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Introduction and Institutional Context

The Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) oversees the institutions of higher education in Idaho. Those institutions consist of three universities (Boise State University, Idaho State University, and University of Idaho), one college (Lewis-Clark State College), a technical college, and three two-year institutions. Each of the two-year institutions also has its own board of trustees. In addition to overseeing higher education in Idaho, the SBOE also oversees K-12 education and several agencies.

The primary service region for Boise State University is the 10-county southwestern portion of Idaho, which includes the bulk of the state’s population as well as the State Capitol, and many headquarters of businesses, government agencies, and non-governmental organizations.

Until recently, the university shouldered the bulk of the responsibility for all state-funded post-secondary educational programming in our service region, from professional-technical education (PTE; primarily certificates and associate’s degrees) through doctoral education. In 2007, the College of Western Idaho (CWI) was created and given control of the building that had previously housed the west campus of BSU. BSU’s PTE programs were shifted to CWI, and CWI also created a number of 2 year academic programs to prepare students for eventual transfer to 4-year programs. Enrollments have expanded dramatically at CWI, and are expected to surpass 8,200 in fall of 2011.

BSU now offers 100 baccalaureate programs, more than 70 master’s programs, and 4 doctoral programs. An additional three doctoral programs are expected to begin in Fall of 2012. Enrollments for the Fall 2011 semester are nearly 20,000 headcount, of which about 17,475 are undergraduates and 2,260 are graduate students. The majority of students served are on the main Boise campus. However, the university offers limited coursework and degree programs at several off-campus locations as well. Additionally, a range of coursework and degree programs are available online.

BSU is led by President Robert Kustra and his executive team which includes: Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Martin Schimpf, Vice President for Finance and Administration Stacy Pearson, Vice President for Student Affairs Lisa Harris, Vice President for Research and Economic Development Mark Rudin, Interim Vice President for University Advancement Rosemary Reinhardt, and Vice President and University Counsel Kevin Satterlee.

Campus governance is shared by the Faculty Senate, the Professional Staff Association, the Association of Classified Employees, and the Associated Students of Boise State University. There are approximately 510 tenured/tenure track and other full time faculty members; they are augmented by about 560 adjunct faculty members.

Academic departments are organized into six colleges: Arts & Sciences, Business & Economics, Education, Engineering, Health Sciences, and Social Sciences & Public Affairs. Supporting and collaborating with those colleges are the Graduate College, the Honors College, and the Division of Extended Studies.

The University’s present strategic plan, Charting the Course, was put forth in August 2006 to guide our actions to attain our vision to become a Metropolitan Research University of Distinction. That plan identified four “destinations” that together describe what it means to attain our vision: Academic Excellence, Public Engagement, Vibrant Culture, and Exceptional Research. A set of ten strategic goals was developed to facilitate development of specific actions. The university has initiated the creation of a new strategic plan that will be overlain upon the structure of the Core Themes and Core Objectives described later in this document. It is anticipated that goals and strategies will be developed during fall 2011, and the creation of specific plans for implementation will follow in spring of 2012.
Preface: Response to Recommendations from 2009 Review Committee Report


Recommendation 1: Core Curriculum Reform

Boise State University continues to be challenged by self-identified weaknesses in the current Core Curriculum. The Committee recommends that the Core Reform Task Force continue to foster deliberative processes that result in timely adoption of a general education framework that aligns curriculum design, pedagogy, and assessment with articulated learning outcomes. (Standard 2.C.2, Policy 2.1)

Response to Recommendation 1

Boise State University has recently created a new general education framework that aligns curriculum design, pedagogy, and assessment with a set of learning objectives.

Creation of the New General Education framework:

Boise State’s current Core Curriculum was implemented in 1981 and has remained essentially unchanged since that time. In December 2008, a Core Reform Task Force was formed by the Provost in response to faculty concerns that the Core Curriculum needed to be re-examined in light of twenty-first century educational needs. Throughout 2009-2010, the Core Reform Task force held various forums, met with focus groups, considered feedback from multiple constituents, and began to develop a new program of general education, focused on specific outcomes and organized to provide students with a common, engaging educational experience. These new program learning objectives were inspired by the Liberal Education and America’s Promise (LEAP), a national public advocacy, campus action, and research initiative that champions the importance of a twenty-first-century liberal education.

In the fall of 2009, in the midst of the work of the Core Reform Task Force, an external review team from the Northwest Council on Colleges and Universities assessed the University’s general education program and emphasized the importance of updating the Core Curriculum. Following that review, the Core Reform Task Force completed work on the new program, the Foundational Studies Program, and in October 2010 Faculty Senate approved the Foundational Studies Program as a replacement for the Core Curriculum. Implementation of the program has started: a full time director has been hired, new courses to be offered by departments are being designed and existing courses redesigned, articulation with degree program curricula has been initiated, and faculty to teach new university-wide courses have been hired. Full implementation of the program will occur in fall semester 2012.

The Foundational Studies Program provides a connected, multidisciplinary framework of learning from freshman to senior years. Courses incorporate teamwork and extend the educational experience beyond the classroom to include such areas as international studies, service-learning, internships, and participation in student government.

The distinguishing features and benefits of the program are summarized as follows:

- Courses that are structured around a small number of specific, clearly-articulated learning objectives
• Learning objectives that are more inclusive and relevant, focusing on ethics, diversity and internationalization, teamwork and innovation
• Built-in assessment processes for key learning objectives
• A curriculum that includes first-year seminar, learning communities, experiential learning, communication in the discipline, and a capstone experience
• University-level learning objectives that enhance connections between the general-education program and degree programs
• Coordination with Student Affairs to develop a co-curricular “transcript” portrait
• Financial incentives for faculty members and departments who participate

Articulation of University Learning Objectives
The Foundational Studies Program is organized around eleven University Learning Objectives (ULO’s) that every Boise State graduate will be expected to have met, regardless of major. These objectives provide a framework of uniform assessment categories for departments and degree programs. The University Learning Objectives are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intellectual Foundations</th>
<th>Foundational Studies Program University Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Cluster Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Write effectively in multiple contexts, for a variety of audiences.</td>
<td>Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Communicate effectively in speech, both as speaker and listener.</td>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Engage in effective critical inquiry by defining problems, gathering and evaluating evidence, and determining the adequacy of argumentative discourse.</td>
<td>Critical Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Think creatively about complex problems in order to produce, evaluate, and implement innovative possible solutions, often as one member of a team.</td>
<td>Innovation &amp; Teamwork</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civic &amp; Ethical Foundations</th>
<th>Foundational Studies Program University Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Cluster Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Analyze ethical issues in personal, professional, and civic life and produce reasoned evaluations of competing value systems and ethical claims.</td>
<td>Ethics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Apply knowledge of cultural differences to matters of local, regional, national, and international importance, including political, economic, and environmental issues.</td>
<td>Diversity &amp; Internationalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distribution Requirements / Disciplinary Clusters</th>
<th>Foundational Studies Program University Learning Objectives</th>
<th>Cluster Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Apply knowledge and the methods of reasoning characteristic of mathematics, statistics, and other formal systems to solve complex problems.</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Apply knowledge and the methods characteristic of scientific inquiry to think critically about and solve theoretical and practical problems about physical structures and processes.</td>
<td>Natural, Physical, and Applied Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Apply knowledge and methods characteristic of the visual and performing arts to explain and appreciate the significance of aesthetic products and creative activities.</td>
<td>Visual and Performing Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Apply knowledge and the methods of inquiry characteristic of literature and other humanities disciplines to interpret and produce texts expressive of the human condition.</td>
<td>Literature and Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Apply knowledge and the methods of inquiry characteristic of the social sciences to explain and evaluate human behavior and institutions.</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Curriculum that will achieve University Learning Objectives

The following Foundational Studies courses are central to the program.

1. First Year Writing (ENGL 101 and ENGL 102) is a two-semester sequence for a total of six credits. Coordinated by the English Department’s First Year Writing Program, the courses provide an introduction to university expectations about academic writing and research. (ULO 1)

2. Intellectual Foundations (UF100) is a first year seminar that provides an “intellectual orientation” to university-level learning, inquiry, and innovation. (ULOs 2, 3, 4)

3. Civic and Ethical Foundations (UF200) focuses on analyzing ethical issues and applying knowledge of cultural differences. (ULOs 1, 5, 6)

4. For students that transfer into Boise State and are core certified from their prior institution, Transfer Foundations (UF300) integrates the learning objectives supported by UF100 and UF200 with higher achievement expectations, and counts as 3 credits toward the upper-division credits requirement. (ULOs 1-6)

5. Disciplinary Lens courses will provide a familiarity with the multiple perspectives necessary to be broadly educated and to begin gaining a complete “picture” of the human condition and the world that we inhabit. Students will be required to complete classes across the 5 disciplinary lens areas of Mathematics, Natural & Physical Sciences, Visual and Performing Arts, Literature and Humanities and Social Sciences. These courses resemble the courses that populate the current Core curriculum in that their content and methodology are typically situated within the discipline of the department offering the course. (relevant ULOs 7, 8, 9, 10, 11)

6. Communication in the Discipline (CID) courses focus on written and oral communication as they are practiced within the discipline. (ULOs 1, 2)

7. Finishing Foundations (FF400) is a 1-3 credit, culminating experience offered within the major department. (ULOs 3, 4 and either 1 or 2)

Contribution of Co-Curricular Activities

In addition to traditional coursework, students will be encouraged to participate in co-curricular activities to support their achievement of the intended learning objectives of the Foundational Studies Program. Many activities that students engage in are quite relevant to the larger goals embodied in the institution’s mission and, more specifically, to the learning objectives of the Foundational Studies program. To facilitate achievement of ULOs, staff in Student Affairs can use any of the ULOs 1 through 11 that are relevant to a particular activity to focus or guide the student experience. Examples of such activities are internships, credit for prior learning, student government, and other university activities that are not credit bearing.

Sustainability of and Organizational Support for the Program

The Foundational Studies Program is a hybrid in terms of centralization. DL, CID, and FF courses are being developed and will be assessed by individual academic units within the parameters of the Disciplinary Lens cluster (for DL courses) and Foundational Studies program structure. By contrast, UF100, UF200, and UF300 courses are being developed and taught with centralized oversight and support. The goal of the Foundational Studies Program administrative structure is to place faculty at the center of program development, approval, assessment, and instruction while providing leadership, incentives, administrative support, and resources for successful, coordinated, and sustained implementation of the program.

The Core Reform Task Force recommended that the position of Foundational Studies Director be created to support sustained oversight and leadership. That position would be supported by a staff member and supplemental staff support from the office of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate
Studies. As mentioned previously, the new Foundational Studies director and the staff member have been hired and are permanently funded.

Six faculty members have been hired to teach UF 100 and four faculty members to teach UF200. This faculty is comprised of existing tenured/tenure-track faculty members or lecturers. This faculty will design, implement, teach, and assess the University Foundations course to which they are associated. They will also serve as the leadership team and recommending body for the expectations and framework for the given course.

University governance structures are being aligned for ongoing support of the program. The intention is to integrate existing committees and create a single Curriculum Assessment Committee to oversee course approval and assessment.

