problem solving [helped me feel most prepared to teach]. I plan on using versions of those as part of my class.”

“Extremely worthwhile.”

“I loved every bit of this workshop. I benefited personally and professionally.”

“I loved the way we worked through the course. I think it is very helpful and it was great getting to know people.”

Assessment

Our assessment of the ULOs in UF 300 was conducted throughout the year, but most formally in December 2013 and May 2014 at the end of each semester. The assessment summary report is included in Appendix E of this document.
Findings

- The faculty determined that the format of the final projects impacted their ability to assess them (essays were scored higher largely because it was easier to discern the achievement of the ULO criteria).
- Instructors will be asked to require that any alternate formats for the signature assignment will include a narrative portion making the ULO criteria explicit.
- Questions about the course design (teaching focus and backward design) were raised and considered in a course redesign workshop that followed this assessment process (see UF300 above).
- Based on prior assessment results, current assessment results, and student feedback, the faculty had already planned to redesign UF 300; these assessment results were used as one data point to inform that redesign process.
Disciplinary Lens Courses

For the second year, Foundational Studies worked with a team of interdisciplinary faculty on the CALIPER Project, focusing our attention on the connection between faculty practice and student learning outcomes assessment in STEM disciplinary lens courses. In this second year of the study, we acted on our year one findings indicating that faculty were interested in meeting with others teaching STEM courses and learning more about enacting active learning in their courses and linking these teaching practices to assessment of student learning outcomes. The project expanded to include faculty development workshops and mentorship by CALIPER researchers for the participants. One product of the CALIPER Project has been the development of a Qualtrics survey to collect assessment data. A second outcome has been the refinement of our understanding regarding the use of the Reformed Teaching Observation Protocol (RTOP) with faculty to highlight active teaching and learning. A report from the CALIPER Team will be forthcoming this year; however, the team will be requesting a no cost extension from NSF to continue our work in the coming year.

ULO assessment scores were generated by each faculty individually. Faculty submitted these scores along with responses to open ended questions about the conclusions they drew from the assessment process and changes that they were planning for their courses based on the assessment. The survey is included in Appendix F.

A summary of our ULO assessment data is included below:

- 20 participants completed the survey (DLM = 12, DLN = 8). A few participants submitted data but did not submit the survey; these surveys were input on their behalf.
- Most of the participants entered numerical grades (percentages) as well as ULO proficiency scores.
- With the mean scores in the “Developing” range, they are as would be expected for 100 level courses populated primarily by lower division students.
- The responses to the open ended questions include some thoughtful reflections about the connection between their teaching and the students’ learning relative to the ULOs. For example, “I also plan to include more opportunities for students to demonstrate understanding of the connection between chemistry and "the real world" (ULO 8.4) because this assignment really generated enthusiasm and voluntary participation. I think it helped to interest them in learning the course material."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULO</th>
<th>7.1</th>
<th>7.2</th>
<th>7.3</th>
<th>7.4</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>8.1</th>
<th>8.2</th>
<th>8.3</th>
<th>8.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: ULO assessment in 20 DLM and DLN courses. Spring 2014 data reported June, 2014.

### Communication in the Disciplines and Finishing Foundations Courses

Faculty teaching Communication in the Disciplines and Finishing Foundations courses are preparing for the 2012 cohort to enter their classes. Foundational Studies is encouraging the use of the e-Portfolio for faculty assessment of the ULOs in these classes, however, doing so is not a requirement.

2013-14 was a time for trying out new assignment and course designs based on the course design tables created in 2011. During Program Prioritization, it was clear that departments were considering the way these courses would link the ULOs and Program Learning Outcomes. See the Continuous Improvement section of this document to review progress made this year in support of the assessment of learning outcomes on the University and Program levels.

In 2014, Clyde Moneyhun (Associate Professor, English Department and Director of the Writing Center) will be leading our work to support assessment of the Communication in the Disciplines courses in 2015. Developing a foundation for that work will begin in 2014-15.
Continuous Improvement

E-Portfolio and Assessment Support

Boise State launched the first phase of the e-Portfolio Program in 2013-2014 with the full participation of the First-Year Writing Program (ENGL 101, 101P, 102, 112) and UF 300 as well as use in the Spanish program. Various professors throughout the curriculum experimented with e-Portfolios and, as our e-Portfolio spotlight page demonstrates, students and faculty are expanding their use of the platform to support and demonstrate students’ learning.

A major undertaking this year was the integration of Digication with our People Soft data to create an automatic extract of the student, faculty, and course data needed to populate Digication for university wide implementation. Programming to define fields and create an daily export of data to Digication involved staff from multiple units and hundreds of hours in development and production. The result is the inclusion of all undergraduate course and student users’ data input into Digication eliminating time-consuming manual uploads of this data. Our current extract excludes graduate, second degree and non-degree students, however future phases will include these students in the extract sent to Digication automatically.

Usage of e-Portfolios is increasing, as the table below demonstrates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 year</th>
<th>6 mos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student e-Portfolios</td>
<td>3563</td>
<td>2706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty e-Portfolios</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1: Student and faculty usage of e-portfolios as of July 23, 2014

Support for e-Portfolios included a collaborative team including the e-Portfolio Coordinator (.5 FTE), First-Year Writing Faculty Coordinator (.25 FTE buyout) , two student assistants (10 hours each), technology assistance from Help Desk @ the Zone, and instructional design assistance from Academic Technologies. Support was somewhat ad hoc in 2013-14 as we discovered more about the level of assistance that would be needed to roll out e-Portfolios to a larger audience. A review of the support needed to meet our pedagogical and assessment goals via
the e-Portfolio and other assessment strategies resulted in a model for support that includes multiple campus partners working collaboratively.

**E-Portfolio and Assessment Support at Boise State**

Understanding students’ perceptions of e-Portfolio learning is an important aspect of our assessment efforts. To facilitate our access to this level of feedback from students, we have added a very brief survey to the home page for Digication. The questions are drawn from a federally funded (FIPSE Connect to Learn project) multi-campus study of e-Portfolios for learning and assessment in higher education. Our findings will allow us to compare the Boise State program impact with other campuses.

Survey questions:
1. Building my e-portfolio helped me think about the content of my courses.
2. Building my e-portfolio helped me succeed as a student.
3. Someday I’d like to use my e-portfolio to show what I’ve learned and what I can do to others such as potential employers or professors at other college.
4. Using my e-portfolio has allowed me to be more aware of my growth and development as a learner.
5. Building my e-portfolio helped me make connections between ideas.

