

NEAC Recommendations  
May 5, 2004

<b>Name</b>	<b>Committee</b>	<b>Representing</b>	<b>Term</b>
Vivienne Bennett	Search Comm. – VP for Finance & Administration	At-large	
Jack Leu	Search Comm. – VP for Finance & Administration	At-large	

**CURRICULUM TRACKING**  
**Academic Year 2003-04**

Curric. & Sched. No.	Course Prefix	Course Number	New Course #	Course/Program Title	Form(s)	Type Action	Proposal Originator	Rec'd by Curr. & Sched.	C&S Sent to Senate	AS Sent to UCC	UCC Action	Action Date
43	EDEX	550		San Diego Summer Leadership Institute in Special Education	C	New	J. Thousand	8/7/03	11/17/03	11/17/03	Approved	1/27/04
67	EDMX	532A		Technology and Communication - Special Education Populations.	D	Deletion	M.G. Kelly/K. Hayden	10/17/03	11/17/03	11/17/03	Approved	3/16/04
152	LTWR	303		Masterworks in Literature	C	New	Susie Cassel	12/9/03	12/15/03	12/15/03	Approved	4/27/04
155	LTWR	350		Reclaiming the Humanities	C	New	Susie Cassel	12/9/03	12/15/03	12/15/03	Approved	4/27/04
162	LTWR	603A-C		Composition Theories and Practices II	C	New	Aneil Rallin	5/20/03	11/17/03	11/17/03	Approved	4/27/04

## **Resolution: Student Evaluation of Course Instruction**

That the instrument for student evaluation of course instruction developed by the FAC subcommittee be adopted on a trial basis for three years, during which time it will serve as the official instrument for student evaluation. After the third year of the trial period, FAC (or a subcommittee of FAC) will conduct a review and evaluation of the trial and report its findings to the Academic Senate.

After receiving the FAC report and reviewing its recommendations, the Senate will conduct a vote to confirm (or not) the status of the instrument for student evaluation as the official instrument for student evaluation.

Throughout the trial period, Colleges will provide instructors an opportunity, during the first half of any given term, to specify which of the six types of course-specific questions they wish to employ in the classes they are teaching; instructors not responding in a timely fashion will receive the question set deemed most relevant by Dean's Office staff.

### **RATIONALE:**

FAC charged the Subcommittee on Student Evaluation of Instruction with reviewing current procedures for the evaluation of teaching at Cal State San Marcos and with recommending revisions in both existing processes for the evaluation of teaching and the student evaluation instrument.

For the past one and one-half years, the Subcommittee has been conducting an extensive review of the literature on student evaluation of instruction, with a focus on identifying best practices in administration procedures and item construction, and carefully reviewed more than 150 potential questions.

The Subcommittee sought feedback through college and department discussions in Spring 2003 on the composition of the instrument and again in Spring 2004 on a draft instrument. The feedback suggested that faculty supported using student evaluations to improve teaching, as well as in personnel decisions (which is required); that in accordance with the best practices delineated in the literature on effective evaluation of teaching only summative evaluations by students should be included in personnel files; and that multiple sources of evidence on teaching should be used to make personnel decisions.

## **Resolution: Personnel Decisions and the Instrument for Student Evaluation of Course Instruction**

### RESOLVED:

That, in keeping with the requirements that faculty who teach shall be formally evaluated on a regular basis and must include student evaluation materials in their WPAF, student ratings in Section 1A and student information in Section 2 of the form are required in files compiled for periodic reviews and personnel decisions (retention, tenure, and promotion).

### RATIONALE:

FAC charged the Subcommittee on Student Evaluation of Instruction with reviewing current procedures for the evaluation of teaching at Cal State San Marcos and with recommending revisions in both existing processes for the evaluation of teaching and the student evaluation instrument.

For the past one and one-half years, the Subcommittee has been conducting an extensive review of the literature on student evaluation of instruction, with a focus on identifying best practices in administration procedures and item construction, and carefully reviewed more than 150 potential questions.

The Subcommittee sought feedback through college and department discussions in Spring 2003 on the composition of the instrument and again in Spring 2004 on a draft instrument. The feedback suggested that faculty supported using student evaluations to improve teaching, as well as in personnel decisions (which is required); that in accordance with the best practices delineated in the literature on effective evaluation of teaching only summative evaluations by students should be included in personnel files; and that multiple sources of evidence on teaching should be used to make personnel decisions.

In keeping with current research-based recommendations on student evaluation of instruction the subcommittee proposes that the evaluation data received by RTP and other personnel committees must include the student responses to the five core summative items in Section 1A and the information on students items in Section 2 of the form. Section 1.B and 1.C and the open ended questions in Section 3 are formative responses and would not be required.

## **Student Evaluation of Instruction: Overview of Subcommittee Process and The New Evaluation Form**

FAC Subcommittee on Student Evaluation of Instruction<sup>1</sup>  
Kathy Norman (Chair), Bettina Huber, Gabriela Sonntag, Marie Thomas

Last year, FAC charged our Subcommittee with reviewing current procedures for the evaluation of teaching at Cal State San Marcos and with recommending revisions in both existing processes for the evaluation of teaching and the student evaluation instrument.

For the past one and one-half half years, we have been seeking information on the student evaluation of instruction, with a focus on identifying best practices in administration procedures and item construction. The attached appendix outlines some of the key procedural recommendations we found. We also had a morning-long briefing with Jennifer Franklin, who has done extensive work on the use of course evaluations, and carefully reviewed more than 150 potential questions.

Our initial review of best practices led to our recommending new procedures for administering evaluations. Our draft procedures were revised by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate and subsequently approved by the Senate as a whole in May 2003. The new procedures are currently in use.

In addition to researching best practices, we examined interrelationships among the items currently in use. We examined these by using data from the course evaluations completed by students taking CoAS courses in Fall 2001 and 2002 to generate correlation coefficients for pairs of items; the attached tables summarize the results for the more recent term. Table 1 shows that three of the general items at the bottom of the current form are highly interrelated, implying that they are measuring the same thing. The general item dealing with the instructor's enthusiasm is somewhat less closely related to the three others, suggesting that it may be tapping into something slightly different. Table 2, which relates the specific items in the current form to the general items in Table 1, allows one to assess whether the specific items currently in use provide information not evident in the general ratings. Given the consistent pattern of strong correlations in the table — ranging from 0.52 to 0.79 — it appears that the specific items currently in use add very little information that cannot be gleaned from students' ratings on the general items.

In light of the CBA requirement that faculty who teach shall be formally evaluated on a regular basis, we sought feedback last year on two options:

Option 1: Use Student Evaluations Mainly for Performance Appraisal/Personnel Decisions (summative evaluation).

Option 2: Use Student Evaluations for *both* Performance Appraisal/Personnel Decisions (summative evaluation) *and* to Improve Teaching (formative evaluation).

We noted that if we wanted to pursue the second option, the following changes to current procedures were advisable:

- Develop an evaluation form that includes a few summative items and a longer list of items useful primarily to instructors.

---

<sup>1</sup> The subcommittee originally included a faculty member from CoBA. When he had to step down, we were unable to find a replacement, despite repeated attempts.

- Only the data relating to the small set of summative items are made available to those involved in performance appraisal and personnel decisions.
- Faculty members (and, perhaps, their mentors) see the results of all items (i.e., summative, formative, open-ended responses).

The feedback we received from faculty members suggested that most were open to the second option we proposed. Thus, with the aid of item sets available from an array of other institutions, we developed a new form with both summative and formative items.

We are now recommending that the new instrument be adopted for a three year period, after which its efficacy will be evaluated.

The new form has three major sections. The first includes a series of multiple response items, the second solicits information about the student evaluators, and the third asks them to respond to several open-ended questions. Part A of the first section contains five core questions designed to provide overall summative information; these items will be used in Performance Appraisals and Personnel Decisions. Parts B and C of the first section contain items useful to instructors interested in strengthening their courses.

The items in Part B vary, depending on the type of course being evaluated. We identified six distinct types:

- “regular” courses (the default)
- small seminar courses
- laboratory/discussion sections
- research-based/service learning courses
- teaching methods courses
- on-line courses

Although the first three items included in each of the above item sets are identical,<sup>2</sup> the remainder differ. The inclusion of items tailored to different courses will provide information particularly relevant for the improvement of these specific courses.

While we do not expect that everyone will find all items in the new form entirely to their liking, we hope that the overall format proves appealing and most items acceptable.

---

<sup>2</sup> There is one exception. Only the first two common items are included in the item set for online courses.

**Appendix:  
Recommendations from the Literature on Use of Student Evaluations**

An excellent article by W.E. Cashin delineates a long series of recommendations for the use of student course evaluation data.<sup>3</sup> These recommendations, which grew out of the author's comprehensive review of the relevant literature, cover the following topics: general issues, process issues, interpretation of student ratings, using ratings to improve teaching, using ratings for personnel decisions, and administration issues. We list a few of the most important recommendations below.

- Use multiple sources of data about a faculty member's teaching if you are serious about accurately evaluating or improving teaching .
- Use student rating data as only one source of data about effective teaching.
- To generalize from student rating data to an instructor's overall teaching effectiveness, sample across both courses and time.
- For improvement, develop a system that is diagnostic and interpretable. Use items that require as little inference as possible on the part of the student rater and as little interpretation as possible on the part of the instructor.
- For improvement, ask for open-ended comments; these comments should be used only for improvement.
- Develop standardized instructions that include the purpose(s) for which the data will be used, and who will receive what information, and when.
- Take into consideration the student's motivation level when interpreting student rating data.

---

<sup>3</sup> “ Student Ratings of Teaching: Recommendations for Use.” IDEA Paper #22, Kansas State University, Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development, 1990 (available at: [http://www.idea.ksu.edu/papers/pdf/Idea\\_Paper\\_22.pdf](http://www.idea.ksu.edu/papers/pdf/Idea_Paper_22.pdf)).