Program Assessment

Program assessment is an integral part of the program. The process for assessing the program is as follows:

- **Courses of all types (UF, DL, CID, FF, and ENGL) will be organized around course-level learning objectives that have been designed to articulate with and contribute to the attainment of the appropriate ULO(s).**

- **Assessment rubrics will be used as the basis for determining a student’s level of success in achieving the target objective(s). Rubrics have been completed for the UF courses. The rubrics for DL, CID, FF, and ENGL have been completed by teams of faculty members from each of the disciplinary areas. Each rubric indicates the ways in which the learning objectives will be assessed.**
  - UF faculty members and the Foundational Studies Director will assess attainment of learning objectives in UF courses.
  - Departments will assess attainment of ULOs for courses within their discipline, and with reports about assessment results submitted to the Foundational Studies Director each spring.

- **Assessment meetings will be held twice a year to measure the attainment of learning objectives. As a result of these meetings, 1-page reflections will be written by individual faculty and forwarded to the “course leader” whom would be responsible for digesting/summarizing the reports from their area and making recommendations back to the appropriate area. The Foundational Studies Director and/or the committee will work with academic departments to make appropriate modifications to courses.**

- The Curriculum Assessment Committee (a committee of the Faculty Senate) will coordinate approval and ongoing assessment of Foundations courses. Assessment reports will be submitted to Foundational Studies Director annually and ultimately to the Faculty Senate for review.

- As part of the Department Periodic Review process, departments that provide DL courses will include their course assessments as part of their department self study and review.

- The success achieved of the entire Foundational Studies Program will be reviewed using the Department Periodic Review process in which the Foundational Studies Program will complete a self study and undergo review.
Recommendation 2: Assessment of Academic Programs

The Committee recognizes that the University has made significant progress in policies, instruments, and processes for assessment of educational effectiveness; but it recommends that the University ensure that all academic units are in compliance with University procedures and NWCCU standards on assessment, particularly the final step of demonstrating improvement of teaching and learning. (Standard 2.B.2 and 2.B.3, Policy 2.2)

Response to Recommendation 2

The concerns of the external review team were with assessment of three aspects of our undergraduate educational program: course-level assessment, assessment of the general education core, and program-level assessment.

Course-level Assessment and Improvement: Implementation of a new online course evaluation system

Several comments in the external review report referred to the overall lack of consistency among departments in course evaluation tools being used. Although several colleges each use a single set of questions for student evaluation of teaching, there is no consistency among colleges. Additionally, in several colleges there is large variation among departments in the evaluation instrument used. For a number of reasons, including the need to respond to reviewers’ comments, we have adopted an online course evaluation system: “What Do You Think” (WDYT) by CollegeNet. We piloted the system during summer of 2011 and full implementation will occur in fall of 2011.

The widespread use of WDTY on campus will create considerable consistency among academic departments and will provide important information that can be used by instructors and departments to improve courses. The following relevant benefits will result from our adoption of WDTY:

- We are giving departments the opportunity to have their questions analyzed by the Center for Teaching and Learning to increase their formative value, their validity (i.e., do they measure what they purport to measure?), and their reliability (i.e., are the measures consistent over time and among classes?).
- We are developing a set of standard questions that will enable the comparing of results at the instructor, department, and college levels.
- Instructors have the opportunity to add their own questions and thereby gather specific feedback on pedagogical innovations, course content, media used, etc.
- We will create blocks of questions that are specific to course types, thereby increasing the value of the feedback received. For example, questions for a clinical course will be very different than those for a lecture.
- Feedback to instructors will be much timelier: the new system will provide reports within a few days after the end of the semester whereas with paper evaluations, reports were often delayed by weeks.
- Instructors will be able to use midterm evaluations to gather feedback to inform mid-term course improvements.

General Education Assessment and Improvement: Implementation of a new general education curriculum and a new assessment system

Our response to Recommendation 1 (above) describes the development of our new Foundational Studies Program (FSP) that comprises our new general education core. It also describes assessment of the courses that make up the program and assessment of the entire program. It is
our opinion that the implementation of our new FSP and its assessment structure will have substantial and sustained impact on the broader assessment landscape, for the following reasons:

- All faculty members involved in the teaching of courses involved in the FSP will be required to implement rigorous assessment of course-level outcomes and of the extent to which the courses contribute to University Learning Objectives (ULOs). The use by these faculty members of the FSP assessment apparatus will strongly reinforce other assessment behaviors the faculty members are engaged in.

- The ULOs that have been created and distributed (see table in our response to Recommendation 1) correspond closely to many departmental program learning goals that are not discipline specific. For example, many departments have program learning goals that include communication, critical thinking, and problem solving. Therefore, the assessment ULOs for the FSP will also provide assessment of that set of program learning goals of departments. It is likely that departments will adopt the rubrics and methodologies of ULO evaluation for their evaluation of department program learning goals. Departments must report to the FSP their success at contributing to ULOs. They must also report, in the periodic review process discussed below, the success their students have achieving program learning goals, some of which will be the same as ULOs. A good example would be the “Communication in Discipline” course of the FSP, which will be an upper division majors course that stresses communication. Assessment of learning outcomes for that course for the FSP would obviously provide substantial information for any program learning goal that the department has that concerns communication.

- Similarly, each of the Disciplinary Lens courses has learning goals that will align well with program learning goals. For example, the ULO for DLN (i.e., science) courses reads: “Apply knowledge and the methods characteristic of scientific inquiry to think critically about and solve theoretical and practical problems about physical structures and processes.” Program learning goals in the sciences and engineering typically will have substantial overlap with that ULO, and therefore the assessment processes and results will be highly complementary.

Program-level Assessment and Improvement: Curriculum overhaul and periodic review

The diversity among our academic departments in their methods for program-level assessment is typically as great as the diversity in course evaluations. Such diversity is a hallmark of assessment programs that are “owned” by the faculty and departments, organic in their origins, and sustainable in their application. We believe that the development of a sustainable assessment program is key, and will therefore continue to invest in support for departmental development and implementation of assessment structures that may be particular to those departments.

Periodic Review of Academic Departments (PRAD) is the primary mechanism that we use to ensure that departments undergo an appropriate level of program learning goal assessment. In 2006-07, the guidelines for PRAD were revised to specifically ensure that departments address, in their self studies, (i) the processes for development and revision of program learning goals, (ii) the tools used to assess student success, and (iii) the use of assessment information to make program improvements. Departments undergo PRAD on a 5 year cycle.

It should be noted that a number of our departments undergo specialized accreditation reviews by AACSB, ABET, NCATE, or other organizations. Those organizations that have a heavy focus on assessment of learning goals. Since the revision of the PRAD guidelines, and except for those departments undergoing specialized accreditation, every academic department has undergone or will soon commence the PRAD process.

The PRAD process is receiving a substantial reinforcement this year during curriculum revisions that are occurring as a result of the University’s change from a requirement-for-graduation of 128
semester credits to 120 semester credits. Thirty-three of our 44 departments decided to undergo the change from 128 to 120 credits, and those departments were given the opportunity to participate in a program that provided the department with $10,000 of discretionary funds with the understanding that the department would undergo a process that involved a re-examination of program learning goals, a thoughtful analysis (using a curriculum map) of how the revised curriculum contribute to the learning goals, and a revisiting of the department’s assessment plan. Participants also received help from a facilitator, who helped them work through their curriculum revision.

---

**Recommendation 3: Advising**

*The Committee recommends that the University develop and implement systematic campus-wide policies and procedures in order to provide high quality advising to all students and to prepare faculty and other personnel responsible for the advising function. (Standard 2.C.S and 3.D.10)*

**Response to Recommendation 3**

In this response, we describe recent changes we have made in policies and procedures to address the three primary aspects of the recommendation: (i) changes in policy and procedure to provide quality advising, (ii) the strengthening of preparation of advisors, and (iii) the strengthening of the assessment of advising.

These changes have been the result of work and planning by the University Advising Council, which developed an advising plan and associated action items, referred to as the "University Advising Network," during the time period of February 2010 to October 2010. The plan was vetted with the following stakeholders: college and department advisors, other advisors (such as those in Advising and Academic Enhancement, Athletics, Extended Studies, the Student Success Program, etc.), deans, associate deans, department chairs, the Enrollment Management Committee, New Student and Family Programs, the Registrar’s Office, and the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies.

**Changes in procedure and policy for advising**

- **Required advising for new students to be implemented in fall 2011**

  All students receive advising at the required New Student orientation as their first advising contact. Starting in the fall of 2011, all new and transfer students will additionally be required to receive advising prior to registering for their 2nd semester of classes. Multiple modes of advising will be available to students to allow for student needs and flexibility, including in-person, individual or group, and phone advising. When registering for subsequent semesters, students will be directed to an online form where they will indicate the mode of advising they had most recently used. Students will have the option to choose to self-advice at this time. Although we do not encourage that option, providing a selection for self-advising makes it a documented choice for the student and will provide a means of tracking and measuring advising and student success, and creates a mechanism for follow up by centralized advising staff.

- **Policy changes to support the effectiveness of advisors**

  Boise State University has three university policies related to the effectiveness of advising; policy 4010, 4020, and 4030. Policy 4010 defines the advising responsibility of academic advisors and academic units. Revisions to this policy include a more clearly articulated definition of advising and outcomes, and a clarified definition of responsibilities of the advisor and the associated college/department. For example, it is clearly stated that colleges and departments are responsible for assessing and evaluating advising processes and individual advisors as is
described in Policy 4030. Policy 4020 defines administrative responsibilities for academic advising. Revisions to the policy clarify the role of the Director of Advising and Academic Enhancement and university-wide advising units. For example, the revisions update the role of college academic advising coordinators, clarifying that academic advising coordinators are responsible for assessing advising within their unit. Policy 4030 defines the assessment and evaluation of advising units and of individual advisors. This policy more clearly defines procedures for assessment and how the data is to be used to improve advising. The proposed changes to the policies have completed two levels of review and will be reviewed by department chairs and Faculty Senate again in mid-fall 2011. It is anticipated that the revised policies will be approved and implemented in the fall of 2011.

- **Increased college/department advising staffing to support the advising network**
  New funding has been provided to increase college/department advising staffing to support the advising network. Since April of 2011, two colleges have hired new full-time advising coordinators, two colleges have hired new full-time advisors, and a fifth college is providing funding for a half time faculty advising position. These new positions will provide additional advising support in the colleges that complements existing advising.

- **Increased visibility of advising**
  The university Advising and Academic Enhancement unit is managing an initiative to increase the visibility and accessibility of advising across campus. This initiative includes the use of chat software to support advising exchanges, staffing at visible advising locations across campus, development of web standards for advising information posted on department and unit sites, and implementation of an auto-launch of the current Academic Advisement Report in BroncoWeb at strategic credit milestones to be distributed to students and advisors suggesting an advising exchange.

- **Technology enhancements**
  The university has implemented a university-wide electronic advising tracking system that will track student appointments and the content of advising sessions. Reports containing that information will be regularly created and sent to departments. Several other reporting enhancements are being developed and implemented. Beginning in 2010, a number of reports were enhanced to increase usability, including listings of advisees and advisor assignments, numbers of current majors in a department, and listings of students not currently assigned to an advisor. Departments use these reports to assign academic advisors and to track numbers of advisees. An intervention is being designed and implemented such that students who do not complete critical courses in a timely manner will be contacted and advised of options to continue progress toward degrees. Pilots will be conducted this spring 2012.