There is a four point response scale these questions from “Not at all” to “Very much.”
Foundational Studies Program Council

In November 2013 the Faculty Senate endorsed the creation of a Foundational Studies Program Council composed of faculty and professional staff representatives. The purpose of the FSP Council is to:

Play a role in the review and continuous improvement efforts of the Foundational Studies Program. The functions included in continuous improvement touch upon curricular and instructional design for courses, review of assessment reports, review and revision of ULO rubrics based on faculty and assessment feedback, and strategic guidance for the Foundational Studies Program’s curricular and assessment functions.

Membership of the Council includes the following distribution of representatives:
- DLN* courses: 2 representatives
- DLS* courses: 2 representatives
- DLL* courses: 2 representatives
- DLV* courses: 1 representative
- DLM* courses 1 representative
- ENGL 101, 102, 112: 1 representative
- UF 100, 200, 300: 2 representatives
- ULO Assessment: Coordinator of ePortfolio, Director of Institutional Research (or designee)
- Chair: FSP Director
- CID/FF: Writing Across the Curriculum Director
- Co-curricular Programs: 2 representatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Representative 1</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
<th>Representative 2</th>
<th>Dept.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DLN</td>
<td>Daryl Macomb</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Kristin Mitchell</td>
<td>Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLS</td>
<td>vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eric Landrum</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLL</td>
<td>Becca Sibrian</td>
<td>World</td>
<td>Carrie Seymour</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Languages</td>
<td>(joined fall 2014)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLV</td>
<td>Brian Hodges</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLM</td>
<td>Sasha Wang</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sam Coskey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYW</td>
<td>Heidi Estrem</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UF Courses</td>
<td>John Bieter</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caile Spear</td>
<td>Kinesiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ULO Assessment</td>
<td>E-Portfolio Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>Shari Ellertson</td>
<td>Institutional Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAC</td>
<td>Melissa Keith/Clyde Moneyhun</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-Curricular</td>
<td>Debbie Kaylor</td>
<td>Career Center</td>
<td>Damoni Wright</td>
<td>Student Involvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Foundational Studies Program Council crafted a plan for Boise State’s multi-year assessment review of University Learning Outcomes data. The plan addresses the periodic assessment of all ULOs over a 4 year cycle and includes a “continuous improvement cycle.” The full plan is included in Appendix F. Included below is a chart demonstrating the annual focus for the ULOs and the phases of the continuous improvement cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>ULOs 2, 9, 10</th>
<th>ULOs 5, 6, 11</th>
<th>ULOs 3, 7, 8</th>
<th>ULOs 1, 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: Continuous Assessment Process

**Phase 1: Active Assessment.** Collect and evaluate evidence; make recommendations for changes.

**Phase 2: Distribution and Development.** Share results with larger community; Roll out plans for change; Provide Faculty/Staff development

**Phase 3: Implementation.** Change efforts implemented; Additional faculty/staff development; Review of progress

**Phase 4: Maintenance & Revision.** Formative assessment to compare against phase 1 data.

This assessment plan captures the best practices in higher education assessment by ensuring that we are not taking a “one and done” approach to examining our ULOs. The recursive cycle of identifying strengths and weaknesses in the students learning includes faculty development and continuous improvement with phase 3 providing a “check in” to see if the implemented modifications delivered the intended outcomes.

Importantly, the plan preserves what we have continuously supported, assessment must be authentic and tied to the course or experience. The use of quantitative data (particular question sets embedded in multiple choice exams, for example) is supported through the assessment survey. Similarly, the use of e-Portfolio teaching and learning strategies is supported. Regardless of the mode of assessment, the intent is to foster faculty reflection on teaching and learning.

This plan will require an investment in time and resources by the university and the faculty, but will distinguish Boise State as a leader in authentic assessment.
Strategic Challenges and Opportunities

Foundational Studies is a leader at Boise State in actualizing interdisciplinary thinking and collaboration. Our faculty is drawn from every college and over thirty disciplines. Our courses benefit from that rich blend of multi-disciplinary influences. We consider it our responsibility to continue growing these rich faculty and student interdisciplinary opportunities. With this responsibility come many strategic challenges and opportunities.

Faculty Recruitment

Teaching 6,000 students in over 120 UF 100, 200, and 300 courses and 160 discussion groups each year takes a large, committed faculty community. We are challenged to balance the ratio of full and part time faculty relationships with the responsibilities and commitments to home departments.

We believe that the visibility and prioritization of Foundational Studies in the University Strategic Plan increases the prestige of teaching a University Foundations course, but more tangible support through recognition of teaching excellence in P&T as well as FSP and University highlights and awards will help to bolster our ability to recruit more full time faculty.

We also have an opportunity to share our stories of growth and fulfillment as faculty with colleagues. We will be encouraging these stories of collaboration in 2014-15.

Course Development

Two particular course development challenges concern building and sustaining a common course and creating best practices for community engagement in our UF200 and UF300 courses.

We have piloted community engagement (CE) practices in many of our courses, but we are now ramping up to fully integrate CE into all UF200 (Fall 2014) and UF300 (Spring 2015) courses with the goal of encouraging students to be lifelong learners and civic participants. We will work on actively assessing what works/doesn’t work and how we can best support faculty as they move to include learning beyond the classroom into their curriculum.

Assessment

We continually build our assessment practices to ensure that assessment is authentic and informs, but does not restrict constructive course development. We are also challenged to creatively address resource gaps (manpower, time, funding) for thoughtful assessment including artifact collection, integration with Digication, artifact review, reflection and course revision.
2014 will mark greater involvement of faculty teaching in the Disciplinary Lens courses as well as the Communication in the Disciplines and Finishing Foundations in authentic assessment. As these faculty members are only tangentially connected to Foundational Studies we will continue to partner with colleagues and engage creatively in the use of social media and other communication strategies to reach them. The Foundational Studies Program Council is a step in the right direction to meaningfully engage faculty and staff in the FSP. More attention needs to be paid to developing these capacities on our campus.

The Idaho State Board of Education Policy III N regarding General Education courses in the public universities includes a structure and learning outcomes for GEM courses that will be transferrable across our colleges and universities. While the structure of this statewide general education is consistent to Foundational Studies, the FSP will need to work with the Faculty Senate to mesh our program with the GEM program. The FSP Council will need to review the Disciplinary Lens courses to certify them as GEM stamped courses.

**Student Engagement**

We are challenged to meet and then complicate students’ perception of the value of general education in a culture which expects a streamlined major-to-career trajectory.

Engaging students in thought provoking interdisciplinary questions in multiple courses and experiences has been demonstrated to be the antidote to the single minded litany of vocational preparation. We clearly want students to prepare for careers and to be engaged citizens of the world, and that challenge requires the attributes developed through a robust general education. In the Foundational Studies Program, we engage students not with gimmicks or fads, but through the active interaction with thought provoking ideas and opportunities for reflection and critique individually, with their faculty, and with their peers.