**Table 1. Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients for Four General Items Included in Course Evaluation Forms Completed by CoAS Students in Fall 2002**

	Item K	Item L	Item M	Item N
K. Instructor was enthusiastic about communicating the subject matter (number of responses)		0.740 (14,412)	0.685 (14,448)	0.675 (14,346)
L. The overall quality of teaching by the instructor was high (number of responses)	0.740 (14,412)		0.865 (14,423)	0.827 (14,320)
M. The overall quality of the course was high (number of responses)	0.685 (14,448)	0.865 (14,423)		0.847 (14,370)
N. I learned a great deal about the subject from this instructor (number of responses)	0.675 (14,346)	0.827 (14,320)	0.847 (14,370)	

**NOTE:** all correlation coefficients are significant at the .001 level.

**Table 2. Correlation Between General and Specific Items Included in Course Evaluation Forms Completed by CoAS Students in Fall 2002**

	Item K	Item L	Item M	Item N
A. The instructor clearly articulated course goals	0.592	0.705	0.696	0.675
B. The instructor clearly articulated course requirements	0.567	0.669	0.657	0.631
C. The instructor clearly articulated grading requirements	0.521	0.624	0.616	0.590
D. The instructor was well prepared for class	0.597	0.714	0.686	0.658
E. Class sessions were well organized	0.586	0.729	0.710	0.681
F. The graded materials reflected the course subject matter	0.565	0.652	0.655	0.641
G. The instructor encouraged critical and/or creative thinking	0.619	0.666	0.651	0.646
H. The instructor facilitated students understanding of difficult topics	0.666	0.770	0.741	0.736
I. The instructor encouraged active learning	0.587	0.627	0.612	0.606
J. The instructor was available for consultation outside of class	0.562	0.582	0.564	0.553

**NOTE:** all correlation coefficients are significant at the .001 level.  
the number of responses in each cell ranges from 13,790 to 14,549.



California State University San Marcos  
**Student Evaluation of Course Instruction**

CRN: \_\_\_\_\_

Course No. \_\_\_\_\_ Term and Year: \_\_\_\_\_

Course Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Instructor: \_\_\_\_\_

**Information on Students**

A. I took this course because:  
- it is a requirement for my major/degree program? 1. Yes 2. No  
- it fulfills a GE requirement? 1. Yes 2. No

B. Based on your performance in this course thus far, what grade do you expect to receive?  
6. an A                      3. a C or a D  
5. a B                         2. Credit  
4. a B or a C                1. an F or no credit

C. On average, approximately how many hours **per week** have you spent preparing for this class? (Be sure to include the time spent doing assigned readings, reviewing notes, & writing papers.)

- |                      |              |
|----------------------|--------------|
| 6. at least 10 hours | 3. 4-5 hours |
| 5. 8-9 hours         | 2. 2-3 hours |

- |              |                   |
|--------------|-------------------|
| 4. 6-7 hours | 1. 1 hour at most |
|--------------|-------------------|

D. In this class, how actively have you participated in all aspects of the learning process (e.g., completing required readings and assignments, participating in class activities)?

- |               |                  |
|---------------|------------------|
| 4. Very       | 2. Somewhat      |
| 3. Moderately | 1. Hardly at all |

E. When you first enrolled in this course, how interested were you in its subject matter?

- |               |                  |
|---------------|------------------|
| 4. Very       | 2. Somewhat      |
| 3. Moderately | 1. Hardly at all |

F. Now that the course is nearly over, how interested are you in the subject matter?

- |               |                  |
|---------------|------------------|
| 4. Very       | 2. Somewhat      |
| 3. Moderately | 1. Hardly at all |

Deleted: A. Is this course

Deleted: your

Deleted: B. Are you taking this course to

Formatted: Font: 8 pt

To what extent do you agree with each of the items listed below?

	<u>Strongly</u>				<u>Strongly</u>	<u>Not</u>
	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neutral</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Applic.</u>

**A. Core Questions**

A1. The overall quality of this course was high.	5	4	3	2	1	0
A2. I learned a great deal in this course.	5	4	3	2	1	0
A3. The instructor is an effective teacher.	5	4	3	2	1	0
A4. The instructor is enthusiastic about communicating the subject matter.	5	4	3	2	1	0
A5. The instructor showed genuine interest in students' learning.	5	4	3	2	1	0
<b>( o v e r )</b>						

**B. Course-Specific Questions – see separate sheet**

B1.	5	4	3	2	1	0
B2.	5	4	3	2	1	0
B3.	5	4	3	2	1	0
B4.	5	4	3	2	1	0
B5.	5	4	3	2	1	0
B6.	5	4	3	2	1	0
B7.	5	4	3	2	1	0

**C. Questions Supplied by Instructor** (optional; distributed on a separate sheet)

C1.	0	1	2	3	4	5	C4.	0	1	2	3	4	5
C2.	0	1	2	3	4	5	C5.	0	1	2	3	4	5
C3.	0	1	2	3	4	5	C6.	0	1	2	3	4	5

**Open-ended Questions**

A. List one or two specific aspects of this course that were particularly effective in stimulating your interest in the materials presented or in fostering your learning.

B. If relevant, describe one or two specific aspects of this course that lessened your interest in the materials presented or interfered with your learning.

C. What suggestions, if any, do you have for improving this class?

## Course-Specific Questions

### 1. Regular classes (default)

- a. ~~The course objectives and requirements were clearly outlined in the course syllabus.~~
- b. ~~Required assignments~~ (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor ~~responded when I asked for individual help.~~
- d. The instructor seemed well-prepared for each class.
- e. The instructor's presentations added to my understanding of the ~~course~~ material.
- f. The instructor was sensitive to student difficulties with the ~~course~~ material.
- g. Insofar as possible, the instructor ~~was receptive to student~~ questions.

- ~~Deleted: I understood~~
- ~~Deleted: t~~
- ~~Deleted: early in the term~~
- ~~Deleted: Graded work~~
- ~~Deleted: readily met with and helped me outside of class.~~
- ~~Deleted: lecture~~
- ~~Deleted: acknowledged all~~

### 2. Small seminar-type classes (no more than 20 students)

- a. ~~The course objectives and requirements were clearly outlined in the course syllabus.~~
- b. ~~Required assignments~~ (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor ~~responded when I asked for individual help.~~
- d. The instructor's presentations added to my understanding of the material.
- e. The in-class discussions enhanced my learning.
- f. The instructor suggested specific ways that students could improve their understanding of the course material.
- g. The instructor encouraged us to help each other understand ideas and concepts.

- ~~Deleted: I understood~~
- ~~Deleted: t~~
- ~~Deleted: early in the term~~
- ~~Deleted: Graded work~~
- ~~Deleted: readily met with and helped me outside of class.~~

### 3. Laboratory/Discussion Sections

- a. ~~The course objectives and requirements were clearly outlined in the course syllabus.~~
- b. ~~Required assignments~~ (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor ~~responded when I asked for individual help.~~
- d. The instructor seemed well-prepared for each class.
- e. Students had ample opportunity to ask questions during the lab/discussion sessions.
- f. The lab/discussion sessions clarified the lecture material.
- g. The instructor asked students to demonstrate their understanding of the course material by applying concepts.

- ~~Deleted: I understood~~
- ~~Deleted: t~~
- ~~Deleted: early in the term~~
- ~~Deleted: Graded work~~
- ~~Deleted: readily met with and helped me outside of class.~~

**4. Research-based/Service Learning Courses** (e.g., senior experience, qualitative field research)

- a. ~~The course objectives and requirements were clearly outlined in the course syllabus.~~
- b. ~~Required assignments~~ (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor ~~responded when I asked for individual help.~~
- d. The instructor helped me resolve challenges I encountered in my research/service-learning setting.
- e. In this course I enhanced my ability to apply theoretical concepts to real-world problems.
- f. This course helped me develop skills needed by professionals in my field.
- g. Class discussion and written assignments helped me to understand the broader implications of my research/service-learning experience.

- ~~Deleted: I understood~~
- ~~Deleted: t~~
- ~~Deleted: early in the term~~
- ~~Deleted: Graded work~~
- ~~Deleted: readily met with and helped me outside of class.~~

**5. Teaching Methods Courses (CoE)**

- a. ~~The course objectives and requirements were clearly outlined in the course syllabus.~~
- b. ~~Required assignments~~ (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor ~~responded when I asked for individual help.~~
- d. The instructor's presentations added to my understanding of the course material.
- e. The instructor suggested specific ways that students could improve their understanding of the course material.
- f. The instructor asked students to demonstrate their understanding of the course material by applying concepts.
- g. Cooperative group work facilitated my learning in this course.

- ~~Deleted: I understood~~
- ~~Deleted: t~~
- ~~Deleted: early in the term~~
- ~~Deleted: Graded work~~
- ~~Deleted: readily met with and helped me outside of class.~~

**6. On-Line Courses**

- a. ~~The course objectives and requirements were clearly outlined in the course syllabus.~~
- b. ~~Required assignments~~ (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor ~~responded when I asked for individual help.~~
- d. The activities and assignments related to the course objectives.
- e. The course provided ample opportunity for on-line interaction with other students.
- f. On-line discussions enhanced my understanding of the course content.
- g. The on-line course materials were easy for me to access.