**Preparation of advisors**
The Faculty Advising Institute, which was implemented in the fall of 2004, supports the development of advising competencies for Boise State University academic advisors. Since that time 12 institutes, each 12 to 15 hours, have been held, the most recent one was in the spring of 2011. On average, 20-25 advisors attend each session, with a total 60 participants in FY11. Participants develop their advising skills, build confidence, learn about university services and policies, and build a network for advising support. Consistent positive feedback on the policies, procedures, and strategies for advising has made those aspects the core of the training. Evaluations indicate we have an excellent process in place, which we are continuing. Additional advising training sessions have been added to prepare for summer new student orientation.
Assessment of advising

The University has been administering a Survey on Academic Advising every 3 years since 2004. It was last administered in fall 2010. This survey is a mainstay of information about the effectiveness of advising. The survey provides feedback from students on the use of advising services and the quality of advising. Feedback from the survey indicates that the changes that have been made prior to 2010 have been effective, with a greater number of students receiving advising services and higher satisfaction with the services. The survey will be administered again in the fall of 2013 and will provide student feedback on the effectiveness of more recent changes.

In addition, information from the survey has provided the foundation for a number of the enhancements.

- As a result of the 2004 survey, the Advising! Matters campaign was launched to increase the advertising and visibility of advising.
- As a result of the 2007 survey, the advisor assignment process was enhanced.
- As a result of the fall 2010 survey, we implemented the required advising component for new and new transfer students. We also implemented the assigning of default advisors by academic departments.

Two enhancements to our assessment of advising are underway.

- The advising tracking system described above will automatically launch a survey in which the student will be queried regarding that specific advising experience. The resulting feedback will be provided to academic departments and colleges and to Advising and Academic Enhancement. The target date for implementation is January 2012.
- We are presently revising Policy 4030, which defines the process by which advisors are evaluated. Modifications include:
  - The present practice of university-level assessment of advising on a three year review cycle will be codified in policy.
  - We will clarify the responsibility of the college, department, or unit to complete the assessment for all persons responsible for academic advising in that unit.
  - We will clarify the responsibility of the college, department, or unit to assess the effectiveness of the advising processes in that unit.

The changes to the policy has completed one round of review and will again be reviewed by department chairs and Faculty Senate again in September 2011. It is anticipated that the revised policy will be approved and implemented in the fall of 2011.
**Recommendation 4: Grievance Policies**

The Committee recommends that the University review and revise policies and procedures for students to follow in filing complaints or grievances against a staff or faculty member and that this information be widely and publicly shared. (Standard 3.B.3)

**Response to Recommendation 4**

We have completed an examination of our policies and procedures for student complaints, and have subsequently updated our policies, clarified our procedures, and improved accessibility to the policies with easy-to-access information for students.

**Policy and Procedure**

The first concern raised by the recommendation involves university policy and the procedures defined by that policy. The university previously had one policy (Policy 3130) that combined grade appeal with academic appeal. Additionally, Policy 3130 did not clarify the process to file a grievance nor how to escalate an issue if it was not resolved. To address these issues, we revised Policy 3130 to limit it to grade appeal issues and created a new Policy 3140 to provide a process for academic grievances other than grade appeal. Although there are now two separate policies, they have similar initiation and appeal processes for the student.

The process for initiating and appealing either policy has been updated, streamlined, and documented. The intent of these changes is to make it easier for both students with concerns and for faculty and staff who serve on the review and hearing boards to understand and follow the process. These updated policies are in the university policy manual at [http://policy.boisestate.edu/academic-affairs-student](http://policy.boisestate.edu/academic-affairs-student).

A third policy, Policy 7090, outlines the procedures for addressing student grievances against university personnel and provides authority for the University Grievance Board to resolve complaints that have been filed.

**Enhancement of Communication to Students**

The second issue from this recommendation concerns the public sharing and wide availability of the policy to students. Publication and communication of these policies was examined and as a result, the methods used to direct students to the information have been updated and expanded to provide more effective access for students. We have made the following changes:

- The Student Handbook has been updated to reflect the updated policies and changes that have been made to the university website so that students may easily find the policy and procedure to follow when filing a complaint.

- On the University website, a link has been added on the “Current Students” tab on the homepage to link students to information about grievance policies and a subsequent link to the University policy manual ([http://go.boisestate.edu/gateway/current/student-grievance-policies/](http://go.boisestate.edu/gateway/current/student-grievance-policies/)).

- Additionally, links to “Student Grievance Policies” will be listed on the Boise State University main webpage A to Z search index and on the website for the Vice Provost of Undergraduate Studies.
Recommendation 5: Research Policies
The Committee recommends that faculty play a substantive role in establishing and updating policies relating to research, especially regarding intellectual property, conflict of interest, and research misconduct, so as to ensure that they are consistent with federal regulations and accepted practices in higher education. (Standards 4.B.2 and 4.B.3)

Response to Recommendation 5
Boise State University is engaged in creating and updating policies on intellectual property, conflict of interest, and research misconduct. Investigative work on regarding the three policies has been completed and proposed policy changes will be reviewed this fall with anticipated implementation by the end of 2011.

Revision of Policy on Intellectual Property:
Prior to 2010, The Idaho State Board of Education received feedback that the state intellectual property policy could be improved by adding more straightforward language regarding each respective Idaho institution's rights on intellectual property and accordingly, licensee (industry) rights. This feedback came to the board through organizations such as the Governor’s Idaho Innovation Council and from industries within the state. During 2010, at the request of the Idaho State Board of Education, Boise State University, representatives from the University of Idaho, Idaho State University, and corresponding institutional legal counsel worked together to propose changes to the Idaho State Board of Education policy on Governing Policies and Procedures Section V. Financial Affairs Subsection M. Intellectual Property. As a result of this change, the policy sections which addressed institutional ownership rights and institutional authority to manage the rights in granting licenses were clarified with more definitive language. The Idaho State Board of Education approved the proposed changes to the state board Intellectual Property policy in December of 2010. With the adoption of the new policy by the State Board of Education, all Idaho universities are required to create a new university policy on intellectual property by December of 2011. Boise State University continues to work with the University of Idaho and Idaho State University on alignment of institutional policies, as well as proposed changes to Boise State University’s current intellectual property policy, Policy 1090. Policy changes are in the process of being drafted and will be submitted to the Faculty Research Committee, the Faculty Senate and the Boise State University Policy Committee for approval during the fall of 2011.

Revision of Policy on Conflict of Interest
Our Office of Sponsored Programs has completed an inventory of existing conflict of interest policies at other research universities. Proposed changes to the current BSU policy on Conflict of Interest, Policy 7080, have been completed and reviewed by university legal staff for compliance with federal regulations. The proposed changes will be submitted to the University Executive Council for review. After review by the Executive Team, reviews will be completed by the Faculty Research Committee, the Faculty Senate, and the Boise State University Policy Committee, with anticipated final approval during the fall of 2011.

Revision of Policy on Research Misconduct
Our Office of Research Compliance has reviewed research misconduct policies of other universities and current federal regulations regarding research misconduct. An update of our research misconduct policy, Policy 5060, has been drafted. The revised policy will be submitted to the Faculty
Research Committee, the Faculty Senate, and the Boise State University Policy Committee for approval during the fall of 2011.

Inclusion of faculty in process.
The Faculty Research Committee is a standing committee of the Faculty Senate that serves as an advisory group to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development to provide overall advice regarding strategic directions for University research programs, and to provide input regarding policies and procedures developed and implemented through the Division of Research and Economic Development. Committee members provide a communication link necessary to foster and encourage research within the academic community between the Division of Research and Economic Development and the academic unit in which each member holds an appointment. The committee will review the proposed policy changes this fall and provide input and feedback on the policies.

Recommendation 6: Research Infrastructure

Although Boise State University has made great strides in providing grant support for faculty engaged in research and graduate education, the Committee recommends that the institution provide additional support and infrastructure for faculty engaged in research, ensure that its research support infrastructure keeps pace with its growing research emphasis, and make certain that graduate student policies and procedures reflect this emphasis. Areas of concern include the Indirect Cost Recovery policy, purchasing and HR regulations, faculty compensation, and post-award grant management. (Standards 2.D.1, 2.D.3, 4.A.4, and 4.B.4)

Response to Recommendation 6

Enhancements to Administrative Support
Changes in the area of administrative support have been largely based on a 2009 report from the Huron Consulting Group that examined all areas of administrative support and made a number of recommendations. Recent changes include the following:

- Post-award functions of the Office of Sponsored Projects were combined with pre-award functions in a single office reporting to the Vice President for Research and Economic Development.

- In fall of 2011, the Office of Technology Transfer was renamed into the Office of University and Industry Ventures to better reflect the university-wide scope of support for research and commercialization in collaboration with industry. The Office supports many types of industry collaborations that benefit research endeavors, academic opportunity, and economic development.

- The Division of Research and Economic Development developed a matrix of roles and responsibilities across units, including the Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) remote staff, to better define roles and responsibilities across central and departmental units.

- We completed review and documentation of post-award accounting practices and how they relate to academic units, central finance administration, and pre-award functions.
Improvements have been made to processes by standardizing data entry, reviewing and updating data, and training employees on use of the system.

- For sponsored project administrator positions, staff hires in the Division of Research and Economic Development have focused on individuals with grant and/or accounting experience. These individuals were recruited, in part, on their ability to analyze data, work collaboratively, and present creative resolutions to problems. Additionally, an experienced cost accountant was hired to assist with recharge center development, cost accounting policies and procedures, F&A rate negotiation, and other significant cost accounting functions that the university needed with its expanding research emphasis. These changes in staffing have positioned the division to provide more expertise and support for all areas of research.

- Office of Sponsored Projects (OSP) has made changes in business processes aimed at reducing administrative workload for faculty and staff. For example, OSP has created a manual cost share tracking and reporting system for post-award management of cost share obligations. OSP is also re-writing the Boise State cost sharing policy and related procedures to ensure consistent and compliant practices. It should be noted, however, a much more robust (and less manual) system is essential for Boise State to remain in compliance with federal regulations. Such a system will part of the IT enhancements discussed below.

Enhancements to Policy and Procedure.

Changes to policies regarding intellectual property, conflict of interest, and research misconduct are discussed in our response to recommendation #5.

Recommendation 6 asks that we update graduate student policy to reflect our emphasis in research but gives no specifics. It is the Graduate Council, a standing committee of the Faculty Senate, that oversees all policies that affect graduate students. The Graduate Council is well aware of the increased emphasis of research at the University and of the need to ensure that graduate student policy keeps pace with our changing emphasis.

Other enhancements regarding policy and procedure are as follows:

- The Faculty Incentive Pay Program was approved and implemented in the fall of 2010. This program was developed to recognize and reward recipients of external funds that enhance research, scholarship, service, and creativity.

- The indirect cost policy has been revised in ways that provide additional support for faculty members involved in research. Prior to 2007, the Vice President for Research and Economic Development had very few resources that he could invest in research support. At that time, the allocation of indirect cost recovery was 40% to the central administration, 20% to the academic college, and 40% to the department from which the grant arose. None of the funds went to the Division of Research and Economic Development. The VP for Research and Economic Development successfully changed the funding formula to the following: 35% to the VP for Research and Economic Development, 15% to central administration, 20% to the college, and 30% to the department from which the grant arose. The funds that go to the Division of Research and Economic Development are distributed to academic colleges to enhance research efforts. In 2011, nearly $1M of these funds was invested in a number of major initiatives, including the Arts and Humanities Institute, policy research projects, and ongoing support for lab technician salaries. Funding provided to for the DNA nanotechnology research team in the College of Engineering helped them secure a Keck Foundation grant. Other strategic investments supported a wide variety of smaller initiatives.
The Division of Research and Economic Development is encouraging and facilitating research specific training at all levels. Tutorials on key areas such as cost sharing, tech transfer/IP, effort reporting, cost transfers, and budget adjustments are provided to departments and research support personnel.