“Reading Freire, I was so wholly against the banking concept of teaching, and for the question posing, it made me fully realize that the reason for higher education is not to solidify your expertise in one field, [...] but to allow you to be a whole person. The purpose of education is to give you a foundation to build upon later, by whatever speaks to you. The foundation to understand, comprehend, and implement other ideas that will allow you to build a round wisdom, and then expand on it with your passionate focus!” – Summer 2014 UF 100 student
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 and college websites will showcase student and faculty e-Portfolios.
   - 4500 e-Portfolios will be created in FSP related courses (UF, FYW, DL, CID, FF)
   - Collaborate with AT to design and deliver workshops and training sessions to support students and faculty involved in the initiative.
   - Collect and analyze student survey regarding e-Portfolio usefulness.
   - Revise and deliver faculty assessment survey at the end of the fall and spring semesters
   - Collaborate with IR to develop mapping between NSSE data, senior survey and investigate the use of class based NSSE questions on course evaluations.

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:**
   - Seek faculty approval of the proposed an annual system of assessment wherein faculty are assessing direct evidence of student learning from across the curriculum.
   - Provide easily accessible interface to share/disseminate assessment data to faculty, departments, and programs to support the use of data for curricular and pedagogical development.
   - DL, CID, and FF Course Design Documents will be updated and online so that they are fully accessible to faculty.
   - Create and disseminate the assessment survey for DLV and DLS courses.

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:**
   - FSP website will be revised to decrease the number of “click throughs” required to get to course and assessment information.
   - Develop and disseminate issue specific information for faculty and advisors (e.g. who takes UF 300? How to support Boise State catalog changes)
   - FSP will collaborate with Advising network and NSFP to support students smooth transition into the university.
   - Develop an FSP e-Newsletter to be released 2-3 times per semester
   - Current UF Faculty will serve as FSP ambassadors throughout the year

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:
- Continue the FSP Conversations series for UF 100, 200, and 300 faculty and discussion group leaders regarding active learning for fall and spring. Collect data on the use of active learning and learning outcomes in UF 100, 200, and 300 classes.
- Each semester, offer workshops to launch courses (UF 100, 200, 300) focusing attention on areas highlighted through assessment that present opportunities for improvement.
- Implement plans (in conjunction with Service Learning) to integrate intentional civically-engaged Learning in all UF 200 and 300 classes.
- Integrate E-portfolios into the UF 100 and 200 classes.
- Collect direct assessment of student learning in targeted criteria for ULO 1-6.
- Foster sustainable faculty recruitment and lead faculty models

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

Evidence of Success:
- Collaborate with CTL to create an abbreviated course design workshop for new faculty teams
- Create an archive of resources and “best practices” developed by the inaugural UF 100 Teams
- Teams will have been identified and will have an approved course design table and the beginning of a course plan developed by the end of Fall 2014.

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

Evidence of Success:
- Continue to support Idaho’s statewide General Education Leadership Team
- Present about FSP at national General Education conferences (AGLS, AACU) and Higher Education conferences
- Collaboration on grant supported projects regarding assessment and higher education practices
- Seek/support FSP faculty and staff to publish articles in national higher education media outlets
- Seek/support FSP faculty and staff to publish in higher education journals
Appendix A.

FSP Conversations
Fall 2014 Semester Workshop Series

In order to accommodate as many people as we can, most workshop topics will be offered two times on the scheduled day and each month we will alternate days. Please join us if you can. Materials from the workshops will be posted, but there’s no substitute to joining the conversation! Mark your calendars for the following dates:

Date: Thursday, September 26th
Times: 11:00-11:50 and 3:15-4:05 (Center for Teaching and Learning ILC 315)
Topic: Engaging Students with “Learner-Centered Strategies”

Mary Ellen Weimer, author of Learner-Centered Teaching, defines five key changes to practice that she asserts will make it more learner and learning centered. We will share the five changes and invite participants to adapt them to our FSP courses (UF 100, 200 and 300) during this interactive and learner-centered workshop.

Date: Friday, October 18th
Times: 9:00-10:30 (Center for Teaching and Learning ILC 315)
Topic: Engaging Students with Questions: Leveraging Inquiry in any Classroom

*Please note: For this session we are teaming up with the CTL. Please sign up for this session by going to the CTL website and registering there.* [http://ctl.boisestate.edu/events/default.asp](http://ctl.boisestate.edu/events/default.asp)

Inquiry-based methods are important student-centered pedagogical tools because they tap the curiosity of the learner and prime students to take an active role in constructing understanding. This workshop will introduce a simple approach that can be used in many course environments to start by engaging students with questions. The approach can be used as both short introductions to a lecture and as longer activities that engage students in complex thinking.

Date: Thursday, November 7th
Times: 11:00-11:50 and 3:15-4:05 (Center for Teaching and Learning ILC 315)
Topic: Supporting Teamwork: Conflict Resolution 101

Putting students into a group and giving them a group assignment often only reinforces the same negative experiences and behaviors that our students expect of team projects. How can we work with students to help them build teamwork skills and knowledge? How do we change the tide when a team is not functioning well? Join us to learn about and to share successful teamwork building practices that you can use as your students collaborative work reaches a crescendo this semester.

Date: Wednesday, December 4th
Times: 11:00-11:50 and 3:15-4:05 (Center for Teaching and Learning ILC 315)
Topic: Effective Endings: Wrapping up the semester and helping students know what they now know

Fostering students’ ability to reflect on their learning is a key to helping them connect learning from one course or experience to the next. This kind of integrative learning is a central goal for the Foundational Studies Program. During this workshop we will share strategies to reinforce student reflection and metacognition.
FSP Conversations

Spring Semester Workshop Series -- 2014

Please join us if you can. Materials from the workshops will be posted, but there’s no substitute to joining the conversation! Please register for these sessions on the Center for Teaching and Learning website. These workshops are open to ALL!

**Date:** Friday, January 24th

**Times:** 9:00-10:30 (Center for Teaching and Learning ILC 315)

**Topic:** Freeing Students to Succeed

*Facilitated by Susan Shadle and Ruth Salter*

Students' conceptions and misconceptions of their own capacity for learning can influence their performance as much as or more so than their instructors do. In this workshop, we’ll explore what research has to say about how students unwittingly limit themselves and how we as faculty can help students grow past these limitations.

**Date:** Monday, February 10th

**Times:** 12:00-1:00 (Center for Teaching and Learning ILC 315)

**Topic:** Making Teamwork Work

*Facilitated by Stephanie Cox and Jennifer Black*

Stephanie Cox and Jennifer Black have been developing strategies to support students’ teamwork skills in a variety of class formats from online to face to face and from small seminar sized classes to large plenaries. Join us to talk about course design and tips to increase the success of teamwork in your classes.