- ~~Deleted: I understood~~
- ~~Deleted: t~~
- ~~Deleted: early in the term~~
- ~~Deleted: Graded work~~
- ~~Deleted: readily met with and helped me outside of class.~~

- ~~Deleted: h. The instructor responded when I asked for individual help.¶~~

## **BIOTECHNOLOGY**

### **Degree program offered: Bachelor of Science in Biotechnology**

Biotechnology refers to the long practiced skill of applying our knowledge of the molecular basis of life processes for the benefit of society. While classic examples of biotechnology include using lactic acid to produce cheeses, and yeast to make bread and beer; modern applications exploit DNA based technologies, immunology, biochemistry, and microbiology to make new products or provide services to improve health care, agriculture, food, and the environment. Over the past 20 years biotechnology has caused a profound revolution in science having significant technological and social implications.

Today, pharmaceuticals and vaccines are being designed through biotechnology to treat various cancers, Alzheimer's, heart disease, diabetes, multiple sclerosis, AIDS, obesity and other conditions. Biotechnology is responsible for hundreds of medical diagnostic tests that keep the blood supply safe from the AIDS virus and detect other conditions early enough to be successfully treated. Home pregnancy tests are also biotechnology diagnostic products. In food and agriculture biotechnology has resulted in the development of crops that are naturally resistant to pests and viruses; tolerant of environmental stresses such as drought, salinity, and extreme cold; and more nutritious and longer lasting than their conventional counterparts. Environmental biotechnology products make it possible to more efficiently clean up hazardous waste without the use of caustic chemicals. Bioremediation products use living cells, the byproducts of living materials or both to clean up oil spills and other environmental problems. DNA fingerprinting is a biotech process that has dramatically improved criminal investigation and forensic medicine, and has afforded significant advances in anthropology and wildlife management. Biotechnology is a promising young field that is expected to be one of the pivotal forces in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, helping us to lead longer, healthier lives, to provide more plentiful and nutritious food, and to keep our environment cleaner.

A Bachelor of Science degree in Biotechnology from CSU San Marcos prepares students to succeed in entry level positions in emerging industries in a number of market sectors including pharmaceutical and clinical diagnostics, environmental protection, food and agriculture, medical therapeutics, veterinary, scientific services and scientific equipment and supplies. The degree will also enable graduates to pursue Higher Degrees at Universities in areas as diverse as Biochemistry, Microbiology, Pharmacology, Environmental Science, Molecular Biology, Plant Science, and Business.

The Biotechnology curriculum is comprised of courses selected from the curricula of the departments of Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics, Physics and Business. The core curricula provides students with a solid foundation in molecular biology, immunology, microbiology, and biochemistry, and introduces students to the applied technologies of these fields; molecular genetics/recombinant DNA technology, immunology/cell culture-hybridoma technology, biochemistry/protein purification methods, and DNA sequencing/computational biology. Students as part of the core are also exposed to fundamental business management and marketing theory, and will develop skills and aptitudes important for success in the business arena: written and oral communication, problem solving, team work, leadership, flexibility, negotiation, and regulatory documentation. Since biotechnology-related industries are varied, the degree provides technical background and experience that can be applied across the diverse disciplines within the field, enabling students to adapt to their employment situation as it evolves or to move between the various biotechnology-related industries. The curriculum is meant to provide graduates with the knowledge and training needed to earn entry-level positions not only in research and development but also in areas such as technical services, sales, marketing, management, operations, regulatory affairs, technical writing, and quality control and assurance.

Students in the Biotechnology Degree Program will have access to modern well-equipped laboratories and will gain experience using state-of-the-art instrumentation. The academic

environment is enriched by a close faculty/student interaction and by the availability of internship positions with biotechnology companies and federal agencies. Employment with a biotechnology company provides a valuable, real world, career-sampling experience. Student/faculty research opportunities are also available, and provide valuable training that will enable students to gain rewarding employment thereafter.

**Admission to the program**

Requirements for admission to CSUSM San Marcos and the Biotechnology Degree program are in accordance with Title 5, chapter 1, Subchapter 3, of the California Code of Regulations.

**Prerequisites and Application:**

Freshman applicants must complete a comprehensive pattern of college preparatory study totaling 15 units with a grade of C or better. Transfer students entering at the junior and senior level will be expected to have completed the equivalent of lower division requirements elsewhere including two semesters of biology, four semesters of chemistry, two semesters of physics, one semester of college-level calculus, and one semester of statistics.

**Continuation:**

All courses taken for the major, including supporting courses, must be completed with a grade of C (2.0) or better. A minimum of eighteen (18) units in biotechnology must be completed at CSUSM.

**Financial Aid:**

Several sources of financial aid are available to undergraduate students. Students are responsible for identifying sources of aid, and are encouraged to consult with the University's Office of Financial Aid.

**Degree requirements -- Bachelor of Science in Biotechnology:**

	Units
Total Required.....	120
General Education*.....	51
Preparation for the Major*.....	35
Requirements for the Major .....	49

\*Nine (9) lower-division GE units in Area B (Math and Science) are automatically satisfied by combinations of CHEM 150, MATH 160, and BIOL 211 when taken in preparation for the major. Three (3) lower-division GE units in Area D (Social Sciences) are automatically satisfied by either PSYC 100 or SOC 101, which are also required as preparation for the major. Three (3) upper-division GE units in Area CC (Arts and/or Humanities) are satisfied by students taking either PHIL 315, PHIL 340 or PHIL 345 as a requirements for the major when taken no earlier than the term in which the student attains upper division status completion of 60 semester units.

Biotechnology Majors are permitted to earn the Minor in Biology, under the following conditions. Biotech Majors also pursuing the Minor in Biology may use either Genetics (BIOL 352) or Comparative Animal Physiology (BIOL 353), but not both, to fulfill part of

the 6 elective units required for the Biotechnology degree requirement. These students must also take 12 additional units in Biology, exclusive of coursework applied to the Major, in order to earn the Minor. Departmental advisors will provide information on recommended additional coursework.

	<u>UNITS</u>
<u>Preparation for the Major:</u>	35
CHEM 150	
CHEM 201	
CHEM 201L	
CHEM 202	
CHEM 250	
MATH 160	
PHYS 205	
PHYS 206	
PSYC 100 or SOC 101	
PHIL 315, PHIL 340 or PHIL 345	
<u>Required for the Major, Lower Division:</u>	19
BIOL 210	
BIOL 211	
BIOL215	
BIOL 215L	
ECON 250	
ACCT 203	
<u>Required for the Major, Upper division:</u>	24
BIOL 355	
BIOL 356	
BIOL 357	
BIOL 367	
BIOL 377	
CHEM 351	
MGMT 302	
MKTG 302	
<u>Electives for the Major:</u>	6
Select any of the following for at least six total units:	
BIOL 352	
BIOL 353	
BIOL 358	
BIOL 489	
BIOL 497	
CHEM 351L	
CHEM 352	
FIN 302	
HTM 411	
HTM 425	
HTM 426	
MIS 302	

POM 302  
SSM 415  
SSM 452  
SSM 461

*Catalog Descriptions of Courses Associated with the program:*

**BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES (BIOL)**

**College of Arts and Sciences**

**BIOL 210 Introduction to Cellular and Molecular Biology (4).** The first of a two-semester core sequence that provides the student with basic knowledge in biology, including specific experimental techniques and familiarity with the scientific method. Emphasizes cellular structure and physiology, molecular evolution, classical and molecular genetics, and biochemistry. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for BIOL 202. Three hours lecture and three hours laboratory. Corequisites or Prerequisites: CHEM 201 and 201L. Prerequisite: CHEM 150.*

**BIOL 211 Introduction to Organismal and Population Biology (4).** The second of a two-semester core sequence that provides the student with basic knowledge in biology, including specific experimental techniques and familiarity with the scientific method. Emphasizes physiology, development, diversity of life, evolution, and ecology. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for BIOL 201. Counts toward the fulfillment of the Lower-division General Education Requirement in Physical Universe and Its Life Forms. Three hours lecture and three hours laboratory. Prerequisite: BIOL 210.*

**BIOL 352 Genetics (4).** Detailed study of classical transmission, molecular quantitative and population genetics. Included will be current observations and concepts of the nature, organization, function and regulation of the expression of genetic material. Subject matter covered includes mechanisms of genetic conveyance, recombination, mapping, mutation and repair, RNA and DNA viruses, karyotyping, human genetics, and genetics of organelles. *Three hours lecture and three hours laboratory. May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for BIOL 309. Prerequisites: BIOL 210 and 211.*

**BIOL 353 Comparative Animal Physiology (4).** A comparative survey of physiological adaptations including gas transport, metabolism, temperature and dehydration tolerance, and locomotion. *Three hours of lecture and three hours of laboratory. May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for BIOL 345. Prerequisites: BIOL 210 and 211.*

**BIOL 355 Molecular Biotechnology (4).** In-depth treatment of the fundamental molecular techniques in use in the field of biotechnology. Designed to give hands-on experience as well as conceptual background in biotechnological methods. Subjects covered will include: nucleic acid isolations, vectors, cloning, library screening, hybridizations, PCR, sequencing, sequence analysis and bioinformatics, and transgenic organisms. Other subjects will vary to reflect current practice and developments in biotechnology. *Three hours lecture and three hours laboratory. Prerequisites: BIOL 210 and CHEM 250 and consent of instructor.*

**BIOL 356 Cellular Biotechnology (4).** Second of a two-semester sequence on the principles and applications of biotechnology. An overview of the drug discovery process is presented together with theoretical and practical aspects of specific technologies. Included in lecture and



laboratory instruction are the physiology of prokaryotic and eukaryotic cells, culture of bacterial, plant, insect and mammalian cells, genetic engineering and expression systems, hybridomas, fermentation and scale-up technology, separation technology, protein purification, and immunochemistry. *Three hours lecture and three hours laboratory. Prerequisite: BIOL 210.*