Changes in State Oversight
As noted in the body of the review report, oversight from state agencies, especially in the realms of purchasing and human resources, has been the source of considerable frustration among researchers.

During the last year, the University worked with state lawmakers to revise Idaho Code to allow state institutions of higher education more autonomy and flexibility in procurement under certain conditions. After meeting the conditions, Boise State received independence from the State Division of Purchasing (DOP) and was able to revise policy to better serve campus. Oversight of purchasing policy now rests with the State Board of Education. The change to Idaho Code contains a sunset clause; our goal is that during the next legislative session the change will be made permanent.

Specifically, the following changes in policy were implemented:

- The threshold for bidding goods was raised from $5,000 to $10,000.
- The threshold for bidding services was raised from $50,000 to $100,000.
- The University may now directly negotiate with vendors when the purchase is for experimental, developmental or research work, or for the manufacture or furnishing of property for experimentation, development, research, or test.
- The University has the authority to manage the RFP process, including sole source awards, without duplicate oversight by DOP.

The impact of the changes has been significant. During the first 8 months of implementation, the average processing time for formal bids decreased 60%, from 39 days to 16 days. Sole source activity decreased, and the research exemption was utilized ten times. The research community has expressed substantial appreciation for the changes.

The next step is to engage with state lawmakers to consider revision of Idaho Code regarding state oversight of human resource activities at the University.

In-Progress Enhancements to IT Infrastructure
Boise State University has recently undertaken a far reaching rebuilding of its entire IT enterprise system infrastructure. The project, known as the “Roadmap,” was recently initiated, is estimated to cost $10 million, and take three years to complete.

The Roadmap involves a total of 13 projects. Five of those projects will have substantial positive impact on administrative infrastructure for our research enterprise.

- Financials: involves fit-gap analysis, review of core configuration, assessment and redesign of the chart of accounts, and upgrade/re-implementation from PeopleSoft Finance from 8.8 to 9.1.
- Human Resources: involves HR business process assessment and design, upgrade/re-implementation to PeopleSoft HCM 9.1, and implementation of recruiting solutions.
- Research Management: involves review of our existing business processes and system, assessment of available solutions for pre-award, post-award, technology transfer, and research compliance, and selection and implementation of a robust research system solution.
- Unified Web Experience: involves the development of a web platform for all functionalities and reporting.
- Data Warehouse development: involves the creation of a wide range of easy to use reports regarding finance, HR, and research.

The end result of the Roadmap will be a complete transformation of our administrative infrastructure for research, both in terms of processes and procedures and in terms of the software solutions that support our day to day operations. It is our goal to have robust systems and streamlined processes that facilitate efficient and transparent transactions, improved tools that will allow faculty and staff to effectively manage research related activities, and systems that ensure compliance with federal and state regulations.

Recommendation 7: Evaluation of Part-time Faculty
The Committee recommends that Boise State University policies be revised and implemented to ensure that all BSU faculty, including part-time faculty, are evaluated in a regular and systematic manner. (Standard 4.A.5 and Policy 4.1)

Response to Recommendation 7
Boise State University Policy 4290, Annual Faculty Performance Evaluation, currently contains the following passage:

“Part-time faculty will be evaluated at the discretion of the department chair/division manager. Hence, each department/unit is encouraged to develop procedures for part-time faculty evaluations. At a minimum, the annual evaluation shall include student evaluation.”

We have drafted a revision of Policy 4290 that will require regular and systematic evaluation of part-time faculty members and will require that each college or department establish procedures for evaluation of part-time faculty in their policies.

Revision of the policy, however, must await the full implementation of our new online course evaluation system. As noted by the external review team, there is substantial diversity among departments and colleges in the instrument used for student evaluation of faculty. In many cases departments rely on paper based evaluations, and that reliance has been a key obstacle to regular evaluation of adjunct faculty. A recent survey of department chairs indicated the greatest obstacle to regular evaluation of adjunct faculty was the substantial work involved in the management of paper course evaluations. We believe it important that before we change the policy, we first ensure that departments have the tools necessary to do the additional work required by the updated policy.

Beginning in spring 2010, we began the process of evaluating online course evaluation systems for potential purchase. We piloted one system during summer 2010, but found a number of weaknesses in that system. We recently selected and purchased “What Do You Think” from the vendor CollegeNet. We successfully piloted the system in summer 2011, and will fully implement it in the fall of 2011.

Although use of the online course evaluation software is not mandatory for departments, the implementation of the new policy will create a substantial incentive for departments to participate. We anticipate that most, if not all, of the departments will eventually adopt the software.

With the implementation of the new online course evaluation system, we will have removed the key obstacle to a change in policy, and we anticipate revision will be completed by the spring of 2012.
Recommendation 8: Limit on Maximum Indebtedness

The Committee recommends that the University’s governing board amend its policy on the use of indebtedness to include a limit on the maximum amount of debt an institution can have. (Standard 7.A.4)

Response to Recommendation 8

The Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) has not adopted a formal limit on debt as policy. However, the SBOE has been very clear that the ceiling with respect to the debt burden ratio is 8%. The University provides the SBOE with a current debt burden graph depicting 30 years into the future at many meetings throughout the year, specifically, when discussing financial performance, master plan updates, potential new capital projects, and, of course any consideration of new debt. The University did not issue new debt in 2010, but instead financed a housing project internally from reserves.

The debt burden ratio for the University in 2010 was 7.61%, which reflects the impact of several balloon payments. Without the balloon payments, the debt burden ratio for 2010 was 5.88% and for 2011 is 5.23%. The University is very aware of its limited and valuable debt capacity and is careful to plan priorities accordingly.
Chapter One: Standard One – Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations

Section One: Mission

1.A – Mission

1.A.1 The institution has a widely published mission statement—approved by its governing board—that articulates a purpose appropriate for an institution of higher learning, gives direction for its efforts, and derives from, and is generally understood by, its community.


In October 1998, the Idaho State Board of Education (SBOE) adopted role and mission statements for each of Idaho’s four institutions of higher education: Boise State University, Idaho State University, Lewis-Clark State College, and the University of Idaho. Boise State University’s statement of role and mission was as follows:

“1. Type of Institution
Boise State University is a comprehensive, urban University serving a diverse population through undergraduate and graduate programs, research, and state and regional public service.
Boise State University will formulate its academic plan and generate programs with primary emphasis on business and economics, engineering, the social sciences, public affairs, the performing arts, and teacher preparation. Boise State University will give continuing emphasis in the areas of the health professions, the physical and biological sciences, and education and will maintain basic strengths in the liberal arts and sciences, which provide the core curriculum or general education portion of the curriculum.”

2. Programs and Services
Baccalaureate Education: Offers a wide range of baccalaureate degrees and some qualified professional programs
Associate Education: Offers a wide range of associate degrees and some qualified professional programs
Graduate: Offers a variety of masters and select doctoral degrees consistent with state needs
Certificates/Diplomas: Offers a wide range of certificates and diplomas
Research: Conducts coordinated and externally funded research studies
Continuing Education: Provides a variety of life-long learning opportunities
Technical and Workforce Training: Offers a wide range of vocational, technical and outreach programs
Distance Learning: Uses a variety of delivery methods to meet the needs of diverse constituencies

3. Constituencies Served
The institution serves students, business and industry, the professions and public sector groups throughout the state and region as well as diverse and special constituencies. Boise State University works in collaboration with other state and regional postsecondary institutions in serving these constituencies.”

The above statement served two purposes. First, it defined us as a comprehensive university, charged with providing a wide range of education, research, and service to all constituencies in our service region. Second, it served to define the disciplinary areas in which we were to concentrate our efforts.

Creation of New Mission Statement

During spring of 2011, the SBOE gave the go-ahead for institutions to develop revised mission statements, in large part because the Office of the SBOE has embraced and supports the work that
institutions are doing to revise their mission statements and develop core themes, etc., in response to new NWCCU accreditation standards.

The first step in revising our mission statement and developing our core themes and core objectives was to conduct in-depth interviews of 40 individuals who are representative of various constituencies on campus. That group included all vice presidents and associate vice presidents, all deans, selected department chairs and faculty members, and selected staff members. Generally each interview was focused on one of the four areas represented in Charting the Course, our strategic plan: academics, public engagement, culture, and research. In some cases, the interviewee commented on several of those areas; all vice presidents were interviewed regarding all four areas.

Interviewers asked a standard set of questions that focused on the following:
- What words and phrases would you use to describe this core theme area?
- What have been our notable accomplishments, our greatest successes?
- How should we measure our accomplishments in this area?
- Where should our future focus be in this area?

Interview transcripts were analyzed to identify commonalities and trends. It should be noted that information that resulted regarding the future direction of the university also has helped to inform the development of our strategic planning effort.

The second step was to extract six to ten key ideas that emerged for each of the four areas, and to use those ideas as the basis for a campus-wide survey. Campus members were asked to rank how well they believed we are doing in each of area, and to rank how important it is that we concentrate our future efforts in that area. They were also asked to provide additional thoughts as to University priorities for the future.

A small working group then distilled information from the interviews and surveys into a set of draft mission statements. The Provost then reworked the drafts and created a second draft that was circulated for comment among upper leadership, deans, and department chairs.

At the June 22-23, 2011 meeting of SBOE, draft mission statements of each institution were shared with the SBOE. At the September 9, 2011 meeting of SBOE, mission statements and core themes from each institution were presented and were approved by the SBOE. Coincident with submission of the Standard One reports to NWCCU in September, the SBOE will receive the same reports.

**New Mission Statement**

Boise State University’s new mission statement is as follows:

*Boise State University is a public, metropolitan research university providing leadership in academics, research, and civic engagement. The University offers an array of undergraduate degrees and experiences that foster student success, lifelong learning, community engagement, innovation, and creativity. Research, creative activity and graduate programs, including select doctoral degrees, advance new knowledge and benefit the community, the state and the nation. The University is an integral part of its metropolitan environment and is engaged in its economic vitality, policy issues, professional and continuing education programming, and cultural enrichment.*
Section Two: Core Themes, Core Objectives, Indicators of Success, and Mission Fulfillment

1.A – Mission
1.A.2 The institution defines mission fulfillment in the context of its purpose, characteristics, and expectations. Guided by that definition, it articulates institutional accomplishments or outcomes that represent an acceptable threshold or extent of mission fulfillment.

1.B – Core Themes
1.B.1 The institution identifies core themes that individually manifest essential elements of its mission and collectively encompass its mission.
1.B.2 The institution establishes objectives for each of its core themes and identifies meaningful, assessable, and verifiable indicators of achievement that form the basis for evaluating accomplishment of the objectives of its core themes

Process

The working group used information from the interviews and surveys described above to create a draft of our Core Themes, Core Objectives, and Indicators of Success. Drafts were then shared with various groups, including the President’s Executive Team, the Deans’ Council, department chairs, and the Division of Student Affairs. Reviewers were asked to comment on the following questions:

1. What ideas contained in these Core Themes and objectives stand out? How could we make the descriptions stronger?

2. Where does the university, and where does your college/department, need to focus its attention to ensure success in meeting these objectives in the future?