**Date:** Friday, March 14th

**Times:** 1:30-2:30 (SUB – Trueblood Room)

**Topic:** (Working title) Worthy of assessment: Designing and delivering meaningful oral communication (ULO2) assignments.

*Facilitated by Erin McClellan*

Boise State’s Signature Learning Outcomes include Oral Communication Competency as expressed in ULO 2. Whether you teach UF 100, UF 300, a Communication in the Disciplines (CID) course, or Finishing Foundations (FF) course, oral competency is a topic worth revisiting – where is it in your course? The Communication Across the Disciplines research points to the inherent challenges many faculty face in designing learning activities that foster effective oral communication skills across courses and over time leading us all to lean a little too heavily on the “final presentation” as a demonstration of our students’ oral communication “skills.” In this workshop, Erin McClellan (Asst. Prof., Department of Communication and Communication Across the Disciplines liaison) will lead a participatory session on integrating meaningful oral communication competency activities and assessment into our existing courses.
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UF 100 Annual Assessment Report

Attending: John Bieter, Guy Hudson, Riley Caldwell-O’Keefe, Petros Panaou, Jennifer Black, Shelton Woods, Stewart Gardner, Brian Martin (Instructional Designer), and Vicki Stieha

The UF 100 faculty met on 6/12/2014 to review ULO 3 as described in the Summary of Data report. Our focus was to describe our understanding of their learning relative to criteria 3.1 (articulating the problem/question/issue), 3.2 (collecting and organizing evidence/data/reasons), and 3.3 (evaluative reasoning). We also discussed related issues including student effort and engagement as well as the information literacy unit delivered through our library collaboration.

3.1 Articulating the Problem/Question/Issue

In some of our sections, the general question for the students’ inquiry is pre-established (Competition, for example, establishes a tension between east and west that requires students’ reasoned response). In other sections the problem/question/issue is more open ended. Regardless, we notice the need for:

- Providing support for students to learn to formulate good questions
- Asking students to challenge texts
- Using rubrics to respond to students work (e.g. does the source support, challenge, or extend an idea presented in the course and why?)
- Providing good examples of questions as models.
- Providing students the opportunity to talk through their questions to help them process (suggestion that brief one-on-one conferences with DGs might foster this type of development)
- Creating online mini-lectures (a few minutes) to talk about the text to show how we are questioning it. [Here is an example of one that Steph created about her reading of Meno -- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rh4MOeUEU3RE. What I love about this video is the inclusion of the “how” and “why” create a concept map of a reading at the end of the video. Steph is making her thinking and her teaching transparent here].

3.2 Collecting and Organizing Evidence/Data/Reasons

Our signature assignment asks students to gather supporting evidence for their position or topic. Generally, although our data indicates our students are “meeting” or exceeding our expectation 82% of the time, we are questioning if “satisfactory” (which is supposed to correlate to “meeting” the outcome) is really equivalent to “Good” on the ULO rubric.

As we discussed the data supporting 3.2 in particular we noticed student work exhibits a pattern of either not using or not understanding peer reviewed sources. It was suggested that we need to help students understand why peer reviewed sources are valued. A single lesson (during the information literacy session with the librarians) is clearly not satisfactory. We also noted students’ heavy reliance on Google searches. We think that we need to give them more help to discern when they need to find various types of sources.

Finally, we considered whether our UF 100 “satisfactory” was really better aligned to “developing” than “good” and noted that we were providing a structure for searching and evaluation (referenced below as well) and that those who are performing at or above expectations may not be doing so without that structure. In that case, does 82% really represent “good” on the university level rubrics’ scale? We determined that what we are...
probably seeing is something between developing and good and we need to revise our course level rubrics to reflect that reality.

3.3 Evaluative Reasoning
The signature assignment for the course asks students to use the mnemonic, “CRAAP” to evaluate the sources in terms of their research value (the way we are operationalizing evaluative reasoning for this project). This framework, we believe allows them to follow precise steps to conduct the evaluative reasoning. Ultimately we want students to internalize the CRAAP guidelines in upper division work. As in 3.2, we understand that the high percentage of students who are “meeting or exceeding” our expectation (89%) are doing so at a level we would expect for “developing” critical inquiry because we are providing the structure and they have not yet internalized it. As above, we recommend a revision of our course level learning outcomes to more realistically align with the university learning outcomes.

The Library curriculum
When we discuss critical inquiry in UF 100, the library’s integrated informational literacy curriculum is always part of the conversation. We noted the ongoing conversation about changes being made to that curriculum and suggestions to work with students’ tendency to use Google searching rather than against it. We also talked about encouraging the use of a “pre-test” for the library sessions to “flip” some of the content out of the face to face session and to make the in-class work more challenging. Those who teach honors sections are hoping that we can create a “custom” honors curriculum to substitute for the regular session so that we can challenge these students more appropriately.

Student Effort
Faculty comments on the review of assessment data highlight a pattern of students who may be doing only the minimal effort required to earn the grade they want. While this is a source of frustration to many faculty, we discussed the need to understand that we are going to have a range of students and learning styles. It is a struggle for some of them simply to come to class. There are also students who have never had to work hard in school and they are in the habit of just skating by. We are learning to work within that range. There is an opportunity presented to us for Discussion Group Leaders to reach out to those who can do little work and get a good grade to dig deeper by telling them you care about them and asking them to do more – to challenge themselves.

We note that in order for students to do well, many of them need to have choices. They need to have different ways into the text and different ways to express what they are thinking or learning. It was suggested that we offer more alternatives (topics for final projects, modalities for presentations, etc.)

We also noted that students will do well when they understand what “well” looks like. Jen and Steph have developed rubrics that provide a clear set of guidelines to provide feedback about how they are integrating sources. In East/West Competition, they have a more objective project and they must analyze the data – they are forced to look at the sources in order to support their claim.

Next Year’s Focus
We decided that we are going to make adjustments to the signature assignment and to re-examine 3.1, 3.2, 3.3 data in the fall. Each team will be encouraged to conduct the assessment within their teams (including the Discussion Group leaders) and then to report back to FSP.
In the fall we will also begin conducting assessment within each team on ULO 2 with the focus on 2.1, 2.3, 2.4, 2.5, and 2.6. A draft of the course level rubric for these criteria is included with this report. We will collect evidence for ULO 2 during the 2014-15 academic year and assess it together in May/June 2015.

Each team will work with Vicki and/or Brian Martin to develop an approach to integrating the e-Portfolio that works for them and will generate at least a student submission of the signature assignment through Digication.