**BIOL 357 Foundations of Biotechnology (2).** An overview of the biotechnology industry and how it operates. Topics will include: 1) the process of bringing a product to market beginning with the original idea or concept through research and development, production, manufacturing, advertising, marketing and sales, 2) the laws and regulations required by the Federal government, particularly the Food and Drug Administration, pertaining to discovery, development, testing, and manufacturing of products for commercial distribution, 3) the skills of technical writing and editing and the integrate various sources of information into a uniform style and language for Standard Operating Procedures, laboratory procedures manuals, and regulatory documents, and 4) employment opportunities. *Prerequisites: BIOL 210, BIOL 211.*

**BIOL 358 Computer Skills for Biotechnology (3).** Designed to introduce and explain the application of computational and analytical methods to solve problems in biotechnology. Many of the popular software tools employed in biotechnology and informatics research will be covered. The theoretical basis governing the use and importance of these tools will also be explored. *Prerequisites: BIOL 210, BIOL 211. Co-requisite: CS 111.*

**BIOL 215 Experimental Design and Statistical Analysis (3).** Design and analysis of biological surveys and experiments. Includes hypothesis formation, experimental design, statistical analysis and presentation of results. *Three hours of lecture. May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for BIOL 315 or BIOL 360. Corequisite: BIOL 215L*

**BIOL 215L Laboratory in Experimental Design and Statistical Analysis (1).** Hands-on experience in design of surveys and experiments in biological sciences and their subsequent statistical analysis. Involves extensive use of computers for statistical simulation and analysis. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for BIOL 360. Prerequisite or corequisite: BIOL 215.*

**BIOL 367 Biology of Microorganisms (4).** Presents a comprehensive selection of subjects from the field of microbiology. Students will study prokaryotic structure and function; growth and control of microorganisms; ecology, physiology, and diversity of bacteria; basic microbial and viral genetics, microorganisms of medical and economic significance; and biotechnology and its human applications and societal implications. The laboratory component will employ research-oriented group activities, in addition to individual projects and assignments, and will engage students in the latest techniques utilized in the field of microbiology. *Three hours of lecture and three hours of laboratory. Prerequisites: BIOL 210 and 211.*

**BIOL 377 Immunology (3).** Study of the mammalian immune system at the molecular and cellular level. Mechanisms of immunology, such as generation of unique receptor specificities, transduction of signals through T and B cell receptors, programmed cell death and lymphocyte selection, regulation of responses by growth factors and cytokines, and cell-cell interactions, are explored. The course perspectives includes historical and technological aspects of modern immunobiology. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for BIOL 460. Prerequisites: BIOL 210.*

**BIOL 489 Introduction to Laboratory/ Field Research (2).** A research project in the laboratory or field, generated in collaboration with a faculty member. *May be repeated once for*

*credit, or the project may be continued for an additional semester as part of BIOL 499.*  
*Prerequisite: Consent of instructor.*

**BIOL 497 Internship in Biotechnology (4).** Career-related experience in private industry, government agency, and/or public sector. All participants utilize learning agreements. A final written report is required. Students will be supervised both on site and by the course instructor. The learning agreement must be completed and signed prior to enrollment. *May be repeated for a maximum of six (8) units, but only four (4) units can be applied toward the major. Prerequisites: Consent of instructor prior to registration.*

## **CHEMISTRY (CHEM)** **College of Arts and Sciences**

**CHEM 150 General Chemistry (5).** Introduction to many of the basic qualitative models and principles in chemistry. The areas covered include: basic nuclear and atomic structure, the periodic table, covalent and ionic bonding, states of matter, intermolecular forces, energy changes, chemical equilibria, acid-base chemistry, stoichiometry, properties of gases, and chemical properties of the common elements. The laboratory experiments and projects are designed to complement lecture material and provide real-life applications of chemistry in society. Counts toward the fulfillment of the Lower-division General Education Requirement in Physical Sciences and Its Life Forms. Three hours of lecture, one hour of discussion, and three hours of laboratory per week. Recommended: High School Chemistry. *Prerequisite: Completion of the Entry Level Mathematics (ELM) requirement.*

**CHEM 201 Organic Chemistry (3) and CHEM 202 Organic Chemistry (3).** A two-semester sequence designed to introduce the student majoring in science to the properties of organic compounds. The areas covered are: bonding, structure, stereochemistry, nomenclature, chemical and physical properties of each functional group, acid/base phenomena, reaction mechanisms and kinetics, organic synthesis, and an introduction to spectroscopic structure determination. *Prerequisites: CHEM 150 for CHEM 201, CHEM 201 and 201L for CHEM 202 with minimum grades of C (2.0) in each.*

**CHEM 201L Organic Chemistry Laboratory (2).** The laboratory experiments are designed to illustrate the basic techniques of organic chemistry and to complement the lecture material covered in CHEM 201. *Six hours of laboratory. Corequisite: CHEM 201. Prerequisite: CHEM 150 with a minimum grade of C (2.0).*

**CHEM 250 Quantitative Chemistry (3).** Introduces quantitative approaches to chemical equilibria and kinetics. Fundamental principles of thermodynamics introduced in CHEM 150 are explored in greater depth. Topics include solubility, acids and bases, oxidation and reduction, and nuclear chemistry. Applications of these topics to practical chemical analysis are discussed. *Corequisite for chemistry majors only: CHEM 275. Prerequisite: MATH 160, CHEM202, or consent of instructor.*

**CHEM 351 Biochemistry (3).** A one-semester introduction to Biochemistry designed for students majoring in science. The areas covered are: the structure and biosynthesis of carbohydrates, lipids, peptides, and nucleotides as well as biomolecular conformation and dynamics. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for CHEM 303. Prerequisites: CHEM 202 and CHEM 250 with a minimum grade of C (2.0).*

**CHEM 351 L Biochemistry Lab (1).** Designed to complement the lecture material and illustrate the basic techniques of biochemistry. *Six hours of laboratory. Corequisite: CHEM 351.*

**CHEM 352 Biochemistry (3).** Designed to introduce the student majoring in science to principle areas in biochemistry. Areas which may be covered but are not limited to include: enzyme kinetics and regulation; generation and storage of metabolic energy; basic crystallography and structure of proteins, molecular modeling, membrane structure and pharmaceutical biochemistry. May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for CHEM 304. *Prerequisites: CHEM 351 with a minimum grade of C (2.0) or consent of instructor*

## **PSYCHOLOGY (PSYC)** **College of Arts and Sciences**

**PSYC 461 Neuropsychopharmacology (3).** An examination of the ways that drugs affect the brain and behavior. Emphasis on psychoactive drugs, including antipsychotics, antidepressants, mood stabilizers, anxiolytics and drugs of abuse. Although social, cultural and political aspects of drug use will be briefly touched upon when appropriate, the primary focus of the course will be neurobiological and behavioral effects of the drugs. *Prerequisite: PSYC 360 or consent of instructor.*

## **BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION** **College of Business Administration**

**MGMT 302 Foundations of Management (2).** Important concepts and applications in management including motivation, leadership, group dynamics, organization design, decision-making, communication, and organization change. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for SSM 304. Prerequisite: All lower-division pre-business core.*

**MKTG 302 Foundations of Marketing (2).** Marketing is the process of identifying and satisfying customers' needs for products, services and ideas, and simultaneously creating and delivering a standard of living to society. Examines the components of the marketing process, sources and uses of marketing intelligence, consumer behavior and international marketing. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for SSM 305. Prerequisite: All lower-division pre-business core.*

**ACCT 203 Survey of Accounting Information (4).** Introduction to the five primary accounting areas: financial, managerial, taxation, auditing, and accounting information systems. Each area is introduced in terms of its background, conceptual basis and application in the business environment.

**FIN 302 Foundations of Finance (2).** Examines basic aspects of the financing and investment decisions made by financial managers. Subjects include financial mathematics, net present value, capital budgeting, valuation of financial securities, risk and return, cost of capital structure, and dividend policy. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for FIN 304. Prerequisite: All lower-division pre-business core.*

**MIS 302 Foundations of Management Information Systems (2).** Survey of management information systems topics with an emphasis on service applications. Includes computer hardware

and software, databases, information systems development, and the role of information systems in the organization. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for HTM 304. Pre-requisite: All lower-division pre-business core.*

**POM 302 Foundations of Production and Operations Management (2).** Introduces the elements associated with the design and operation of a service organization and the integration of these elements within the overall corporate strategy. Contemporary issues covered include operations in global markets, designing and controlling service process and planning for operations. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for HTM 305. Pre-requisite: All lower-division pre-business core and BUS 304.*

**HTM 411 Database Management Systems (4).** Introduction to data modeling, database design, and database administration. Coverage of the relational database model and construction of a database application using a relational database management system. *Three hours of lecture and two hours of laboratory. Prere-quisites: All lower-division pre-business core and either HTM 304 or MIS 302 with consent of the instructor.*

**HTM 425 Systems Analysis and Design (4).** Analysis, design, and implementation of computer-based information systems. Life cycle and prototyping paradigms will be examined as well as classical structured methodologies and object-oriented methods. Emphasis will be placed on automated tools for system development. *Three hours of lecture and two hours of laboratory. Prerequisites: All lower-division pre-business core and either HTM 304 or MIS 302 with consent of instructor.*

**HTM 426 Telecommunications for Management (4).** Managers in today's business climate are frequently responsible for their group's telecommunications technology. Introduces students to the telecom-munications issues they are likely to encounter as managers. Emphasis will be placed on emerging technologies critical to the development of the information super-highway, including media alternatives, networking, and personal/ commercial applications. *May not be taken for credit by students who have received credit for HTM 491B. Prerequisites: All lower-division pre-business core and either HTM 304 or MIS 302.*

**SSM 415 Human Resource Management (4).** Effective management of employees in the service sector such as recruitment and interviewing, training and development, performance appraisal, compensation and benefits, employee relations, workforce demographics, and employment law. *Prerequisites: All lower-division pre-business core and either MGMT 302 or SSM 304.*

**SSM 452 Leadership in Organizations (4).** In-depth analysis of the process of leadership in organizations with a focus on the develop-ment of personal leadership skills. Emphasis on students' ability to conceptualize, integrate, and apply diverse approaches to the leadership and motivation of people in organizations. *Prerequisites: All lower-division pre-business core, and either MGMT 302 or SSM 304.*

**SSM 461 Management in Different Cultures (4).** Examination of the impact of culture on managerial decisions. Key management decisions in a number of industries and countries are examined to highlight the complexities of management in a global environment. *May not be taken for credit by students who received credit for SSM 491G. Prerequisites: All lower-division pre-business core, and either MGMT 302 or SSM 304.*

## **Guidelines Motion Concerning the Academic Honesty Policy**

Whereas the Academic Honesty Policy at CSUSM is the policy that addresses violations of academic honesty,

Whereas the proposed, new policy makes clear that

- (1) faculty members have the right to impose a grade sanction for violations of academic honesty, and
- (2) faculty members have the obligation to make an institutional report of cases of academic dishonesty, and

Whereas, the proposed, new policy is silent on administrative guidelines for institutional sanctions based on the number and scope of instances of academic dishonesty, and

Whereas, the CSUSM faculty should be a major stakeholder in the integrity of all academic programs, and

Whereas, the CSUSM faculty should determine the guidelines for institutional sanctions based on the number and scope of violations of academic honesty.