3. What evidence would you use to demonstrate our success in achieving these objectives? How well are we meeting these objectives right now?

Revisions were then made to incorporate suggested changes. The resulting draft will continue to evolve as we develop our strategic plan and continue to consider our role as an institution.

Overview of Core Themes

Each of our Core Themes is an elucidation of one aspect of the University’s mission, designed to create a better understanding of the breadth and the limits of that aspect of our mission. The descriptions of the Core Themes lay the groundwork for the description of the Core Objectives, that is, the ways in which the University accomplishes its work.

Our Core Themes focus on the four areas of our mission:

1. Undergraduate education
2. Graduate education
3. Research and creative activity
4. Community commitment

There exists substantial overlap and integration among the four areas identified by the Core Themes. For example, although we found it important to separate undergraduate education from graduate education in our Core Themes because of differences in objectives, audience, issues, and challenges, we understand that each of those Core Themes must be understood in the context of the other. It is our intent that our extensive description of that overlap and integration, found throughout the descriptions of our Core Themes and Core Objectives, will bridge the necessary categorization of our operations into separate Core Themes.
Overview of Core Objectives, Indicators of Success, Measures, Key Performance Measures, and Mission Fulfillment

For each of our Core Themes, it is important that there is access to what we provide, relevance in what we provide, quality in what we provide, and the culture that enables us to provide it. Therefore, we have standardized the titles of the Objectives of each of our Core Themes to be Access, Relevance, Quality, and Culture. There are two exceptions: (i) the Undergraduate Core Theme’s first objective is expanded to be “access and completion” to reflect our focus on student success, and in the Community Commitment Core Theme, relevance and quality have been combined because in this area those two objectives are inextricably intertwined.

The “Indicators of Success” in the tables that follow are statements of what should be happening and what should be observable if we are successful in attaining that particular Core Objective. For each Indicator of Success, we have identified one to several “Measures” to denote the specific measurements that would be made to evaluate success.

From the set of Measures for each Core Theme, we have identified a small number of “Key Performance Measures” (KPM) that serve the purpose of dashboard-like indicators as to whether we, at the university level, are fulfilling our mission. KPM are chosen to focus on the fundamental aspects of our mission, for example, “Are students graduating?” Our choice of an acceptable level for each is based on a number of factors, including examination of similar measures at peer institutions, consideration of the strategic goals of the Idaho State Board of Education, and awareness of the contexts of our community and our student body.

At this point, we have been comprehensive in developing Indicators of Success and Measures, going well beyond the set of measures we have identified as KPMs. The reasons are threefold:

First, a next step is that individual units, especially within the Division of Academic Affairs and the Division of Student Affairs, will identify Indicators and Measures relevant to their operations. It is important to provide a wide diversity from which those units can identify relevant Indicators and Measures and/or further elaborate the Indicators and Measures beyond what are listed below.

Second, although KPMs may provide an indication that remedial action is necessary, they are generally much too broad to provide the information necessary to determine what response is appropriate. For example, finding a lower than acceptable graduation rate gives no indication of which of the multitude of possible contributing factors should be the focus of a response. Therefore, it is wise to maintain a set of measures that can be used to help diagnose and/or further illuminate the area of focus.

Third, most KPMs are “lagging” indicators, that is, they are the downstream outputs and/or outcomes. Many of the other Indicators and Measures listed below are “leading” indicators, that is, they are the upstream inputs and necessary and/or desirable conditions that contribute to downstream success. Ensuring that our leading indicators are in order will help to prevent problems that would later be revealed by lagging indicators. They enable us to employ a “preventative medicine” approach.

Put another way, the KPMs are a way of demonstrating that we are successfully fulfilling our mission. However, we rely on a multitude of other indicators and measures to ensure, in an operational sense, that we are able to accomplish our mission.

“Peer institutions” are referenced a number of times below. In most cases, we refer to the list, approved in August, 2010 by the Idaho State Board of Education, consisting of: California State Univ.-Fresno, Cleveland State Univ., Georgia State Univ., Indiana Univ.-Purdue Univ.-Indianapolis, Portland State Univ., San Francisco State Univ., Univ. of Akron Main Campus, Univ. of Massachusetts-Boston, Univ. of Memphis, Univ. of Missouri-Kansas City, Univ. of Nebraska at Omaha, Univ. of New Orleans, Univ. of Texas at San Antonio.
Core Objective 1.1: Access and Completion. Students of all backgrounds have the opportunity and support needed to pursue and successfully complete their undergraduate degree programs.

Core Objective 1.2: Relevance. Our undergraduate students develop depth and breadth in the skills, knowledge, and experiences required to ensure their success in the 21st century world.

Core Objective 1.3: Quality. In addition to developing depth of knowledge, understanding, and skill in their respective disciplines, our undergraduate students are engaged in an education that stresses the liberal arts. They master enduring skills and habits of mind that transcend disciplinary boundaries, achieve a breadth of knowledge and understanding over a range of disciplines, receive a solid grounding in civic and ethical responsibility, and become aware of the global community and their connection to it.

Core Objective 1.4: Culture. Our undergraduate students experience high expectations for academic achievement, a vibrant intellectual atmosphere, a culture that embraces local and global connections, and an environment that inspires creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship. An appreciation of, and respect for, a variety of perspectives and cultures are developed in our students. Our students are engaged in university life and community activities.

Key Performance Measures and Acceptable Performance for Core Theme One:

Retention. Students are more likely to drop out of college during their first year than at any other time. Therefore, first-year full-time retention rate is often used as an indicator of the likely success of a student in completing a college degree. However, this metric does not include all of our students and does not reflect our high number of students who are non-traditional, have families, are employed while enrolled, etc. Many of our students stop out for one or more semesters during their college career. That said, first-year full-time retention rate is a measure for which peer data is available. Our rate for the fall 2010 cohort was 69%. Improving that rate will continue to be the focus of considerable effort; our goal is to improve that rate to 73% for the fall 2012 cohort, which is equal to the FY10 average of our peer institutions.

Graduation rate. Successful graduation of students is key to our success as an institution. The commonly used 6-year graduation rate for first-time full-time students is problematic as an indicator for our institution because many of our students are transfer students, are able to attend only part time, must stop out for multiple semesters, and/or transfer to other institutions to complete their degrees. We are in the process of developing a more realistic measure of success. Nevertheless, 6 year graduation rates are helpful to track our progress relative to other institutions. In the three years between fall 2008 and fall 2011, the 6-year graduation rate of our first-time full-time students increased from 24.3% for the fall 2002 cohort to 29.6% for the fall 2005 cohort. Improving the graduation rate of our students is the focus of considerable effort; our goal is to bring that rate above 30% for the fall 2007 cohort.

Graduation numbers. Number of graduates per service area population and overall number of graduates are two important measures of our success. The Idaho State Board of Education has established a goal that by the year 2020, 60% of all Idahoans between the ages of 25 and 34 will
have a post-secondary certificate or degree. They have also given each institution target numbers, and by the year 2020 Boise State University is tasked with producing 3,416 graduates per year, a substantial increase from the 2,409 graduates of 2010-11. Another measure of success is the number of graduates per population of our 10-county service area. In FY2009 we had 29.6 baccalaureate graduates per 10,000 population. Our goal is to maintain that number in the face of large population increases in the area.

Evidence of attainment of University Learning Objectives. Our new general education program, the Foundational Studies Program (FSP), will commence in fall 2012. The FSP includes a comprehensive assessment structure to determine if University Learning Objectives (ULO) are being met. The ULOs align well with the Core Objectives of the Undergraduate Education Core Theme, with the learning goals of our individual degree programs, and with a number of co-curricular objectives of Student Affairs. Therefore, the attainment of ULOs provides an excellent measure of our success as a university.

Measures of student engagement:

- **NSSE benchmarks.** We participate in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). The NSSE provides a series of “benchmarks” that provide evidence, based on student perception of their experiences, of our success in the following areas: level of academic challenge, active & collaborative learning, student-faculty interaction, enriching educational experience, and supportive campus environment. Those areas are closely aligned with the Core Objectives of our Undergraduate Education Core Theme. It is our goal to maintain benchmark measures that are at or above the averages for our peer institutions.

- **Measures of student participation.** The degree to which students participate in a variety of university activities is a good measure of their engagement in university life. We will assess, for example, participation in student organizations, volunteer activities, the Undergraduate Research Conference, Service Learning, and the Student Recreation Center. An acceptable level of participation will be an increase from the previous year.

- **Internships and employment:** Our students participate in a wide range of internship experiences, both on and off campus, and a number of students are employed on campus. Both types of experience are indicative of student engagement. Acceptable levels will be increases in each measure from the previous year.

Alumni survey results. In the fall of every other year, we survey the alumni who have graduated 18-24 months previously, asking questions regarding the employment of graduates and their satisfaction with their education at Boise State. To understand how successful we are at preparing graduates for subsequent careers, we will study the responses to survey questions designed to measure perceptions regarding preparation for employment and graduate/professional school, and their use of knowledge and skills gained during their education at Boise State. Scores from our most recent survey (during fall 2009) indicated that 85% to 90% of graduates rated their education as adequate or better in those areas. It is our goal to increase the numbers that give higher ratings than simply “adequate.”
### Core Theme One: Undergraduate Education

Our university provides access to high quality undergraduate education that cultivates the personal and professional growth of our students and meets the educational needs of our community, state, and nation. We engage our students and focus on their success.