**Intellectual Foundations UF 100 Course Rubrics**

The following UF 100 interpretation of the ULO rubric criteria are the result of our 2014 assessment meeting and our adjustment of our expectations for UF 100 students level of performance in the class relative to our University Learning Outcome goals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Critical Inquiry</td>
<td>Clearly identifies and describes the problem/question/issue; strong evidence demonstrating understanding of how it fits within the course’s focus.</td>
<td>Identifies and describes the problem/question/issue and provides a partial explanation of how it fits within the course’s focus.</td>
<td>Identification of a topic with a partial or scant description of the problem/question/issue being developed. Evidence connecting to the larger course focus is scant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Critical Inquiry</td>
<td>Adheres to and clearly follows research practices with respect to thoroughness and accuracy of data collection (e.g. evidence indicates understanding of database searching, use of peer reviewed material, correct citations) yielding resources that are well matched to the assignment criteria.</td>
<td>Reasonable search strategy using academic database, consistent search terms, and appropriate evidence types (e.g. peer reviewed versus non) yielding resources that are matched to the assignment criteria.</td>
<td>Data is collected using non-academic search strategies (e.g. typing search string into general search engines such as Google or Yahoo) yielding resources that may not match the assignment criteria or appropriately support the problem/question/issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Critical Inquiry</td>
<td>With the use of the</td>
<td>Adheres correctly to the</td>
<td>Incomplete or incorrect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluative Reasoning</strong></td>
<td>CRAAP criteria or independently, evaluates the value of the source for its accuracy and reliability and identifies the bias of the source and blends the evaluation into the rationale for its use as a resource.</td>
<td>CRAAP criteria for the evaluation of resources. May or may not be blended into a rationale for its use as a resource.</td>
<td>interpretation of information or criteria needed for CRAAP evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1 Oral Communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>Message</strong></td>
<td>Focuses on a central message that is clearly and consistently stated and supported with evidence/appropriate details.</td>
<td>Focuses on a central message in a manner that is apparent. Some use of appropriate evidence/details to support that message.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.2 Oral Communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>Support (use of data and appropriate props, images, or graphics)</strong></td>
<td>Data and/or visual elements effectively support the speaker’s credibility and reinforce the message.</td>
<td>Speaker uses data and/or visual elements appropriately to add to his/her credibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.3 Oral Communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>Uses an organizational pattern that is clearly and consistently observable.</td>
<td>Organizational pattern (visually and verbally) is intermittently observable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4 Oral Communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td>Makes thoughtful and appropriate language choices for the audience and occasion to make the presentation stand out.</td>
<td>Language choices are acceptable and appropriate to the audience and occasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5 Oral Communication</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presentation/Delivery</strong> (it is assumed that UF)</td>
<td>Uses delivery techniques that make the presentation interesting, understandable, and</td>
<td>Delivery techniques are satisfactory and assist the audience in understanding.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
100 will include the requirement of an oral presentation in person or online where every student has an oral role.

| 2.6 Oral Communication | Communicate effectively as a listener | Engages in a way that conveys comprehension of orally communicated ideas | Engages in a way that indicates flawed understanding of an orally communicated message but clearly attempts to fulfill the role as listener. | Lack of engagement with orally communicated message suggesting breakdown in the role as a listener. |
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Fall 2015 UF 100 Plenary Themes and Lead Faculty

All of the themes presently have “working titles” and the descriptions below are excerpted from the course proposals

Thinking Carefully about Climate Change: Foundational Colloquium on Science, Society, and Sustainability

Stephen Crowley, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy, President of the Faculty Senate (2013-2014).
Stewart Gardner, Lecturer, Department of Political Science and Foundational Studies Program.

Perhaps no questions will involve the critical thought of our students over the course of their lives—and indeed all human societies, for the foreseeable future—more than the constellation of questions around changes in the planet’s climate, the myriad effects of those changes, and possible individual and communal responses to those effects. The UF 100 course we propose would introduce students to a portion of those questions while helping them to develop perspectives, strategies, and tools for assessing and coping with them. [...] We envision [organizing the class] around a set of large natural science questions about the character of climate and environment, and their potential intersections and impacts with a great many systems of human concern, from physical, to ethical, political, economic, and so on.

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

Petros Panaou, Department of Literacy
Dr. Joe Champion, Department of Mathematics

Science Fiction (SF) authors use contemporary scientific knowledge to extrapolate potential scientific and technological breakthroughs and their impact on human societies. They often study scientific texts and concepts and introduce them in their narratives, in a manner that adds credibility to the stories they tell. A science-fiction-themed section of UF100 would introduce SF narratives as a transdisciplinary space for students to explore the ways our lives—past, present and future—intersect with science and technology. In this engaging and creative manner, it would be serving the central aim of providing an intellectual orientation to university-level learning, inquiry, and innovation.

Becoming American: The Basque Experience (Case?)

John Ysursa, Director, Basque Studies Consortium, Department of History
Dr. Ysursa is currently seeking a co-Lead faculty

The basis of the course is an exploration of the profound revolutionary essence of a simple question that many people of the modern, industrialized West take for granted: “how do you define yourself?” For most all of human history, one’s identity was largely assigned by birth as defined by the family, tribe or larger community. Only recently in some places like the United States did “choice of what to be” become a viable option. One can be born an American, but one can also become American. The Basque-American immigrant experience will serve as a case study providing an introduction and examples of the multiple issues that have arisen in this Land of Immigrants.

God?
Shelton Woods, Interim Dean, SSPA, Department of History
Dr. Woods is currently seeking a co-Lead faculty
This UF 100 course is broadly modeled on the nationally-recognized Harvard class, “The Question of God” taught by Dr. Armand Nicholi. Crucial questions of our everyday lives will be answered from the perspective of a purely material worldview versus a theistic worldview. Each of the course questions will be presented from these perspectives. […] One of the many activities that might be used for this course is for students to investigate how [the debate over politics and religion] is played out in many spheres of our culture.

Faculty members are encouraged to continue to submit course proposals and they will be reviewed on a rolling basis so that we can remain flexible and responses to changes in schedules and the need for seats in the program. Please encourage faculty to speak to Vicki Stieha regarding their interests.

Lead faculty are released from teaching courses or workload is negotiated to permit them to teach two plenaries and two discussion groups per year. In addition to their regular pay, faculty are given a $3000 annual stipend. The home department is paid $6000.
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UF 200 Annual Assessment Report

Fall 2013 Assessment
A group of nine (9) faculty who taught UF 200: Civic and Ethical Foundations met to review the assessment data submitted by faculty teaching the course in the Fall 2013 semester. Prior to the meeting, faculty teaching UF 200 were asked to review student learning outcomes based on the criteria established in the University Learning Outcome rubrics. Each faculty member randomly selected five (5) students from their roster. Submitted student generated artifacts were evaluated by faculty with a focus on ULO 1.6 (Writing: mechanics) and 5.3 (Ethical Reasoning).