Be it resolved, that the Executive Committee of the Senate direct the Student Affairs Committee

- (1) to re-visit the Academic Honesty Policy in academic year 2004-2005 in order to propose guidelines for institutional sanctions based on the number and scope of violations, and
- (2) to present to the Senate in academic year 2004-2005 a revised policy that includes such guidelines.

TO: Dick Montanari, Academic Senate  
FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee  
DATE: April 20, 2004  
RE: RTP Survey Report

After the 2002 revision of the University Retention, Tenure and Promotion policy, FAC was charged to gather comments and report on satisfaction and perceptions from the faculty after using the document for one year. FAC surveyed all faculty reviewed and all faculty and administrators who served as reviewers of WPAFs during AY 2002-2003. In preparing these reports FAC used comments from survey respondents, invited guests to FAC meetings and gathered comments from attendees at Faculty Center sponsored workshops on preparing the WPAF. A summary of the survey results and a paper clarifying the concept of "item" in the WPAF are attached. Please accept these reports and recommendations for Academic Senate

#### Summary and Conclusions:

- The narrative page limit of up to 15 pages was acceptable to most respondents whether being reviewed or reviewer.
- Instructions and procedures are clearer, but files are generally but not necessarily more organized.
- Most reviewers did not wish for an increase in the number of items allowed for evidence.
- Those being reviewed found it difficult to decide what to include in the file, though they liked the smaller size.
- Reviewers were asked to comment on a need for a definition of "item" and to offer suggestions. Fifteen of the 23 who responded did not favor a definition of item, others provided possible definitions.
- Those being reviewed found the RTP workshops helpful, the few reviewers that attended also found them helpful to somewhat helpful.

#### Recommendations:

- Retain the current limit of 15 pages of narrative, and the 30 item limit.
- Accept the committee's paper on "What is an Item" as a guideline for what to include as an item when preparing a WPAF.
- Encourage to the greatest extent possible that everyone going up for review and those on review committees attend the RTP workshops whether through the faculty center or through the colleges. The changes envisioned and embodied in the language of the new campus Retention Tenure and Promotion Document are as much a conceptual shift for the faculty as a procedural one and community dialog through workshops and other venues is a critical component of that process.
- Please distribute this report to all faculty on campus and add to packet of information for new faculty.

#### Attached:

1. Revised RTP Policy Survey Report
2. What is an Item

## Revised RTP Policy Survey Report FAC

After several years of diligent work by members of FAC, a revised RTP policy was approved by the Academic Senate in Spring 2002. The policy went into effect during AY 2002-03. In order to assess perception of and satisfaction with changes in the revised RTP process, members of FAC created a survey that was sent to all faculty reviewed during AY 2002-03, and to all faculty and administrators who served as reviewers of WPAFs. A summary of survey results follows.

### Faculty who were reviewed in AY 2002-03

Surveys were sent to 87 faculty; 36 returned the questionnaire, giving a response rate of 41%. One-third of the respondents were being evaluated for the first time; another quarter were reporting on their second evaluation, and the rest had been evaluated three or more times.

#### General questions

The first part of the survey consisted of six general questions about WPAF preparation. Each item was rated on a scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The table below lists the items, the percentage of faculty who agreed (ratings of 4 and 5) and disagreed (ratings of 1 and 2) with the item, and the item mean and median.

Item	% Agree	% Disagree	Mean	Median
Instructions for WPAF preparation were clear.	66	17	3.7	4
Processes and procedures were easy to follow.	53	22	3.4	4
Preparing the WPAF was a good opportunity for me to evaluate my own progress.	72	19	3.9	4
I found it difficult to decide what to include in my file.	56	33	3.3	4
I wish the page limit on the narrative were higher.	33	58	2.6	2
I wish the number of items allowed for evidence were higher.	38	57	2.6	2

Two-thirds of the respondents felt that the new instructions were clear. Close to three-quarters reported that the WPAF was useful to evaluate their progress. Over half of the respondents said that the processes and procedures were easy to follow, and were satisfied with the narrative page limit and the number of allowed items. Over half also reported that it was difficult to decide what to include in the file.

#### RTP workshops

The rest of the survey consisted primarily of open-ended questions inviting comments about various aspects of the new RTP process. The first questions were about RTP workshops. Of the 28 respondents who attended a workshop, 57% found the workshop to be very helpful, 36% said it was somewhat helpful, and 7% said it was not helpful. Faculty commented positively on workshop organization and information, and the presenters genuine concern for those who were

undergoing the review process. Some faculty said that since the policy was new, there were often more questions than answers. Other faculty felt that, since there didn't seem to be uniformity of expectations across the university (although there should be), that it would be more appropriate for each college and the library to hold its own workshop. In addition, some commented that PRC members didn't seem to be up to date on the new policy.

### **Difficulties and frustrations**

Respondents were asked to list two difficulties or frustrations in preparing their WPAF. The two most frequent comments were about having to start from scratch with a new format when respondents had files that had already been positively reviewed, and the difficulty of deciding what to put in the file. Other comments that came up more than once were: the issue of what an item is, the narrative page limit, the difficulty of new faculty being forced to put together a file four months after arriving, student evaluations not arriving before the file was due, not feeling as if there was sufficient time to put together the WPAF (or feeling that it took too much time to prepare), and the fact that it is difficult to put together a file during the first weeks of the semester.

### **Positive aspects**

Respondents also listed up to two positive aspects of preparing their WPAF. By far, the most frequent comment was that it allowed faculty to review their accomplishments and progress. Some saw the WPAF as useful for planning, or that it was a good experience for the next round of evaluation. Some respondents commented favorably on the smaller file size; others said that with the limit on the number of items, they were more discriminating in what they chose to put in their files. A couple of respondents commented that the new policy provided clearer direction on how to prepare a file.

### **What is an item?**

Respondents were asked if they were in favor of creating a definition of ITEM and to offer a definition. Of the 23 faculty who provided comments, 15 indicated that they did not favor creating a definition of an ITEM. Some felt that this would stifle creativity, or that it would be too difficult to come up with a definition general enough that it would apply across the university. Others, however, felt that it was important to provide a definition. Below are the definitions offered:

- Yes, there needs to be an operational definition of ITEM so that we know and are not penalized for not following the proper form or having the proper information. I think it should be defined as follows:
  - A class is an item—a course syllabus is an item—a course activity is an item, etc.
  - A paper is an item—a presentation is an item—a grant is an item.
  - All university committees count as 1 item—all college committees counts as 1 item—all chairs of committees count as 1 item—
- “Item” should allow grouping several tightly related documents or pieces of evidence together. In other words, the “whole” should be considered the item, not the “parts.” For instance, a Web site consisting of a number of pages or a course description consisting of syllabus, assignments, etc., should count as 1 item if desired.
- As little as one page, but not more than can be attached with one hand stapler (this gave a size of reference).



- An item would be composed of all the materials needed to place the item within my professional efforts, especially if a component of the item was innovative or exemplary but was not so if presented on its own (e.g., substantial revision of a course syllabus and its teaching methods)
- Yes—we need a definition. Examples—a syllabus, a manuscript, a committee report.
- Item: (noun). A verifiable text used by the candidate to substantiate an assertion and to illustrate to reviewers the necessity of including such in the file. The nature of the item can include, but is not limited to hardcopy/electronic document, electronic recording – video/audio, valid URL, etc.

### **Changes from previous RTP process**

Those respondents who had been reviewed under the old system were asked to comment on up to two changes (positive, negative, or neutral) in the RTP process. Two respondents said that they noticed no change. The most frequently mentioned positive change was about the 30-item limit and the fact that files were more condensed. Other respondents said that the file was now easier to organize. The most frequent negative comment was about having to revamp the file in light of the new policy. A suggestion was made that faculty who had gone through review under the old rules be protected under a grandfather clause. The only other negative comment that appeared more than once was that the lack of specific criteria left the process arbitrary and capricious (both respondents used those exact words), and that more specificity and concrete criteria were needed.

### **Other comments**

Most of the additional comments provided were already mentioned in previous sections of the survey. Suggestions were made that all PRC members attend a training workshop, that criteria be made more specific, that WPAFs should go digital, and that the whole process should be more collaborative and viewed as a faculty development opportunity (rather than a review being done “to” faculty, it should be done “with” faculty).