#### Core Objective 1.1: Access and Completion

Students of all backgrounds have the opportunity and support needed to pursue and successfully complete their undergraduate degree programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Students from a diversity of backgrounds, including underrepresented, first generation, non-traditional, veteran, and transfer students, are able to enroll in our undergraduate programs. | # and % of entering freshman: first generation, transfer, veterans, non-white ethnicities  
# of students enrolled in degree completion programs, e.g., Bachelor of General Studies |
| Students have access to the courses required by their degree programs.                   | # and % of students waitlisted each semester  
Survey of students: barriers to progress  
# of courses offered in alternative formats and schedules |
| Students have access to courses and programs offered in a diverse range of formats and schedules. | # of programs and courses available and in alternative format and schedule, and enrollments in those programs and courses  
# students enrolled in 2+2 programs with CWI |
| Faculty members use best practice pedagogies that support success of all students within their courses. | Attendance at Center for Teaching and Learning workshops on pedagogical best practices |
| Students of all backgrounds have a broad array of support (e.g., financial aid, advising, co-curricular) needed to keep them enrolled and progressing to degree completion. | Average aid per undergraduate student  
# of scholarships for underrepresented groups  
Assessment of advisors and advising effectiveness  
Measures of student orientation effectiveness  
**Retention rate of freshmen** |
| We provide focused support for those students with specific needs.                     | Student use of units that provide focused support: Disability Resource Center, Women’s Center, Counseling Center, Student Diversity and Inclusion, International Student Services, Veterans Services, etc.  
# of partnerships of focused support units with other units  
Measures of impact of units that provide focused support |
| Students of all backgrounds graduate within a time frame consistent with their full-time or part-time enrollment status | **Graduation rates: overall**, first generation, transfer students, non-white ethnicities, etc.  
**Number of graduates**  
**Number of graduates per population in service area**  
Time to degree |
| High school students have access to college credit through dual-enrollment programs.    | # of dual enrollments  
# of dual enrollment credits |
| High school students from underrepresented groups receive support and encouragement to pursue a college education. | Participation in TRIO program, Upward bound, CAMP, and similar programs |
| Boise State undergraduate education is competitively priced relative to peer institutions. | Cost of Boise State University as a % of median income, compared to peer institutions |
Core Objective 1.2: Relevance. Our undergraduate students develop depth and breadth in the skills, knowledge, and experiences required to ensure their success in the 21st century world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| New degree programs are developed and existing programs updated based using ongoing assessment of workforce needs and with input from professional groups. | ➢ Proportion of programs updated using needs assessments and/or professional association feedback  
➢ # of new programs developed based on demand  
➢ # graduates in high demand disciplines |
| A coherent undergraduate experience includes in-depth disciplinary studies that integrate our Foundational Studies University Learning Objectives e.g.: critical inquiry, innovation, and writing and oral communication. | ➢ Assessment measures of achievement of ULO’s |
| Graduates are prepared for 21st century careers. Undergraduate degrees from Boise State are valuable assets to students and employers. | ➢ Alumni survey: preparation for employment, use of skills and knowledge from education here, alignment of employment with career goals.  
➢ % employed in Idaho  
➢ Survey: employer feedback re: preparation for employment  
➢ # of graduates in high demand areas  
➢ % of graduates employed in a field related to their degree  
➢ # of internships at potential employers |
| Graduates pursuing further study gain admission to respected professional and graduate programs. | ➢ Successful admission to professional and graduate programs and rankings of those programs  
➢ Alumni survey: graduate feedback re: preparation for graduate/professional programs. |
| Degree programs include experiential learning in the discipline, such as internships, clinical experience, field experience, service learning, and research or other creative activity. | ➢ # and % of students participating in internships, clinical experience, field experience, service learning, research and creative activity |
| Students apply knowledge and methods of inquiry to matters of local, regional, national, and global importance including political, economic, social, and environmental issues. | ➢ NSSE questions re: participation in community partnerships  
➢ Participation in Innovate@BoiseState, Investigate Boise workshops, etc.  
➢ Student publications and presentations  
➢ Participation in Undergraduate Research Conference  
➢ Participation in student leadership opportunities |
Core Objective 1.3: Quality. In addition to developing depth of knowledge, understanding, and skill in their respective disciplines, our undergraduate students are engaged in an education that stresses the liberal arts. They master enduring skills and habits of mind that transcend disciplinary boundaries, achieve a breadth of knowledge and understanding over a range of disciplines, receive a solid grounding in civic and ethical responsibility, and become aware of the global community and their connection to it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All departments implement program-level assessment to measure attainment of discipline-specific learning objectives. Assessment plans have appropriate measures that inform program improvement.</td>
<td>➢ % of departments reviewed with completed assessment processes &lt;br&gt; ➢ % of departments reviewed that update programs based on assessment feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members successfully craft learning environments and practice pedagogies that support success of all students in their courses.</td>
<td>➢ Faculty participation in pedagogy and assessment workshops at CTL &lt;br&gt; ➢ % of promotion &amp; tenure policies that recognize ongoing pedagogical development as important &lt;br&gt; ➢ # of course and instructional improvements based on assessment results &lt;br&gt; ➢ NSSE benchmark: level of academic challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective pedagogy is a focus of the university</td>
<td>➢ Publications and grants in the realm of the scholarship of teaching &lt;br&gt; ➢ # of, and attendance workshops focused on innovations in education &lt;br&gt; ➢ % of teaching evaluation instruments with a focus on assessment of pedagogical innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our students master the ideas, ways of thinking, applications, and content of their disciplines.</td>
<td>➢ Successful attainment of program learning goals as measured by department assessment structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students achieve University Learning Objectives (ULO) of the Foundational Studies program, including critical inquiry, creativity, innovative thought, written &amp; oral communication, problem solving, teamwork, ethics, and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>➢ ULO’s for Foundational Studies Program are achieved &lt;br&gt; ➢ NSSE benchmark: active &amp; collaborative learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through disciplinary lens courses taken as part the Foundational Studies Program, students obtain fundamental skills in mathematics and quantitative reasoning, scientific inquiry, visual and performing arts, humanities, and social sciences.</td>
<td>➢ ULO’s for Disciplinary Lens courses of the Foundational Studies Program are achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students experience a diversity of cultures and appreciate the richness of perspective associated with cultural differences.</td>
<td>➢ NSSE questions re: exposure to cultural diversity &lt;br&gt; ➢ # of student participants in international programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students become civically engaged through co-curricular activities such as service learning, leadership activities, and internships.</td>
<td>➢ Internships (% of students who participate, # available) that focus on civic engagement &lt;br&gt; ➢ # of students involved in Service Learning &lt;br&gt; ➢ Participation in campus organizations &lt;br&gt; ➢ Participation in volunteer activities in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees would be proud to send their children to Boise State University.</td>
<td>➢ Survey of employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College-bound high school students in Idaho include Boise State as a top school of choice</td>
<td>➢ % of students selecting Boise State on ACT exam reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All degree programs in disciplines with specialized accreditation meet or exceed requirements</td>
<td>➢ % of programs in disciplines with specialized accreditation that meet or exceed requirements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Core Objective 1.4: Culture. Our undergraduate students experience high expectations for academic achievement, a vibrant intellectual atmosphere, a culture that embraces local and global connections, and an environment that inspires creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship. An appreciation of and respect for a variety of perspectives and cultures are developed in our students. Our students are engaged in university life and community activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Boise State University fosters a culture of creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship. | - Student attendance at lecture series, etc.  
- # of awards for innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship  
- # of news reports on innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship  
- NSSE benchmark: active & collaborative learning |
| Students have the opportunity to become engaged in multiple aspects of university life. | - Student Recreation Center usage  
- Participation in student organizations and government  
- Student participation in University Day and # of university units participating  
- Participation in leadership activities  
- EBI survey |
| Administration, faculty, and staff focus on student success, beginning with freshman orientation and continuing throughout the college career. | - NSSE benchmark: supportive campus environment  
- NSSE questions re: student support  
- Alumni survey: level of support |
| Students of diverse backgrounds are welcomed and have the support they need to succeed. | - Diversity of our student body (ethnic, religious, socioeconomic, etc.)  
- # of students who participate in programs supporting diversity e.g.: Women’s Center |
| Degree programs and campus experiences expose students to a diversity of cultures and ideas. | - # of international students on campus  
- NSSE questions re: exposure to diverse ideas  
- Participation in and # of diversity-oriented events, e.g., MLK Day |
| Students are intellectually curious and can safely participate in open discussions. | - NSSE benchmark: enriching educational experience  
- NSSE benchmark: student-faculty interaction  
- # of events that create forums for open discussion  
- Frequency of incivility actions |
| Students actively participate in our research and creative endeavors. | - Participation in undergraduate research conference  
- Undergraduate co-authorships and professional conference participation  
- Undergraduate participation in creative activity presentations  
- NSSE question re: participation in research internships  
- # of funded student opportunities for participation |
| Students actively participate in community partnerships and activities. | - NSSE question re: participation in community activities  
- Student participation in activities sponsored by the Volunteer Services Board.  
- Service Learning participation |
Core Theme Two: Graduate Education

Our university provides access to graduate education that is relevant to the educational and societal needs of the community and state, is meaningful within national and global contexts, is respected for its high quality, and is delivered within a supportive graduate culture.

Core Objective 2.1: Access. We provide students of all backgrounds with access to graduate educational opportunities in formats that are appropriate, flexible, accessible, and affordable.

Core Objective 2.2: Relevance. Our graduate students develop skills, knowledge, and experiences that are relevant and valuable locally, regionally, nationally, and globally.

Core Objective 2.3: Quality. Our graduate programs are composed of advanced and integrated learning experiences that provide disciplinary depth and interdisciplinary connections, and that reinforce the overall scholarly output of the university.

Core Objective 2.4: Culture. Our graduate experience embodies high expectations for academic achievement and respect for the core values of scholarship, integrity, generosity, and responsibility.

Key Performance Measures and Acceptable Performance for Core Theme Two:

Access: A key aspect of our success in the realm of graduate education is providing access to qualified graduate students from a wide range of backgrounds. Our success will be measured by the demographics of program enrollments, program enrollments relative to the demand from qualified graduate students, enrollments in courses and programs that are delivered in non-traditional but appropriate formats, and the number and type of graduate assistantships. All three types of enrollment have been increasing substantially. Our goal is that all three continue to increase within limits imposed by funding and infrastructure. The number of graduate assistantships has also been increasing, and our goal is to continue that increase to a level that is appropriate to meet the needs of each program.

Graduation: The number of graduates and the number of graduates per service area population provide broad scale measures. Both measures are increasing, and our goal is to continue that increase. The graduation rate and length of time to degree provide measures of the efficiency with which students are able to move through graduate programs. Our goal is that program graduation rates approach the limits imposed by unavoidable attrition. Our goal for time to degree is to be close to that built into the original program design criterion.

Research and creative activity by graduate students: Numbers of publications, presentations, performances, exhibits, etc., provide measures of the success of our graduate students, especially those in thesis-based (as opposed to professionally-focused) programs. We are presently implementing the software package Digital Measures, which will enable us to accurately track the research and creative activity of our graduate students. Digital Measures will also enable us to track the venues in which publications, presentations, performances, and exhibits occur, and therefore gain a measure of their impact. We will be able to establish acceptable levels for research and creative activity by graduate students once we secure baseline data from the newly implemented system.

Alumni survey results: As with undergraduate alumni, in the fall of every other year we survey graduate alumni who have completed their degrees 18-24 months previously, asking questions regarding their preparation for employment and satisfaction with their education. It is our goal to maintain at least an 85% rating of “adequate” or above.
**Comprehensive listing of Indicators of Success and Measures for Core Theme Two**

**Key Performance Measures are bolded**

**Core Theme Two: Graduate Education.**
Our university provides access to graduate education that is relevant to the educational and societal needs of the community and, state, is meaningful within and national and global contexts, is respected for its high quality, and is delivered within a supportive graduate culture.