General Findings and Actions:

1. The range of criteria for ULO 1 (writing) is very wide and students’ learning from the course would be better served by focusing on criteria that are consistent with the “writing to learn” focus of UF 200.
2. There is a need for readings that will better ground students in the conceptual frameworks upon which they can build understandings of diversity/internationalization (ULO 6) and ethics (ULO 5). The faculty determined a set of common readings from which faculty can choose to support our work toward the Signature Learning Outcomes.
3. Faculty members developed two “signature” assignments for UF 200 to encourage a more common experience and facilitate assessment across courses.
   a. Code of Ethics: Accomplished between weeks two and five. Assignment must assess ULOs 1.7, 1.11, and 5.1 - 5.4
   b. Synthesizing/Reflective Assignment: Accomplished between weeks 13 and 15. Assignment must assess all course ULOs. (Lead faculty only)

Spring 2014 Assessment
Four raters assessed 48 “Code of Ethics” assignments randomly selected from the UF200 general population (plus three assessed during the norming session). These same raters also assessed 17 synthesis assignments randomly selected from the UF200 lead faculty courses (plus three assessed during the norming session).

General Findings and Actions:
Code of Ethics Assignment
What level did the student achieve for ethics in this assignment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULO Criteria assessed</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>33% Exemplary or Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Pie chart showing the distribution of ethics levels: Exemplary: 33%, Good: 44%, Developing: 23%, Unsatisfactory: 1%.]
Exemplary: Reliably distinguishes factual issues and disputes from ethical ones (Clearly identifies and defines an ethical dilemma); clearly articulates basic ethical concepts, their relation to one another and their relevance to the subject of inquiry.

Good: Successfully distinguishes factual issues and disputes from ethical ones (ethical dilemma implied and only minimally articulated); evidences general understanding of basic ethical concepts, their relation to one another and their relevance to the subject of inquiry.

Developing: Occasionally distinguishes factual issues and disputes from ethical ones (some evidence of ethical dilemma presented); evidences rudimentary understanding of basic ethical concepts, their relation to one another and their relevance to the subject of inquiry.

Unsatisfactory: Unable to distinguish factual issues and disputes from ethical ones; evidences little or no understanding of basic ethical concepts as they relate to one another and the subject of inquiry. (Does not identify an ethical issue.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULO Criteria assessed</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Diversity and Internationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>32% Exemplary or Good</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What level did the student achieve for ethics in this assignment? (See rubric above)

Developing: [14]
Exemplary: Co [1]
Good: General [9]
Unsatisfactory [7]

What level did the student achieve for diversity and internationalization in this assignment?

Developing: [10]
Unsatisfactory [9]
Exemplary: Ap [1]
Exemplary: Occas [14]

Exemplary: Applies cultural self-awareness and knowledge of diverse group frameworks to specific problems and situations, clearly articulating alternative approaches and solutions; demonstrates disposition to work toward improving one’s own society, informed by awareness of diversities

| | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3% |
both within and beyond.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good</strong></td>
<td>Occasionally applies cultural self-awareness and knowledge of diverse group frameworks to specific problems and situations, but cannot articulate alternative approaches and solutions without help.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developing</strong></td>
<td>Recognizes applications of cultural self-awareness and knowledge of diverse group frameworks to problems and situations, but is unable to make such applications on one's own.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unsatisfactory</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrates little interest or ability in applying cultural self-awareness and knowledge of diverse group frameworks to specific problems or situations; regards problems of other groups as of little importance.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Findings**

- **Ethics**: Students seemed to have an implied understanding of ethical issues, though are generally unable to clearly articulate the ethical implications or to apply theories or principles.
- **Diversity and Internationalization**: Students seem unable to authentically incorporate multiple perspectives of complex global issues or analyze potential solutions to global issues.

**Actions** (Recommended by the Assessment Team and the FSP Assistant Director and approved by the UF200 Lead Faculty)

- Updated signature reading list
- Revise the signature assignments.
- One signature assignment needs to be dedicated to Ethical Reasoning

**UF200 Signature Course Assignments**

NOTE: We are still in the process of creating the most adaptable signature assignments that provide a common experience for students and make assessment across courses possible. With that said, you are welcome to take a look at the two signature assignments below and create one assignment which assesses all ULOs (5.3, 1.2, 1.4, 6.3, and 6.4). We will meet as a faculty at the end of the semester to reflect on what we learned.

**UF200 Signature Assignment #1: Ethical Reasoning (ULO 5.3)**

ULO 5.3 asks that students cogently apply prominent theories/principles to ethical issues; clearly articulate potential objections to one's own ethical reasoning and to others.

We are asking that each faculty create and pilot a specific assignment that asks students to achieve this criterion. The assignment should be due between weeks 10 and 15.

**Possible assignments:**

- Working in teams, students should choose an ethical issue (perhaps one that they are already researching or have carefully considered through class discussion and course materials). They should research relevant facts which people would use to make an ethical decision about that issue. Then the team creates a mind map demonstrating which set of facts are most important for each of the five ethical frameworks (Santa Clara reading). They should also include at least one fact that is least important or contrary to the decision one would make using each of the ethical frameworks. As a
team, they present this to the class (possibly using an interactive method to have students choose which facts are most relevant to them on the issue).

- Provide students with a current events article and have them analyze the ethical issues present in the given dilemma.

**UF200 Signature Assignment #2: Global Solutions (ULO 6)**

1500 – 1700 word research paper (1.2, 1.4) + author’s note due between weeks 13 and 15

The goal of the project is to culminate the semester with a project that tackles an issue with global implications from multiple perspectives and connecting this with a personal implication/responsibility.

This project may be any combination of team and individual work which fits your pedagogical style and course design. ULO Criteria assessed in this project (of course, you may include additional criteria – but all projects must contain at least these four)

1.2 Write effectively: Voice
1.4 Write effectively: Sources
6.3 Diversity and Internationalization: Identification of Issues
6.4 Diversity and Internationalization: Application to Issues

Students should utilize the following framework to “solve” their problem. This project should build from the library research component, include integration and appropriate citation of at least five reliable sources. (Note: We encourage faculty to create specific language about your expectations for appropriate voice and reliable sources that you include in your assignment instructions for students.)