### **WPAF Reviewers**

Surveys were sent to 60 reviewers and 31 were returned, yielding a response rate of 52%. Of the surveys returned, 26 were from PRC members, 2 were from the University Promotion and Tenure Committee, and 3 were from administrators. Because of the small number of surveys from administrators and P&T members, all reviewers were treated as one group.

### **General questions**

The first part of the survey consisted of four questions about submitted WPAFs. Each item was rated on a scale ranging from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree). The table below lists the items, the percentage of faculty who agreed (ratings of 4 and 5) and disagreed (ratings of 1 and 2) with the item, and the item mean and median.

Item	% Agree	% Disagree	Mean	Median
This year’s WPAFs were well-organized.	61	16	3.6	4
Candidates seemed to engage in serious self-reflection.	65	16	3.8	4

I wish the page limit on the narrative were higher.	13	71	2.0	1
I wish the number of items allowed for evidence were higher.	16	68	2.1	2

---

Over 60% of the respondents felt that the WPAFs they reviewed were organized, and almost two-thirds said that candidates seemed to engage in self-reflection. Most reviewers did not wish for a higher page limit on the narrative or an increase in the number of items allowed for evidence. Respondents were also invited to clarify their responses, or provide suggestions/comments based on their experiences. The comments represented a variety of opinions. One respondent said that the revised RTP document is an improvement, and another said that the files were informative and easy to review. Two reviewers commented that, for them, the reflective statement is the most revealing part of the file. Two other reviewers expected more reflection in the narrative. Two reviewers would like to see past reviews for those going up for Full Professor. Other reviewers recognized that file quality varied, not necessarily as a function of the revised policy.

### **RTP workshops**

Ten respondents reported attending an RTP workshop; half felt it was very helpful, and the other half felt it was somewhat helpful. One reviewer commented that the workshops allow people at all levels of review and ranks to discuss the parts of the RTP process that are open to interpretation. Two respondents said that the new process was still vague, which limited the helpfulness of the workshops.

### **What is an item?**

Respondents were asked if they were in favor of creating a definition of ITEM and to offer a definition. Of the 19 reviewers who responded to this question, 9 did not want to create a definition. Some preferred the flexibility of not having a definition, or felt that the item limit was not abused in the files reviewed, so that no problem existed. However, 53% wanted a definition, and even some of the reviewers who were opposed to a rigid definition did ask for further clarification. Below are relevant comments; the variety of responses points to the difficulty in determining a firm definition of the term.

- Yes, I would favor a definition. This would not only give “reviewees” a better indication of what is expected, it would give reviewers consistent guidelines. I do not necessarily think of an item as one course syllabus or one set of teaching evaluations, but rather an item can be several pieces of evidence that make up the item. For example, a particular course may be highlighted to demonstrate innovative teaching, which would be one item. However, this “item” may include a course syllabus, a particular lesson, a video, etc. I can see that this definition might again lead to information overload, so I would think that the definition of an “item” might also include something like “an item may consist of no more than x supporting documents.”
- Give an idea of the intention. An item, e.g., a syllabus, exam, etc. Or e.g., CD with all syllabi.
- An item should be ONE thing, for example a journal article. For teaching a sample syllabus.
- An item is a complete set of documents of the same nature. To clarify, here is what an item is and is not: An item is not a set of documents, such as an “item” for a course being the syllabus, course hand-outs, sample tests, and evident of students’ work. In my definition the

syllabus would be one item, course hand-outs is one item, sample tests is one item, sample of students work is an item. If the professor provides “items” for a second course, the same rules would apply, each being separate items. Clarifying further, if three sample tests for a particular course were provided, it would be one item and not three.

- I am not sure the word ITEM needs to be defined, but rather subcategories of ITEMS need to be identified and then defined. For example, either EACH COURSE TAUGHT should be a separate item and candidates have to decide which courses to include, or COURSES TAUGHT IN SEMESTER X should be one item. In the first case that ITEM can include syllabus, handouts, examples of student work, and any other material prepared for the course. In the latter case, all the same material can be included for all courses taught in that semester. Another example, each experience of service should be one item: e.g., member of GEC, and all supporting material from the term on GEC should count as one item.
- One item = one activity or product (e.g., syllabus, paper, performance, term paper assignment).
- I prefer not to limit the items by attaching a definition of item. However, examples may be given as to how a certain selected “item” provides specific evidence and how the creative selection of items can support and substantiate entirely different career stories.
- I favor creating guidelines which discourage a faculty member from cramming a bunch of documents together to count as one item. For example:
  - if multiple documents are acceptable within an item, there should be a limited number
  - they should indicate a thread or trend
  - that trend should be explained by a maximum of 5 sentences as an introduction to the “item.”
- I would like a definition, but I don’t have a suggestion. I think we need to work on specifying essential items that should be included in all files.

**Changes from previous RTP process**

Reviewers were presented with a series of items asking them to compare their experiences of reviewing files under the revised policy and the previous policy. The table below lists responses.

Item	% Agree	% Disagree	Mean	Median
This year’s files were better organized than in the past.	32	23	3.1	3
This year’s files provided sufficient narrative for evaluation.	68	9	4.0	4
This year’s files were easier to review than in the past.	59	9	3.9	4
Overall, reviewing the “new” WPAFs is preferable to reviewing the “old” WPAFs.	59	14	3.9	4

The largest percentage of reviewers (45%) were neutral on the item about file organization. Evidently, the revised policy did not result in much of a change in the degree to which files were organized. Over two-thirds of the reviewers felt that the narrative, with its 15 page limit, was sufficient for evaluation. Over half felt that the most recent WPAFs were easier to review, and that reviewing them was preferable to reviewing previous years’ files. Fourteen reviewers added comments to this section. Of those who commented, 6 (43%) saw no difference in the

files, while two (14%) reported that the narrative and item limits made the files easier to navigate and review. Four of the reviewers complained that the narratives did not contain enough information or were not reflective enough. Two reviewers also stressed the importance of organization of the files. As one reviewer said, "...The key to (an) easy to understand file is the ORGANIZATION. It is very frustrating when you can't find something that is referenced in the narrative or index."

### **Other comments**

Five additional comments were included in the survey responses. Three reviewers said that the revised policy resulted in a better process. One reviewer said that the policy should stress more documentation of scholarship, and less documentation of service (the reflection on service is more important than documentation). Finally, one reviewer called for departments and colleges to develop their own RTP standards.

## What is an item?

### History

When the RTP policy was being revised, FAC members were faced with two realities that needed to be changed. First, faculty had become less selective in what they included in their WPAFs, resulting in large files that were increasingly difficult to evaluate. Second, a general sense of distrust seemed to exist in terms of documentation of service contributions. The result was that faculty provided documentation of the smallest service contributions which resulted, again, in larger, but not necessarily more informative, files.

### Attempted solutions

In order to make the files more selective and representative of best practices, the revised 2003 RTP policy placed a 15-page limit on the reflective statement and a limit of 30 items to serve as documentation of contributions to teaching, scholarship/creative activity, and service. Provost Sheath has also requested that, as part of their file, faculty include a “complete” vita; one that provides detailed lists of classes taught (including number of students), publications, and service contributions. Much of this information had previously been included in the reflective statement or in the listing of file materials.

### The problem

In the new policy FAC did not define the term “item.” Not surprisingly, the lack of a definition led to confusion on the part of faculty compiling their WPAF’s, as well as those who review the files. The opinions held by faculty and administrators cover the continuum from an item is equal to “one piece of paper” to an item is “everything that can fit in one staple”.

It should be noted that results of the RTP survey carried out last year indicated that file size had diminished as the result of the new policy, primarily among new faculty. It is not surprising that faculty who have had files in the review system multiple times are reluctant to change the way they put their WPAF together. Faculty accustomed to the old system may hesitate to counsel new faculty to include less. We might expect, therefore, that as faculty who came in under the old policy are promoted out of the review system, the culture change called for by the new policy should result in smaller files in the future. In essence, we are trying to invoke a culture change that will take 2 to 4 years to accomplish.

### What is an item?

The issue remains, however, that without guidelines about what constitutes an item, faculty will present varying degrees of documentation in their files, making the task of reviewing files more difficult and possibly discriminatory. FAC believes, however, that defining what is meant by the term “item” is much less important than getting faculty to understand the significance of the reflective statement to the WPAF. The reflective statement is not a list of accomplishments; that is the function of the complete vita. Instead, the reflective statement provides faculty with an opportunity to explain their educational philosophy, to highlight some successes, and discuss lessons learned.

When writing the reflective statement for their WPAF, faculty should strive to present a coherent story about their work. Similarly, when selecting items for the WPAF, faculty should choose a

representative sampling of material that supports and documents the reflective statement. Each item must, in some way, be directly linked to the reflective statement.

We do understand, however, that faculty and reviewers are seeking guidance about what an item is. We have concluded that it is impossible to present a definition of the term “item,” although we do have some thoughts about what an item is not. An item is not, necessarily, one piece of paper, one syllabus, one journal article, or one CD (although these could each be considered an item in the appropriate context). On the other hand, an item is not all the pages that can be held together with one staple!

Instead of a definition, this document provides examples of possible items for each of the three sections discussed in the reflective statement. We begin with scholarship/creative activity, as the easiest section to document, and end with teaching, which is the most difficult.

**Scholarship/creative activity items:** It is not necessary to provide documentation of every activity that falls in this category. These accomplishments are all listed in the vita. Documentation should be reserved for what faculty perceive as their most important scholarship and creative activities. The documentation should be directly linked to the reflective statement, and the discussion should include why the selected activity is important (e.g., how did this item contribute to the field, etc.).