**Core Objective 2.1: Access.** We provide students of all backgrounds with access to graduate educational opportunities in formats that are appropriate, flexible, accessible, and affordable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Graduate programs meet the need for traditional and non-traditional formats and scheduling. | ➢ # of graduate programs with non-traditional delivery formats and schedules  
 ➢ Enrollment in graduate programs with non-traditional delivery formats and schedules |
| Faculty members use best practice pedagogies that support success of all students within their courses. | ➢ Attendance and # of workshops at Center for Teaching and Learning on pedagogical best practices  
 ➢ % of courses that adhere to “Universal Design for Learning” principles. |
| Access is facilitated by availability of graduate assistantships, fellowships, and housing. | ➢ # of graduate fellowships  
 ➢ # of state funded graduate assistantships  
 ➢ # of grant funded graduate assistantships  
 ➢ # of assistantships to non-traditional students  
 ➢ $ per graduate assistants relative to peer institutions  
 ➢ # rooms available for graduate student housing |

**Core Objective 2.2: Relevance.** Our graduate students develop skills, knowledge, and experience that are relevant and valuable locally, regionally, nationally, and globally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Graduate programs are developed and updated by faculty based on periodic needs assessments that reflect trends in local, regional, national, and global contexts and with input from professional societies, employers, and students. | ➢ # of programs that are created/updated based on needs assessments and/or feedback from professional societies, employers and students  
 ➢ Diversity of program offerings reflecting variation in student needs, e.g., professional and academic programs in the same discipline. |
| Graduate degrees from Boise State University are valuable assets to students and to employers. Students are well prepared for careers that have substantial responsibility and impact. | ➢ Feedback from employers regarding value of degree  
 ➢ Alumni survey: preparation for employment and for professional & graduate schools  
 ➢ # of graduate students whose enrollment is funded by employers and # of employers funding the attendance of employees at Boise State  
 ➢ # of graduates employed in their field within 6 months of graduation  
 ➢ Entrepreneurial success of graduates, e.g., # of startups by graduates  
 ➢ Alumni survey: use of skills and knowledge |
Core Objective 2.3: Quality  Our graduate programs are composed of advanced and integrated learning experiences that provide disciplinary depth and interdisciplinary connections, and that reinforce the overall scholarly output of the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| All graduate programs have operational assessment plans with appropriate measures of goal attainment and use of that information for improvement. | ➢ % of departments reviewed with fully functional assessment processes  
   ➢ % of departments reviewed that updated programs based on assessment feedback |
| Learning goals and curricula for each graduate program are updated regularly and integrated to emphasize depth within the discipline and connections to related disciplines. | ➢ % of graduate programs reviewed with updated learning goals and curricula |
| Graduate students master the ideas, ways of thinking, applications, and content of their disciplines. | ➢ Successful attainment of program learning goals as determined by department assessment structure |
| Graduate faculties are active in their disciplines as documented by scholarly activity. | ➢ % of graduate faculty who contribute to the scholarly profile of the university |
| Departments attract highly qualified faculty members with potential to establish national and international reputations. | ➢ Quality of applicant pools for faculty positions. |
| Programs routinely attract highly qualified graduate students from diverse backgrounds. | ➢ Average GRE of incoming students  
   ➢ % of graduate student population from non-white ethnicities and other underrepresented groups |
| Graduate scholarship is of sufficient quality for publication and presentation and contributes to the overall reputation of the university. | ➢ # of publications and presentations by graduate students  
   ➢ # of awards to graduate students for research and creative activity  
   ➢ Prestige of venues |
| Students graduate successfully, and do so with time-to-degree consistent with their full-time or part-time enrollment status. | ➢ Time to degree for graduate students  
   ➢ Number of graduates  
   ➢ Number of graduates per population in service area |
| Scope and quality of infrastructure facilitate graduate research and creative activity. | ➢ Survey of faculty and graduate students re: facilities, processes and procedures, library, technology, etc.  
   ➢ Access to instrumentation, etc., at other institutions |
| Specialized accreditation is acquired and maintained for relevant graduate programs. | ➢ % of graduate programs meet or exceed requirements for specialized accreditation |
Core Objective 2.4: Culture. Our graduate experience embodies high expectations for academic achievement and respect for the core values of scholarship, integrity, generosity, and responsibility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New graduate students are welcomed, oriented, and subsequently well-supported at the departmental and university levels.</td>
<td>% of departments with orientation programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the graduate faculty effectively mentor graduate students. They emphasize the importance of integrity and generosity in collegial relationships, stress responsible conduct of research, and convey the role of scholars as &quot;keepers of the discipline.&quot;</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of departments including distance students in orientation programs</td>
<td>Student to faculty ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in CTL GA orientation program</td>
<td>% of departments that recognize and reward mentoring excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the graduate faculty effectively mentor graduate students. They emphasize the importance of integrity and generosity in collegial relationships, stress responsible conduct of research, and convey the role of scholars as &quot;keepers of the discipline.&quot;</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student participation in CTL teaching workshops</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of departments that recognize and reward graduate students for teaching excellence</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to faculty ratio</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of departments that recognize and reward mentoring excellence</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students are prepared for their roles as future teachers and/or leaders in the discipline and are valued in their teaching and leadership roles while graduate students.</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of departments that recognize and reward graduate students for teaching excellence</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student participation in CTL teaching workshops</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students are exposed to the broad culture of the discipline through professional meetings, performance and exhibit venues, professional organizations, social networks, and the off-campus collaborations of their faculty mentors.</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students for teaching excellence</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student participation in CTL teaching workshops</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students are exposed to the broad culture of the discipline through professional meetings, performance and exhibit venues, professional organizations, social networks, and the off-campus collaborations of their faculty mentors.</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students for teaching excellence</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students are exposed to the broad culture of the discipline through professional meetings, performance and exhibit venues, professional organizations, social networks, and the off-campus collaborations of their faculty mentors.</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students for teaching excellence</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students create and experience a mutually supportive environment as a result of their participation in a wide a variety of activities and scholarly endeavors.</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of students participating in study groups, field experiences, seminars, or clubs</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of graduate students in student government, associations, and service activities</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of graduate programs with sufficient enrollment to reach &quot;critical mass&quot;</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of participants in the Graduate Residential Scholars Program</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual graduate programs honor selected students for academic excellence through a meaningful awards program that is closely connected to departmental and disciplinary traditions.</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students for teaching excellence</td>
<td>% of departments evaluating the mentoring of graduate students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CORE THEME THREE: RESEARCH AND CREATIVE ACTIVITY

Through our endeavors in basic and applied research and creative activity, our researchers, artists, and students create knowledge and understanding of our world and of ourselves, and transfer that knowledge to provide societal, economic, and cultural benefit. Students are integral to faculty research and creative activity.

Core Objective 3.1: Access. Community members can connect with and benefit from our researchers, artists, and students. Our students are true collaborators in our activities.

Core Objective 3.2: Relevance. Our efforts in research and creative activity have direct and beneficial impact on the community, state, nation, and global community.

Core Objective 3.3: Quality. We pursue research and creative activity that brings about discovery of fundamental knowledge and produces a better understanding of the human condition and our world. The work of our researchers, artists, and students has substantial disciplinary impact and contributes to the overall reputation of the university.

Core Objective 3.4: Culture. We provide creative, proactive, and responsive support for the research and creative activity of our faculty, staff, and students. Our researchers, artists, and students collaborate within and across disciplines, both within and outside the institution. We facilitate an ongoing integration of teaching with faculty research and creative activity.

Key Performance Measures and Acceptable Performance for Core Theme Three:

Publications and Citations: The number of publications produced by university personnel is an indication of scholarly productivity; the number citations in other publications provides an indication of the impact of those publications. Both numbers are derived from databases of The Web of Science, which includes citations for the vast majority of published research articles, although it is of limited use in measuring creative non-written works. Acceptable levels of both measures will be based on the derivation of similar measures from our peer institutions and on an examination of historical levels. Additionally, the use of Digital Measures, now being implemented, will enable us to make use of the benchmarking of faculty activity provided by the Delaware Study of non-classroom activity.

Performances and Exhibits: The numbers and venues of performances and exhibits will be used as measures of creative activity. The gathering of such information will be enhanced by implementation of Digital Measures. Interpretation of the prestige of venue is key to understanding the level impact and prominence of creative activity. Acceptable levels for both will be based on the Delaware Study of non-classroom activity, on historical trends, and on information from peer institutions.

Research grants and contracts: The securing of external funds for research is key to our success. We measure the following aspects of research funding: number of proposals submitted, number of awards, dollars of awards, and dollars of research expenditures. An additional measure of our success will be the relative prestige of funding agencies. For example, how much funding is from the NSF and NIH and other competitive sources? A final measure will be the diversity of funding, that is, how broad is the range of sources from which we receive funding (e.g., industry, private foundations, etc.) and how broad is the range of departments and of individuals that are successful at securing competitive funding? It is challenging, at this time, to state acceptable levels for such funding. On the one hand, recent increases in funding quickly render any sort of “acceptable level” as obsolete. On the other hand, the recent downturn in the economy has decreased the level of
funding available. We will determine acceptable levels that embody our mission as a university in comparison to our peer institutions.

Intellectual property: Patents and other disclosures of intellectual property are perhaps the most salient product of our research activity. The number of disclosures arising from Boise State University researchers was 22 during the last fiscal year, up from 14 the previous year. It is difficult to delineate an “acceptable level” given the enhancements we are making to our technology transfer apparatus and recent policy changes regarding intellectual property. We will determine acceptable levels that embody our mission as a university following additional analysis of our peer institutions. An additional measure that we will employ is the number of business startups resulting from university research.

Engagement of students: The participation of undergraduate and graduate students as collaborators in our research and creative activity is an important aspect of this area of our mission. There are several relevant measures, such as participation in the Undergraduate Research Conference, the number of credits of research internships, and the number of students supported by sponsored project funding. We will also measure the number of co-authorships, co-presentations, co-performances, etc., of students with our researchers and artists using Digital Measures. An acceptable level of each of these measures is to maintain our current levels. As we study the information that results from Digital Measures, and compare it to our peer institutions, we hope to derive more definitive levels of acceptability.
### Core Theme Three: Research and Creative Activity

Through our endeavors in basic and applied research and in creative activity, our researchers, artists, and students create knowledge and understanding of our world and of ourselves, and transfer that knowledge to provide societal, economic, and cultural benefit. Students are integral to our faculty research and creative activity.

#### Core Objective 3.1: Access. Community members can connect with and benefit from our researchers, artists, and students. Our students are true collaborators in our research and creative activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Businesses, agencies, and organizations and citizens can work with researchers on problems of practical importance. | ➢ # of and diversity of businesses, agencies, and organizations and individuals that consult with BSU on research being done here  
 ➢ # of formal contractual collaborations with businesses  
 ➢ # of internships and practica of undergraduate and graduate students  
 ➢ # of faculty sabbaticals housed by industry |
| Students are valued participants in research projects and creative activities, and develop professional credibility as early-stage practitioners in their chosen discipline. | ➢ # of student authorships, presentations, and performances, and the prestige of those venues  
 ➢ # of participants in the undergraduate research conference  
 ➢ Credits for research internships  
 ➢ Successful admission to professional and graduate schools |