- What is the issue? Identify an issue that has ethical and global implications. (ULO 6.3)
- What is the context? (ULO 1.4, 6.3)
  - Identify at least two groups with a vested interest in the issue. Analyze their interest in terms of at least two cultural frameworks (economics, historical, politics, social, or religious)
- What is the solution? (ULO 1.4, 6.4)
  - Identify at least two specific laws, policies, organizations, persons, or other actions that demonstrate an attempt at addressing the global issue.
  - Identify at least one UDHR article which is applicable for the ways that each group is addressing the issue.
  - Analyze the examples in terms of in what ways and how effectively they are addressing the issue. Are they practical, workable, and feasible? Are they having an impact?
- 200 – 300 word reflection/author’s note (ULO 1.2, 6.4)
  - Answer one of the following two questions:
    - Identify one or two of your social identities and explain how they are implicated with the issue you explored.
    - How does this project relate to your own sense of understanding of and responsibility to your community?
Ensuring that the assignment fits the above guidelines, each faculty may craft the language and the format of the paper/project in a way that fits with their course as long as it fits the above guidelines for student work. For example, this could mean utilizing an additional modality for presenting the projects (video, presentation, creative performance, conceptual art, digication/website) or this may be a longer project that builds throughout the semester.

Assessment Plan:
Fall 2014 (Formative assessment only): All-faculty conversation at the end of the semester to discuss the successes and challenges of the signature assignments. Create a more common ethics signature assignment and make necessary tweaks to the ULO 6 assignment.
Spring 2014 (Formative and summative assessment): Assessment team will assess ULOs 1, 5, and 6 through the course signature assignments.
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UF300 Annual Assessment Report

Four faculty members including FSP Assistant Director Riley Caldwell-O'Keefe conducted a rigorous review of 50 student learning artifacts randomly selected from the UF 300 courses taught during the Spring 2014 semester. All assignments were assessed based on the following ULOs:

- Critical Inquiry (3.1: Articulating the Problem/Question/Issue)
- Innovation (4.a.3: Making Contributions/addressing a need/solving problems)
- Ethics (5.3: Ethical Reasoning) Diversity and Internationalization (6.3: Identification of Issues)

The overall level of achievement on the ULOs was:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULO Criteria assessed</th>
<th>Critical Inquiry</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
<th>Ethics</th>
<th>Diversity and Internationalization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53% Exemplary or Good</td>
<td>39% Exemplary or Good</td>
<td>31% Exemplary or Good</td>
<td>40% Exemplary or Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings

- The faculty determined that the format of the final projects impacted their ability to assess them (essays were scored higher largely because it was easier to discern the achievement of the ULO criteria).
- Instructors will be asked to require that any alternate formats for the signature assignment will include a narrative portion making the ULO criteria explicit.
- Questions about the course design (teaching focus and backward design) were raised and considered in a course redesign workshop that followed this assessment process (see UF300 above).
- Based on prior assessment results, current assessment results, and student feedback, the faculty had already planned to redesign UF 300; these assessment results were used as one data point to inform that redesign process (see the UF 300 Common Assignment for a sample of the newly focused coursework).

Actions

- Faculty redeveloped the course based on the more carefully focused ULO criteria and the new theme for the course, “Personal Responsibility in a Global Community: Create, Innovate, Problem-Solve.” Through the course re-development process (see UF300 above) the faculty developed the following:

Course Learning Objectives:

- Construct new meanings and perspectives about oneself and the world by exchanging and evaluating ideas through writing and speech.
Utilize ethical frameworks and diverse perspectives to reach creative, effective solutions about complex global issues, individually and as a member of a team.
Consider and take appropriate actions to engage positively in civic and community life as a citizen of a local and global community.

**UF300 Signature Assignment**
**Global Solutions**

Note: Begin your course design from here and work backwards. What skills, dispositions and knowledge do students need to accomplish earlier in the semester to successfully complete this project? See especially the UF300 course design table for some ideas.

This project may be any combination of team and individual work which fits your pedagogical style and course design, but ensure that the teamwork is reliant upon each individual completing their components for successful project completion (ensuring true teamwork and not simply “parallel play”).

ULO Criteria assessed in this project (of course, you may include additional criteria – but all projects must contain at least these five)

3.4 Demonstrative Reasoning
4.a.3 Making Contributions/Addressing a Need/ Solving Problems
4.b.2 Facilitates the Contributions of Team Members
5.3 Ethical Reasoning
6.4 Diversity and Internationalization: Application to Issues

The goal of the project is to culminate the semester with a project which tackles an issue with global implications from multiple perspectives, framing the understanding of the complexity of the issue within ethical frameworks and connecting this with a personal implication/responsibility (I am the solution!)

Students should utilize the following framework to “solve” their problem. This project should build from the library research component.
- Identify a need
- Why does the status quo not meet the need
- What is a solution? (One suggestion: Each team member individually comes up with/researches one solution)
- As a team, analyze all of the possible solutions and come up with at least one detailed solution which is practical, workable and feasible

Each faculty may determine the acceptable modalities of their project (video, paper, presentation, creative performance, conceptual art, digication/website).
Common Assessment for Fall 2014

A. Teamwork Reflection after completing the Global Solutions project
Each student individually submits the following to a Digication assignment which includes the standards 4.b.2 and 1.2
- A 100 word reflection on each of the below three questions.
- They should provide at least one specific example for how they accomplished each one OR reflect on specific personal behaviors or dispositions that kept them from accomplishing the criteria. The answers should be respectful, self-reflexive and carefully proofread.
  - In what ways did you constructively build upon the contributions of your team members?
  - In what ways did you constructively synthesize the contributions of your team members?
  - In what ways did you encourage all of your teammates to participate and engage with the team project?

B. Hollywood Pitch
Each student should submit a written first draft (250 word pitch), written final draft (500 – 750 words), and 60 second video to a Digication assignment which includes standards 1.5, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4 and 2.5
- Elizabeth Cook’s Hollywood Pitch assignment is located on the UF300 development site under course documents/common texts/common assignments.
- Remember that we are moving away from the 21st century skills focus (in reference to the final draft instructions currently on Blackboard). I suggest that they utilize another framework that is specific to their field of study, the UF300 ULO criteria or some other framework which fits within the trajectory/design of your UF300 course. In any case – the final draft and video should show the students’ creative, “professional” selves.

Assessment Plan
- Fall 2014 we will assess teamwork, written and oral communication.
- Spring 2015 we will assess critical inquiry, innovation, ethics and diversity
Appendix F: DLM and DLN Assessment Reporting Survey

The survey stems from the first page so that faculty can view the learning outcomes associated with their course (page 2), however, all of the questions are the same regardless of the course taught. The sample here shows the version for mathematics courses. The exact format is used for DLN courses.

The following survey is designed to collect assessment reports from faculty teaching Disciplinary Lens courses that are part of the Foundational Studies Program. We will be focusing on the PROFICIENCY scores that faculty provide and combining them with other Disciplinary Lens courses in your DL category.

