FSP COUNCIL MEETING
September 18, 2015
1:00-2:30 p.m., Riverfront Hall 301

ATTENDEES:
Council members (11): Patrick Delana, Heidi Estrem, David Gabbard, Gary Hunt, Adrian Kane, Debbie Kaylor, Daryl Macomb, John McClellan, Kristen Mitchell, Marty Most, Caile Spear

Others (3): Vicki Stieha, Riley Caldwell-O’Keefe, Kay Wingert

AGENDA
1. Welcome new members
2. Updates: Faculty Senate Review of UF 100 & FSP
3. State Board of Education General Education Policy III.N. in relation to UF 300
4. Assessment reports: DLV & DLL. Representatives for disciplinary groups meeting in December.

DISCUSSION:

**Faculty senate review.** Vicki Stieha updated the council on the faculty senate’s review of the Foundational Studies Program.
- **Expansion of review.** Vicki Stieha recently met with Joelle Powers, Faculty Senate president, and Scott Lowe, Faculty Senate vice president. The senate initially understood request by President Kustra to be a more focused review of the UF 100 course. Provost Marty Schimpf has clarified that senate is requested to widen gaze beyond the UF 100 course to a general overview of the Foundational Studies program now that we are three years in.
- **Review process.** The faculty senate will have three subcommittees in 2015, one of which will perform the FSP review. The senate subcommittee has already been provided with initial background information on the FSP. The subcommittee will also ask FSP council members and members of the original core reform taskforce to provide information—and will interview representative faculty and students.

**UF 100.** Discussion of UF 100 included updates on: Fall 2015 faculty development, student evaluations, Spring 2015 plenary pilot/possible changes to course structure, and steps to address faculty recruitment issues.
- **Faculty development.** (1) During Fall 2015, all Discussion Group Leaders (DGLs) are required to attend FSP faculty development workshops and received $140 in funding to attend the training (at least four 75-minute sessions). In conjunction with the workshops, DGLs are creating reflective e-portfolios about their teaching and the team teaching process. (2) Vicki Stieha is observing at least one class session with each DGL and completing an observation rubric. In addition, all Fall 2015 discussion sections will be participating in a midterm assessment process, whether through CTL or by other means.
- **Student evaluations.** Institutional Research found that students scored UF 100 similarly to other large, 100-level courses in some areas. However, UF 100 received lower marks on “meeting course objectives.” This result may indicate that students do not clearly understand what the UF 100 learning outcome objectives are—or the relationship between plenary sessions and discussion group work. The FSP is working with faculty to clarify student understanding of objectives and course structure.

- **Course structure.** The size of plenary sessions (200+ students) may be a barrier to faculty recruitment. It also distances lead faculty from students and student feedback. Key question for investigation: Is plenary of 200 too big? Does UF 100 have “too many moving parts”? Vicki Stieha is developing new plenary theme for Spring 2015 called “Mind Games” with a pilot test design. “Mind Games” course will cut plenary size to 125 students and be taught with “super DGL” as partner.

- **Faculty recruitment.** (1) Some departments are not motivated to lend faculty to the FSP program. In addition to being reluctant to recruit replacement faculty for department courses, chairs may not understand that each department receives credit for UF 100 seats their faculty instructs. Riley Caldwell-O’Keefe is developing message to chairs addressing this misunderstanding. (2) Lead faculty receive no compensation for the significant time they invest in developing new thematic courses. Question raised as to whether compensation originally planned for course design could be reinserted into future FSP budgets.

**UF 300.** Vicki Stieha sought input from council members on requiring transfer students to take UF 300, given State Board of Education Policy III. N. and changing curriculum at outside institutions. Boise State’s revised general education has been a model for other institutions in the state and we have supported the statewide move toward shared outcomes (GEM outcomes were written partially based on Boise State’s ULOs) and more tightly integrated curricula.

- **Review of state board policy.** The state board requires that general education matriculation (GEM) credits be recognized by fellow institutions and “transferable as meeting the GEM requirement at any institution.” The fact that Boise State requires transferring students with who have satisfied all of the GEM outcomes elsewhere to take UF 300, an additional course that to meet those outcomes may no longer be necessary.

- **Changes at other institutions.** CWI, which accounts for about 30% of Boise State transfer students, has instituted core courses similar to UF 100 and UF 200 (with thematic structure and critical inquiry focus). In addition, state universities in California, Oregon, and Washington (where many out-of-state transfer students come from) have all adopted curriculums linked to LEAP learning outcomes. Given the general movement of other institutions toward curriculums similar to Boise State’s, should we continue asking transfer students to take UF 300? Consensus of discussion indicated that council members would be willing to discontinue UF 300 if certain institution-specific elements of the course were available to transfer students in another format. Initial discussion focused heavily on two elements: library orientation and e-portfolio creation. (Teamwork, innovation, and civic engagement ULOs briefly mentioned as other possible areas of concern.)

- **Addressing gaps if UF 300 discontinued.** Council members discussed various ways that library orientation and e-portfolio training might be delivered to transfer students outside of UF 300 as currently designed. Ideas put forward included:
  - Retaining UF300 requirement but changing it from a three-credit course to a one-credit course (perhaps one-credit version could focus on single project incorporating both library research and e-portfolio presentation).
Offering an optional one-credit course but asking transferring students to take a self-assessment survey (whether online, through student advising, or at Bronco venture) that would help students with gaps self-identify into the course.

- Asking departments to incorporate library orientation and e-portfolio elements into CID courses.

**ULO Assessment Plan.**

- **Phase One DLL assessment.** The DLL assessment survey had both a high response rate and garnered a meaningful level of qualitative commentary. FSP council member Adrian Kane helped fellow department members understand survey objectives and complete the assessment survey at a group meeting. The FSP believes that this model (in-person, department-member messaging and a survey completion meeting) encouraged more faculty to make a robust response.

- **Phase One DLV assessment.** The initial DLV assessment survey had a low response rate and resulted in little meaningful qualitative commentary. The FSP believes theater and visual arts faculty were disadvantaged by e-mail only messaging and on-line only completion. Theatre is meeting to collect assessment data. Follow up will continue with Music and Art. Future survey delivery will be designed along more successful DLL model.

- **Orientation for DLS representatives meeting in December.** Social Science departments will be starting phase one assessment this year. Council members endorsed recruiting department members to present assessment plan and survey in person to social science faculty. In terms of the December Statewide meeting, we need to review current representatives and potentially replace a few.

**DOCUMENTS PROVIDED:**

1. Idaho State Board of Education Policy III N:  
2. FSP Annual Report pp 40 (Disciplinary Lens Assessment Report):  
3. ULO Assessment Plan summary:  
   http://academics.boisestate.edu/fsp/university-learning-outcomes/assessment-plan/