#### Core Objective 3.2: Relevance. Our efforts in research and creative activity have direct and beneficial economic, societal, and cultural impact on the community, state, nation, and global community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our creative activity contributes to the cultural enrichment of the region.</td>
<td>➢ # of and attendance at cultural performances and exhibits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Our research and creative activity contribute to the economic vitality of the region, state, and nation. | ➢ # of research discoveries with local, regional, national, and/or global impact  
 ➢ # of startups resulting from BSU research  
 ➢ # of patents, disclosures, etc.  
 ➢ Measures of economic impact  
 ➢ Measures of contribution to quality of life |
| Our research contributes to the solution of key societal issues in a broad variety of contexts. | ➢ # of faculty members testifying to governmental bodies  
 ➢ # of faculty serving on commissions  
 ➢ Legislation and policy enacted with input from researchers |
Core Objective 3.3: Quality. We pursue research and creative activity that brings about discovery of fundamental knowledge and produces a better understanding of the human condition and our world. The work of our researchers, artists, and students has substantial disciplinary impact and contributes to the overall reputation of the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and creative activity is well-funded from external sources.</td>
<td>➢ $ and # of research grant and contract funding: submissions, awards, expenditures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; creative activity are disseminated: publications, presentations, performances, exhibits.</td>
<td>➢ # of creative activity performances, exhibits, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The work of our researchers and artists is of top quality, has substantial impact, and is recognized nationally.</td>
<td>➢ Source of research grant &amp; contract funding: % from competitive sources &amp; prestigious sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Level of prestige of creative activity venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ # of citations &amp; impact factor of publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ External awards/honors for excellence in the research and creative activity of faculty, staff, and students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Objective 3.4: Culture. We provide creative, proactive, and responsive support for the research and creative activity of our faculty members, staff members, and students. Our researchers, artists, and students collaborate within and across disciplines, both within and outside our institution. We facilitate the ongoing integration of teaching with research and creative activity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our supportive infrastructure enables our researchers and artists to be successful.</td>
<td>➢ Survey of researchers: satisfaction with infrastructure systems and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Infrastructure effectiveness, e.g., processing time, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centers and institute strengthen academic departments and provides opportunities for their faculty and students.</td>
<td>➢ Survey of dept chairs: benefits/costs of center and institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ # of new faculty, staff, and student researchers and artists facilitated by centers and institutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enduring and productive interdisciplinary relationships easily evolve from frequent informal interdisciplinary interactions.</td>
<td>➢ # of opportunities for informal interdisciplinary interactions on and off campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ # of collaborative, interdisciplinary proposals, projects, publications, performances, etc., within the university and with outside partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration across academic disciplines enables the pursuit of a wider range of initiatives in research and creative activity than otherwise possible.</td>
<td>➢ #, $$, and prestige of interdisciplinary grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and creative activity are integrated with our curricula and our pedagogy.</td>
<td>➢ # departments reviewed with research and creative activity integrated into curriculum and pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ # courses/credits focused on research/creative activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Scholarship of teaching: # publications, # symposia, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university culture recognizes and promotes creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship.</td>
<td>➢ # of internal publications and announcements for creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ # of news articles re: BSU research/creative activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Faculty, staff, and student awards for innovation, creativity, and entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ # of research and creative activity symposia, conferences, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CORE THEME FOUR: COMMUNITY COMMITMENT

The university is an integral part of the community, and our commitment to the community extends beyond our educational programs, research, and creative activity. We collaborate in the development of partnerships that address community and university issues. We and the community share knowledge and expertise with each other. We look to the community to inform our goals, actions, and measures of success. We work with the community to create a rich mix of culture, learning experiences, and entertainment that educates and enriches the lives of our citizens. Our campus atmosphere is civil and collegial.

Core Objective 4.1: Access. Our campus is easily accessible and navigable by community members. Similarly, our faculty and staff are easily accessible to community members seeking information and expertise. Students, faculty, and staff easily connect with community partners.

Core Objective 4.2: Relevance and Quality. Members of the community and of the university collaborate to solve important problems and to enrich our community. We contribute to the development and direction of the community, and the community is engaged in the development and direction of the university. The university and community share valuable knowledge and expertise. The community seeks and values the contribution of the university, and the university seeks and values the contribution of the community.

Core Objective 4.3: Culture. We partner with the community in a wide range of cultural, athletic, and social events. We provide educational opportunities beyond the classroom, serving as a center for non-credit educational programs. We provide a welcoming environment for community, which values, supports, and participates in programs offered by the university.

Key Performance Measures and Acceptable Performance for Core Theme Four:

Community Engagement designation from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. In 2007, the university joined the inaugural group of institutions who received the Carnegie Foundation’s new Community Engagement designation. Such a designation relies on a compendium of a wide range of aspects of our engagement with the community, and we were recognized in the areas of Curriculum Engagement and Outreach & Partnerships. It follows that an acceptable level for this measure would be to maintain such a designation by the Carnegie Foundation.

President’s Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll. The Honor Roll was launched in 2006, and annually recognizes institutions of higher education for their achievement in community service and for contributions that colleges and their students make to local communities and the nation as a whole. As with the Carnegie Foundation designation, it follows that an acceptable level for this measure is to retain our place on the honor role.

Student participation with the community:

- Service Learning activity and impact. Service Learning activities are a key aspect of our community engagement. This last year we created partnerships with more than 200 community organizations involving more than 2500 students. Our numbers increase each year. At the very least, an acceptable level will be to maintain our current level of activity; however, we plan to determine a level of acceptability that is more robust.

- Internships with community members. Another key aspect of our community engagement is the involvement of students as interns with community entities. Currently, an acceptable
level will be to maintain our current level of activity; in the future, however, we plan to determine an acceptable level that is more robust.

- **Student participation in volunteer activities.** The Volunteer Services Board organizes a wide range of activities in the community for student volunteers. An acceptable level will be to maintain our current level of activity; in the future, however, we plan to determine an acceptable level that is more robust.

**Community-related funding.** Two measures of sponsored projects funding provide an indication of our success in community engagement. First, the amount of sponsored projects funding that is secured for the purpose of public service gives an indication of our activity in that area. That amount has been steadily increasing, reaching more than $9 million in FY 2011. As with research funding, determination of an acceptable level will require substantial consideration of historical trends and peer information. For now, we will regard it as acceptable if public service funding does not decline. A second measure is the amount of funding that comes from local sources, the implication being that funding from a local or state source is indicative of a partnership with a local or state partner. In FY2011, that figure was over $4 million. We will regard it as acceptable if funding from local sources does not decline.
**Core Theme Four: Community Commitment**

The university is an integral part of the community, and our commitment to the community extends beyond our educational programs, research, and creative activity. We collaborate in the development of partnerships that address community and university issues. We and the community share knowledge and expertise with each other. We look to the community to inform our goals, actions, and measures of success. We work with the community to create a rich mix of culture, learning experiences, and entertainment that educates and enriches the lives of our citizens. Our campus atmosphere is civil and collegial.

Core Objective 4.1: Access. Our campus is easily accessible and navigable by community members. Similarly, our faculty and staff are easily accessible to community members seeking information and expertise. Students, faculty, and staff easily connect with community partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Members of the public can easily navigate our campus and website.</td>
<td>➢ Feedback on website and ease-of-use measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Feedback on parking and visits to campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy and straightforward for the community to connect with an expert at Boise State.</td>
<td>➢ Survey of public: ease of access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ # of consultations for the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy and straightforward for university faculty, staff, and students to connect with community groups and individuals.</td>
<td>➢ # partners, #departments, &amp; # faculty in, and impact of Service Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Student internships with local entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Participation in community volunteer activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ # of co-presentations &amp; co-publications of university personnel with community members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Objective 4.2: Relevance and Quality. Members of the community and of the university collaborate to solve important problems and to enrich our community. We contribute to the development and direction of the community, and the community is engaged in the development and direction of the university. The university and community share valuable knowledge and expertise. The community seeks and values the contribution of the university and the university seeks and values the contribution of the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The university is recognized for its engagement with the community.</td>
<td>➢ Carnegie Foundation designation for community engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ President's Higher Education Community Service Honor Roll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our partnerships with community partners enhance the social, economic, and cultural vitality of the region.</td>
<td>➢ # of news stories re: impact of community partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Measures of cultural impact: quality of life, livability, success of partners, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Hours of mediation contributed to Small Claims Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Measures of societal impact: success of partners in resolving issues, impact of specific collaborations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Economic impact: ISBDC impact on businesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding is secured for public service activities.</td>
<td>➢ $ of awards of grants and contracts with public service purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local governmental, NGOs, and industry fund university research and other activities.</td>
<td>➢ $ of awards of grant and contracts from local sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, staff, and students support the important work in which community partners are engaged. The community supports the work of its university partners.</td>
<td>➢ #, diversity, and success of partnerships ➢ # of awards and honors for community partnerships ➢ Service Learning participation: # partnerships, # departments, # faculty, # students ➢ # internships with community entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, staff, and students are effective and valuable members of community and government councils and committees. Community members are effective and valuable members of university committees and councils.</td>
<td>➢ #, diversity, and prominence of community and government councils and committees on which university personnel serve. ➢ #, diversity, and prominence of university committees and councils on which community members serve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty, staff, and students are sought as a source of knowledge and expertise within the community. Community members are sought as a source of knowledge and expertise by the university.</td>
<td>➢ # and diversity of expert consultations with community members ➢ #, diversity, and prestige of venues at which university members speak as authorities ➢ Use of faculty members as experts by media: interviews and appearances ➢ # and diversity of guest lectures by community members ➢ # and diversity of programs/courses that embed practitioner expertise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Core Objective 4.3: Culture. We partner with the community in a wide range of cultural, athletic, and social events. We provide educational opportunities beyond the classroom, serving as a center for non-credit educational programs. We provide a welcoming environment the community, which values, supports, and participates in programs offered by the university.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators of Success</th>
<th>Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University events provide a diversity and richness of culture and entertainment to the community.</td>
<td>➢ Diversity, number, attendance, and prestige of university cultural, social and athletic events on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus serves as a gathering place for community cultural, social, educational, and athletic events.</td>
<td>➢ Number of and attendance at community events on campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University serves as a center for non-credit education.</td>
<td>➢ Enrollment in: Osher Institute, personal enrichment classes, educational travel programs, professional development programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media coverage of Boise State University includes a broad spectrum of research, cultural, sports, and educational news that inform and educate the community.</td>
<td>➢ Media coverage of research, culture, education, sports at Boise State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section Three: Conclusion

This report, *Standard One: Mission, Core Themes, and Expectations*, is the first report prepared by Boise State University under the NWCCU’s new accreditation standards and cycle. Our schedule for the remaining four accreditation standards is as follows: Standard Two: Resources and Capacity, report and visit, Fall 2013; Standard Three: Planning and Implementation and Standard Four: Effectiveness and Improvement Standards, report, Fall 2015; Standard Five: Mission Fulfillment, Adaptation, and Sustainability, report and visit, Fall 2017.

This Standard One report states Boise State University’s mission and identifies four core themes: Undergraduate Education, Graduate Education, Research & Creative Activity, and Community Commitment. Each core theme has three to four objectives, each objective has several indicators of success, and each indicator has several measures. The result is a framework that is conceptually broad enough to encompass the university, but with sufficient specificity to enable us to assess mission fulfillment.

Our Standard One report will form an important foundation for the creation of our new strategic plan, a process presently underway. The vision, values, goals, and strategies of our plan will be developed during fall semester of 2011, and a plan for the implementation of the strategic plan will be developed during the spring semester of 2012. Our Standard One report essentially describes the entirety of what we are, as an institution, attempting to accomplish. Our new strategic plan will identify those areas within our mission upon which we will focus our strategic efforts during the next five years. In some cases, a strategic goal may reflect a fundamental change in the emphasis of our mission. In other cases, a strategic goal may reflect our desire to dramatically improve our performance in a particular area. Our Standard One report also contains indicators and measures that will be used to determine how successful we are in carrying out our mission. In many cases, those same measures will be appropriate for assessing progress in achieving our strategic goals.

We are also revising our process for Periodic Review of Academic Departments (PRAD) based on the information contained in our Standard One report. PRAD is a key mechanism by which we assess the performance of departments in a wide range of areas, including achievement of learning goals, research and creative activity, and service. It is our intent to completely overhaul the guidelines presently used for department self studies and to adopt, as much as feasible, the Core Themes, Core Objectives, Indicators of Success, and Measures that are described in our Standard One report.