Descriptions of the proficiency levels for your DL category are available on the rubric pages for the DL categories. Please navigate to: http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/university-learning-outcomes/. It is recommended that you open the rubric for your DL category to have available in another window while you complete this survey.

Please see a sample of classroom data reported on an assessment form as a model for the following assessment report: http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/files/2014/04/explaining-assessment_2014.pdf

ENTER YOUR COURSE PREFIX and NUMBER in the space below (e.g. MATH 170, BIOL 191)

Please complete one survey per course that you are teaching. Multiple sections of the same course can be combined on one report. Please do not indicate the section number(s) you are teaching, only the course prefix and number.

Please indicate the Disciplinary Lens Course category for the course that you are reporting on:

- DLM Mathematics Disciplinary Lens
- DLN Natural, Physical, and Applied Science Disciplinary Lens
You do not need to complete every criteria (column headings contain criteria). Please leave cell blank if you do not have data for a criteria. You may submit data for graded and/or ungraded evidence of learning. Please include data that have been aggregated for the class (not individual student scores) with the average scores for the evidence.

Please see the Disciplinary Lens course rubric for Mathematics (ULO 7) for proficiency scoring details. 4 = Exemplary, 3 = Good, 2 = Developing, 1 = Unsatisfactory
http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/files/2013/04/ULO-7-Mathematics.pdf
In the space below, 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)

What conclusions have you drawn from your assessment data about the students' learning?

Describe the ways in which the conclusions that you have drawn above have implications for future course planning or instructional methods.

After clicking SUBMIT on the next page you will be given an option to Download a PDF by clicking the link on the TOP RIGHT side of the next screen for the download.
Appendix G.  

Report of the FSP Council Assessment Plan

A subgroup of the FSP Council met Friday, April 18, 2014 and crafted two halves of this proposal (1) addressed the periodic assessment of all ULOs over a 4 year cycle and (2) addressed the Continuous Improvement Cycle.

Attendees: Damoni Wright, Brian Hodges, Caile Spear, Heidi Estrem, Shari Ellertson, Shauna Anderson, Melissa Keith, Vicki Stieha

Focus of this session: To address the following question:

How can we make sense of the ULOs and the criteria so that Foundational Studies’ ULO assessment can move forward in reasonable timeframe and transparent and meaningful way?

On May 6, 2014 the full FSP Council convened and reviewed the Assessment Plan. The plan (as presented below) was unanimously approved with no abstentions by the members in attendance.

Attendees: John Bieter, Becca Sibrian, Brian Hodges, Caile Spear, Damoni Wright, Daryl Macomb, Debbie Kaylor, Eric Landrum, Heidi Estrem, Sasha Wang, Shari Ellertson, Shauna Anderson, Vicki Stieha

Absent: Melissa Keith, Kristen Mitchell

Assessment Plan

The teams developed two complementary components of an assessment strategy, which are included in this document.

Periodic Assessment of all ULOs over 4 year cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year 1 Assessment Group</th>
<th>Oral Communication (2)</th>
<th>DL Visual &amp; Performing Arts (9)</th>
<th>DL Literature and Humanities (10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 2 Assessment Group</strong></td>
<td>Diversity (6)</td>
<td>DL Social Science (11)</td>
<td>Ethics (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 3 Assessment Group</strong></td>
<td>Critical Inquiry (3)</td>
<td>DL Mathematics (7)</td>
<td>DL Natural, Physical, Applied Science (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year 4 Assessment Group</strong></td>
<td>Writing (1)</td>
<td>Teamwork/Innovation (4)</td>
<td>Review of Assessment Process</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* See “rationale for periodic review” below for explanation of the assessment cycle.

Process:

The assessment questions will be: How well are students achieving the outcomes? And how do you know?

Faculty will provide: Report summarizing assessment results for the course, assignment(s) used to assess ULOs, examples of student work (along with the associated assignment), evaluation criteria.
Sampling strategy: Faculty may sample student work for ULO assessment based on the sampling strategy included in the table below. Non-academic programs may use the same sampling approach based on program/event population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class size</th>
<th>Number of random samples drawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101+</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course reports (program reports from non-academic units) will be sent to the FSP Council. Assessors would review the assessment results and aggregate all sections of a course to provide a course level report for departmental reporting use.

[Ideally, in departments or programs a team of individuals would have reviewed reports for potential changes and enhancements to support learning prior to sending to the FSP Council. Doing so, however, is not currently funded centrally and would need to be incorporated into department or program workload.]

Assessors would then aggregate all course/non-academic program reports for category level reports (e.g. all DLV courses would be aggregated and the data would be assessed). Category level reports would be routed to the Provost’s office (for accreditation reporting) and to the appropriate faculty senate subcommittees.

Continuous Improvement Cycle

* The cycle recommendations were made to balance the assessment across the four year period. We wanted to spread the signature learning outcomes (1-6) over the 4 year period. We were mindful of the courses that were still being rolled out (in 2014-15 CID courses will be fully implemented and in 2015-16 FFs will be fully implemented). We also considered the time needed to establish the e-Portfolio on campus and to support expansion into classes beyond the first year.

The first year ULOs 2, 9, and 10 were chosen because we are already assessing Oral Communication in UF 100 and 300. The faculty teaching CID courses can be added in 2014-15. DLV is a small category and most of the courses are similar in size and structure (large lecture classes). DLL includes two disciplines that have been working on and thinking about assessment for some time (World Languages and English) and most of the courses use writing as a mode for instruction.
The second year inclusion of ULOs 5 & 6 in conjunction with ULO 11 (Social Sciences) brings together issues of culture and difference shared across all the ULOs, albeit in very different ways. ULOs 5 & 6 are assessed annually in UF 200 and 300.

The third year adds 3, 7, and 8. We have been assessing all three of these ULOs in smaller ways. ULO 3 is assessed annually in UF 100 and 300. ULOs 7 and 8 have been assessed in DL courses for STEM majors through an NSF funded research project, CALIPER.

The fourth year includes ULO 1 and 4 (Teamwork & Innovation). Again, both have been assessed elsewhere annually in UF 100, 300, and in the FYW Program. We will be adding assessment from CIDs and FF courses to those ongoing assessment efforts. The FFs will have had time to get up and running and the e-Portfolio system should be fully integrated by this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>ULOs 2, 9, 10</th>
<th>ULOs 5, 6, 11</th>
<th>ULOs 3, 7, 8</th>
<th>ULOs 1, 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020-21</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Of the nine attendees, two were Lead Faculty (tenured), two were permanent lecturers, one was professional staff, and four were adjunct faculty.