Items chosen for discussion should be appropriate to the faculty member’s discipline. The following examples should not be taken as an exhaustive list of all possible items, but as illustrations of the “size” of typical scholarship/creative activity items. An item in this section could be a reprint or preprint. If an article has been accepted to a journal but not yet published, a copy of the manuscript and the acceptance letter from the editor would constitute an item. Similarly, an article that has been submitted but not yet reviewed should be accompanied by documentation that it has been received by the journal editor. In addition, it could be a grant proposal submitted to an external agency and its status. Books, monographs, and technical reports would each count as items. For the arts, it could be the review of a play, showing, or musical performance. Please see the current RTP policy for other examples of items in this category.

**Service items:** It is not necessary or desired that faculty provide documentation of every service activity. The complete vita should list all service activities and a short statement of the role faculty played in the conduct of those activities. The reflective statement is a place to highlight only the most important activities and documentation should relate directly to the activities highlighted in the narrative. For example, when serving on a committee, if a faculty member was primarily responsible for the development of a policy or procedure, inclusion of the policy or procedure would constitute an item. Chairs of Academic Senate committees might include, as an item, the final report of the committee as evidence of tasks accomplished. A workshop conducted for a community group might be documented by a letter of thanks or a copy of the program.

**Teaching items:** Teaching is our primary mission, yet it is the most difficult area of faculty work to document. This section of the reflective statement is particularly important. It should not be a list of courses and number of students taught (again, these kinds of information

would be found in the complete vita). Instead, the reflective statement should be a thoughtful analysis of process and outcomes for a sample of classes.

Our definition of “item” for this section is somewhat generous because we recognize the difficulties inherent in documenting an activity that is, essentially, private (at least in terms of other faculty). If a particular course is discussed in the reflective statement, we believe that all of the selected material associated with that class might be considered an item (e.g., syllabus, sample exam, sample assignment, peer evaluation, etc.). However, all such material must be discussed in the reflective statement, or it should not be included as documentation. There is no reason to put in multiple syllabi for the same course, for example, unless a point is being made about major changes in the curriculum for that course. One exam or one assignment is sufficient unless the reflective statement includes a discussion of different assessment techniques.

### **Conclusion**

FAC members think that the complete vita, the reflective statement page limit, and the requirement to discuss each item in the reflective statement will, in turn, result in reduced and more selective documentation. We also look forward to the day when reflective statements are truly reflective. We are convinced that, as the culture changes, faculty will begin to accept the fact that promotion and tenure decisions do not hinge on the size of the WPAF, but on the accomplishments of the individual.

**California State University San Marcos**  
**Academic Senate**  
**2004/05**

**Chair:** Jackie Trischman  
**Vice-Chair:** Linda Holt  
**Secretary:** Rosario Diaz-Greenberg

*Parliamentarian:* Don Barrett 04/05

**ACADEMIC SENATORS**

**CoAS**

Jocelyn Ahlers, 04-06  
Wayne Aitken, 03-05  
Kristin Bates, 04-06  
Vivienne Bennett, 03-05  
Mayra Besosa, 03-05  
Susie Lan Cassel, 04-06  
David Chien, 04-06  
Charles De Leone, 03-05  
Darel Engen, 04-06  
Jule Gómez de García, 04-06  
Merryl Goldberg, 04-06  
Rocio Guillen, 04-06  
Linda Holt, 04-06  
Michael Hughes, 04-06  
Carmen Nava, 03-05  
Tejinder Neelon, 03-05  
Lance Newman, 04-06  
Karno Ng, 04-06  
Steve Nichols, 04-06  
Brian Norris, 03-05  
Graham Oberem, 03-05  
Jill Pellettieri, 03-05  
Amber Puha, 03-05  
Radhika Ramamurthi, 04-06  
K. Brooks Reid, 03-05  
Michael Schmidt, 03-05  
E. A. (Al) Schwartz, 04-06  
Patty Seleski, 04-06

**CoAS (cont.)**

Jill Weigt, 03-05  
Marshall Whittlesey, 03-05  
Shaun-inn Wu, 03-05  
Xiaoyu Zhang, 04-06

**CoBA**

C. New Chiyachantana, 04-06  
George Diehr, 04-06  
Eun Kang, 04-06  
Ofer Meilich, 03-05  
Wenyuh Tsay, 04-06  
Kathleen Watson, 03-05

**CoE**

Tom Bennett, 03-05  
Zulmara Cline, 04-06  
Rosario Diaz-Greenberg, 03-05  
Elizabeth Sugar Martinez, 04-06  
Janet McDaniel, 03-05  
Juan Necochea, 03-05  
Lorri Santamaría, 03-05  
Laurie Stowell, 04-06

**SSP-AR**

Kara Kornher, 03-05

**Library**

Bonnie Biggs, 03-05  
Jackie Borin, 03-05  
Yvonne Meulemans, 04-06

**Lecturer**

Kathleen Bates, 04-06

**ASCSU (Statewide Senate)**

Dick Montanari 02-05  
Richard Serpe, 03-06

**ASI Rep. 04/05**

*Open Seat, 04/05*

**Staff Rep. 04/05**

*Open Seat, 04/05*

**Committee Chairs (Art. 5.1)**

TBD, APC  
TBD, BLP  
Marie Thomas, FAC  
TBD, GEC  
TBD, LATAAC  
Valerie Callanan, NEAC  
TBD, PAC  
TBD, SAC  
Carmen Nava, UCC

**Ex-Officio Members (non-voting):** President, Provost, Vice Presidents, Associate Vice Presidents and Deans within Academic Affairs, CFA representative, and Past Senate Chair.

**Executive Committee of the Academic Senate (EC)**

Jackie Trischman, Chair  
Linda Holt, Vice Chair  
Rosario Diaz-Greenberg, Secty.  
TBD, APC  
TBD, BLP  
Marie Thomas, FAC

TBD, GEC  
TBD, LATAAC  
Valerie Callanan, NEAC  
TBD, PAC  
TBD, SAC  
Carmen Nava, UCC

TBD, ASCSU

*Ex-Officio (non-voting):*  
Karen Haynes, President  
Robert Sheath, Provost  
TBD, CFA Rep.



1                                   **Graduation Requirements for Baccalaureate Degrees and Academic Certificate Programs**  
2   **April 13, 2004**  
3   **Revised: May 3, 04**

4  
5    ***Unit Requirement***

6  
7    Every baccalaureate degree requires completion of a minimum of 120 semester units. Some choices of majors will  
8    require more than 120 semester units; the descriptions of each major specify how many units are required.

9  
10   At least forty (40) units shall be in upper-division credit and no more than seventy (70) units may be transferred from a  
11   community college.

12  
13   ***Major Requirements***

14  
15   Every baccalaureate degree must include an approved major. While individual programs have unique requirements, all  
16   majors must include twenty-four (24) units exclusive of units used to meet the General Education requirement. For a  
17   Bachelor of Arts degree, at least twelve (12) units required in the major shall be upper-division courses, and for a  
18   Bachelor of Science degree, at least eighteen (18) units required for the major shall be upper-division. Most majors  
19   require more than these minima. .

20  
21   ***Multiple Majors***

22  
23   It is possible for a student to complete more than one major within one degree (for example, a B.A.). Each major must  
24   consist of at least 24 semester units that are completely separate and distinct from the other majors' requirements and  
25   General Education. To be recognized as graduating with multiple majors, a student must declare the additional major(s)  
26   with the appropriate discipline or program no later than the beginning of the student's final year of study. The  
27   completion of additional majors within one degree will be noted at the time of graduation by appropriate entries on the  
28   student's transcript and on the diploma.

29  
30   It is also possible for a student to complete a major in one degree concurrently with additional majors from a different  
31   degree (for example, a major in a B.S. concurrently with an additional major from a B.A.). Each major must consist of  
32   at least 24 semester units that are completely separate and distinct from the other majors' requirements and General  
33   Education. By declaring which major is the primary major (for example, Biochemistry) the student also declares which  
34   degree he or she will receive (in this case, a B.S.). Students must make this declaration no later than the beginning of  
35   the student's final year of study, and that degree's major will be noted at the time of graduation by appropriate entries  
36   on the student's transcript and on the diploma. Majors within the other degree will be noted only on the student's  
37   transcript.

38  
39   The University does not award two degrees for multiple majors that are completed concurrently.

40  
41   ***Minors***

42  
43   An undergraduate student may elect to complete one or more minors; this is not a degree requirement. After the first  
44   minor, each subsequent minor must contain twelve units beyond those used for major requirements and other minors.  
45   Students may not declare or receive a minor in the same subject or title as the major. Unless the description of the  
46   major(s) and minor contain additional stated restrictions, there is no restriction on double-counting units in the major(s)  
47   and the first minor that a student declares. Minors are awarded as part of a baccalaureate degree. The completion of a  
48   minor will be noted only on the student transcript.

49  
50   ***Academic Certificates & Certificate Programs***

51  
52   Cal State San Marcos grants certificates to individuals who complete certificate programs that enhance major  
53   requirements or credential programs. A certificate is issued upon the successful completion of an academic certificate  
54   program. The university acknowledges the completion of a certificate by recording it only on a student's transcript.

## MINOR IN COGNITIVE SCIENCE

### Office:

TBD

### Telephone:

(760) 750-XXXX TBD

### Program Director:

TBD

### Faculty:

Jocelyn Ahlers, Ph.D. (Linguistics)

Katherine Brown, Ph.D. (Communication)

Jule Gomez de García, Ph.D. (Linguistics)

Gina Grimshaw, Ph.D. (Psychology)

Rocio Guillen-Castrillo, Ph.D. (Computer Science)

Alicia Munoz Sanchez, Ph.D. (World Languages and Hispanic Literatures)

Barry Saferstein, Ph.D. (Communication)

Miriam Schustack, Ph.D. (Psychology)

Shaun-inn Wu, Ph.D. (Computer Science)

Robert Yamashita, Ph.D. (Liberal Studies)

Rika Yoshii, Ph.D. (Computer Science)

Lorna Zorman, Ph.D. (Computer Science)

### Program Offered:

- Minor in Cognitive Science

The Cognitive Science Minor at Cal State San Marcos offers students the opportunity to broaden their academic experience through systematic study of the interdisciplinary field of Cognitive Science. Cognitive science has a variety of definitions, but one simple one is that it is the interdisciplinary scientific study of mind. The field involves contributions from the disciplines of psychology, computer science, linguistics, communication, biology, neuroscience, philosophy, anthropology, and social science. The minor in Cognitive Science allows students to focus on the domain of Cognitive Science from multiple perspectives, and to customize their course selections in accordance with their individual interests within the field. The program requires courses from at least four different disciplines, and allows courses from several more. Students choosing to pursue the minor in Cognitive Science will get exposure to some of the breadth of this emerging field of study. The minor is appropriate for students in any major, but may be especially of interest to students majoring in one of the disciplines that are related to the cognitive sciences. This minor helps to prepare students for graduate study in related fields, as well as for a variety of careers in both public and private sectors.

### Cognitive Science Minor Requirements

Completion of nineteen (19) units, at least twelve (12) of which must be at the upper-division level. Students are advised that some optional courses have prerequisites, and should plan accordingly.

#### Core Courses

CS 111 Computer Science I (4 units)

PSYC 362 Cognitive Processes (3 units)

51 Brain and Mind

52 Select at least one course:

- 53 BIOL 348 Brain and Mind (3 units)
- 54 CS 573 Artificial Neural Networks (3 units)
- 55 PSYC 361 Brain and Mind (3 units)
- 56 PSYC360 Biopsychology (3 units)
- 57 PSYC 465 Human Neuropsychology (3 units)

58

59 Language and Mind

60 Select at least one course:

- 61 LING 300 Introduction to Linguistics (3 units)
- 62 LING 360 Cognitive Linguistics (3 units)
- 63 LING 371 Language and Culture (3 units)
- 64 LING 371B Language and Culture (3 units)
- 65 LING 381 Language and Gender (3 units)
- 66 LING 450 Language Acquisition (3 units)

67

68 Communication and Distributed Cognition

69 Select at least one course:

- 70 COMM 355 Communication and Collaboration (3 units)
- 71 COMM 400 Discourse Analysis (3)
- 72 COMM 333 Language and Social Interaction (3 units)
- 73 COMM 435 Communication and Gender (3 units)

74

75 Electives

76 Select at least one course:

- 77 ANTH 315 Human Origins (3 units)
- 78 CS 571 Artificial Intelligence (3 units)
- 79 CS 574 Natural Language Processing (3 units)
- 80 CS 575 Machine Learning (3 units)
- 81 LBST 361 The Social Construction of Science (3 units)
- 82 LBST 361B The Social Construction of Science (3 units)
- 83 PHIL 210 Symbolic Logic (3 units)
- 84 PSYC 392 Laboratory in Sensation and Perception (3 units)
- 85 PSYC 393 Laboratory in Cognitive Psychology (3 units)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

**Senate Meeting Time Resolution**  
**California State University San Marcos Academic Senate**  
**April 21, 2004**

WHEREAS, the current meeting time of the Academic Senate of Cal State San Marcos (1:15 – 3:00 pm) was set based on an old schedule of class meeting times; and

WHEREAS, an official ending time of 2:50 pm would allow Senators teaching at 3:00 pm (two or more senators will begin classes at 3:00pm on Wednesdays in the Fall, 2004, semester) sufficient time to get to class; and an official starting time of 1:00 pm would allow Senators teaching until 12:45 or 12:50 pm (14 or more senators end classes at 12:45 or 12:50 on Wednesdays in the Fall, 2004, semester) sufficient time to get to the Senate meetings and sign-in by 1:00 pm; therefore, be it

RESOLVED, that beginning in the Fall, 2004, semester, the Academic Senate of California State University San Marcos will meet from 1:00 pm to approximately 2:50 pm with extension beyond 3 pm requiring a motion for extension.

## Extended Studies Roles and Responsibilities

### I. Introduction

The Extended Studies program at California State University San Marcos provides increased access to undergraduate, graduate, and continuing education and thereby contributes to the lifelong learning opportunity of students and community members, and to the continued health and economy of the communities served by the University.

As an educational unit of the University, Extended Studies is subject to the regulations of the State of California, the California State University, and CSU San Marcos. This document provides guidance for implementation of the applicable regulations and covers the following types of instruction.

- A. Courses that may be used to satisfy requirements for a degree awarded by the University ("University Credit Courses") – these include:
  - 1) courses listed in the University's catalog and offered in special sessions utilizing alternative times, locations, or modes of delivery (Special Sessions);
  - 2) courses carrying University credit, approved/established by an academic department and approved by the Academic Senate, but not listed in the University's catalog, which are designed primarily to address the needs of a specified client group or audience. (~~Extension~~/Contract Credit/Special Session);
  - 3) courses offered to non-matriculated students on a space-available basis (Open University).
- B. Courses that may not be used to satisfy requirements for a degree awarded by the University (Noncredit) – these include, but are not limited to:
  - 1) courses which lead to certification of particular skills;
  - 2) courses intended for professional development that award Continuing Education Units;
  - 3) courses which serve the intellectual and avocational interests of members of the community.
- C. Courses that award university credit that may not be used to satisfy requirements for a degree awarded by the university (Extension Credit).

### II. University Credit Courses

- A. Extended Studies courses and programs offered for University credit must have been approved by the CSUSM Academic Senate or the CSU Statewide Academic Senate, the Dean of Extended Studies, and the President, and the appropriate college/library. These courses are part of the University's current curriculum, and can also be courses designated "Special Topics." The appropriate Form E or Form ET must be used.

- 48 B. Instructors who teach Extended Studies courses offered for University credit must be  
49 approved in advance and in writing by the department chair or program director of the  
50 appropriate discipline and the appropriate college/library dean each time a course is taught.  
51  
52 C. Extended Studies will obtain student evaluations of each Extended Studies course offered  
53 for University credit and will provide copies to the instructor, the appropriate department  
54 chair or program director, and the appropriate college/library dean.  
55  
56 D. Both matriculated and non-matriculated students, except those who are disenrolled from the  
57 University, may enroll in courses available through the Extended Studies Open University  
58 program.  
59  
60

61 III. Courses Offered With Non-Degree University Credit  
62

- 63 A. Extension Credit provides non-degree units and allows CSUSM to offer a wider array of  
64 credit courses to a larger audience and have these units appear on a CSU transcript. These  
65 are typically professional advancement courses that are credit worthy, but not applicable to a  
66 degree or part of the standard CSUSM curriculum. These courses are developed to meet  
67 special needs of particular groups or communities, e.g. K-12 teachers; the Extension Credit  
68 that they confer denotes an investment of time and accomplishment comparable to that  
69 required in established University courses.  
70  
71 B. Courses that would carry Extension Credit would be numbered in a series outside of the  
72 current degree courses, perhaps an 800/900/1000 series, and carry the prefix of the  
73 corresponding CSUSM department. Extension Credit courses would not be listed in the  
74 academic catalog.  
75  
76 C. All such courses and instructors would require the review and approval of the corresponding  
77 college/department, similar to what Special Session and/or Special Topics courses require.  
78  
79

80 III IV. Courses Offered Without University Degree Credit  
81

- 82 A. Extended Studies courses offered without CSU San Marcos degree credit may award  
83 Continuing Education Units, certification of particular skills, or certificates of completion.  
84  
85 1. Documents attesting these awards must clearly specify the nature of the award in  
86 order to avoid confusion with award of a degree.  
87  
88 B. Extended Studies courses offered without CSU San Marcos degree credit are subject to the  
89 approval of the Dean of Extended Studies and the President but are not subject to approval  
90 by the CSUSM Academic Senate.  
91  
92 1. When planning a course or program without CSU San Marcos degree credit,  
93 Extended Studies shall inform the deans of the appropriate colleges/library, who  
94 shall notify the faculty of the appropriate disciplines. The communication shall  
95 specify the course or program's:  
96

- 97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120
- 1) purpose;
  - 2) intended audience;
  - 3) content;
  - 4) instructor qualifications; and
  - 5) sites and facilities.
2. Each time it offers a course without CSU San Marcos degree credit, Extended Studies shall consider:
- 1) appropriateness of intended sites and facilities;
  - 2) qualifications, teaching interests, and availability of CSU San Marcos faculty members in the appropriate disciplines; and
  - 3) qualifications, teaching interests, and availability of lecturers for the course.
3. Extended Studies will contract directly with instructors of courses offered without CSU San Marcos degree credit.
4. Extended Studies will obtain student evaluations of each Extended Studies course offered without CSU San Marcos degree credit and will provide copies to the instructor. Evaluations will be retained for three years and will be available for inspection by the Dean of Extended Studies and other University personnel in accordance with applicable campus policies.

121 IV. Review and Evaluation

- 122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143
- A. The Dean of Extended Studies will provide a report of courses and programs to the Academic Policy Committee and the Vice President for Academic Affairs annually by the end of the first week of March. The report will include information on:
- 1) programs offered and their location;
  - 2) enrollment data;
  - 3) new programs and/or initiatives being planned for the next year;
  - 4) programs being deleted from offerings;
  - 5) a summary assessment of Extended Studies' attainment of its objectives in support of its mission; and
  - 6) other information as requested.
- B. The Academic Policy Committee of the Academic Senate (APC) shall review the report of the Dean of Extended Studies and prepare an evaluation of the Extended Studies program with recommendations which will be provided to the Provost and the Academic Senate as an information item at its first April meeting. The evaluation may consider such questions as:
- 1) the quality of the Extended Studies programs and courses;
  - 2) the adequacy of the curriculum in meeting the needs of students and the community; and
  - 3) the adequacy of the sites and facilities used.