

Explanation for New Upper Division General Education (UDGE) forms:

1. The intent was not to change the criteria for UDGE courses, but to refine the language of the questions on the forms to reduce or eliminate ambiguity, vagueness and redundancy, so that respondents would be able to give the General Education Committee (GEC) the information that it needs in a simple and efficient manner.
2. Because additional language was needed to clearly communicate the purpose of the questions on the forms, it was decided that the current integrated form that includes questions, responses and signatures was no longer feasible. Thus, a “form” page that concentrates on basic facts and signatures was to be accompanied by an “instructions” page that elaborates on the questions that require more extended answers and attachments.
3. Questions 1-4 were changed to better reflect (a) proposed new policy (see other GEC business items) and (b) the definition of Upper Division General Education passed by the GEC in 1999 (as supplemented by new policy and item 4 below).
4. In the second part of the form (now labeled questions 5-8) the last question in all three forms was dropped, as the ability of a course to “enhance students’ lives outside the classroom or their studies in other subjects” is almost universal and the question typically yielded no information useful to the GEC’s deliberations. Instead, this language was moved into the definition, to preserve this as a general value of General Education.
5. In the old forms, the questions in the latter half of the form all required some mention of how the objectives were assessed. These phrases have been struck in favor of a comprehensive two-part question at the end of the form.

A guide to changes in the UDGE forms (note: This text shows the instruction page only; refer to sample forms for overall format of new form):

California State University, San Marcos

FORM UDGE-BB (WHITE)

FORM INSTRUCTIONS FOR UDGE-BB (WHITE)
UPPER DIVISION GENERAL EDUCATION NEW COURSE PROPOSAL
FOR AREA BB - MATHEMATICS/QUANTITATIVE REASONING OR PHYSICAL AND LIFE SCIENCES

- ~~o This is a new course. A FORM C is being filed concurrently.~~
- ~~o This is an existing course not currently satisfying an UDGE requirement. A FORM C-2 is being filed concurrently.~~
- ~~o This is an existing course currently satisfying an UDGE requirement which is being submitted for recertification. A FORM C-2 is required only if the course is being changed.~~

A. Criteria for All Upper Division GE Courses:

The Definition of Upper Division GE Courses:

Upper Division General Education provides an opportunity for students to learn about areas of study outside their academic major. Upper Division General Education courses assume satisfaction of Lower Division General Education Requirements and develop upper division skills. Courses should not require discipline-specific prerequisites. Designed for non-majors, these courses make explicit the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the disciplinary or interdisciplinary area of study. This conceptual framework and the applicability of these principles and methods should be emphasized throughout the course.

Upper Division General Education courses should help students see how disciplines, ideas, issues and knowledge are often interrelated, intersecting and interconnected. Upper Division General Education courses can present knowledge which can enhance students' lives outside the classroom or their studies in other subjects. These courses should also provide students with a classroom environment that fosters independent, active, engaged learning and a genuine curiosity about the subject matter.

Upper Division General Education courses shall be three-unit courses so that three such courses will exactly correspond with the 9-unit Upper Division General Education requirement of the CSU.

Attachments and Responses 1-3 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course is truly suitable to the General Education student. Please read the definition of Upper Division General Education printed above before answering these questions.

1. Please attach a syllabus or draft syllabus of the course.
2. How many units is this course? Upper-Division General Education courses are limited to 3 units.
3. 2a. Does this course have (a) prerequisite(s) other than completion of LDGE requirements?
 ___yes___ ___no___
- b. Does this course fulfill requirements for a major by the academic unit in which the course is offered? Check the YES box even if the course counts as an elective in the major.
 ___yes___ ___no___
- c. If you answered "yes" to 2.a. or 2.b., then the course is an exception to the definition printed above, and you must explain why the GE committee should make an exception for this course. Please describe how this course is designed to provide valuable and appropriate learning experiences to for majors and non-majors.
43. a. Describe the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the disciplinary or interdisciplinary area of study that are explicitly covered in the course.
- b. How will the applicability of the principles and methods be demonstrated?
- c. Describe how the items in 3.a. & 3.b. are distributed throughout the course.

Upper division general-education students may have fulfilled their lower division area B requirements in broad, interdisciplinary courses or in a different discipline than the discipline in which this course is offered. Please explain how this course introduces such students to the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the discipline, and how connection is made between these fundamentals and the particular applications emphasized in the course.

B. Criteria for Upper Division Area BB Courses:

Questions 5-6 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course belongs in the Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning or Physical and Life Sciences category.

~~On a separate sheet of paper, address the criteria implied by the following instructions. (In the following instructions, "scientific" or "science" is meant to pertain to the natural, as opposed to social, sciences). "Mathematical" or "mathematics" is meant to include fundamental studies of quantitative, geometrical, statistical and computational methods, and not merely their application to particular problems. Courses in this area include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications. (Section 40405.2, Article 5 of Title 5).~~

Formatted

Formatted

Deleted: ¶

- 4.5. Please specify how your course requires students to use reasoning skills characteristic of common scientific and mathematical practice to do one or more of the following: to solve problems, to interpret observations, to make predictions, to design experiments for the testing of hypotheses, or to prove theorems. Examples given should illustrate how these skills are used throughout the course, and how the students' attainment of these skills is assessed.
- 2.6. Please specify how your course presents a balanced picture of both past successes and current uncertainties in science or mathematics to illustrate the cumulative, historical nature of the development of science and mathematics both past successes and current uncertainties in science or mathematics are well represented in the course, in order that the cumulative, historical nature of the development of science and mathematics can be illustrated. Give examples covered in the course of (a) older, well-established laws and theories that are no longer debated in scientific and mathematical circles, and (b) issues where either fundamental questions remain unanswered or where the application of well-established principles to new situations carries some uncertainty or controversy. Also describe how students' knowledge of these laws, theories, or questions is assessed.
3. Describe how the specific scientific or mathematical content of the course can be useful to the student, not only as "examples" of scientific or mathematical methods, but as knowledge which can enhance their life outside the classroom or their studies in other subjects. Describe how students' linkage of the course material to the real world or other courses is assessed.

Assessment for Upper Division Area BB Courses:

Question 6 will help the General Education Committee to evaluate whether you have planned sufficiently for assessing the success of your course.

8. a. Please give examples explaining how the work assigned to students (quizzes, tests, essays, projects, etc.) allows you to measure how successful individual students are in meeting the UDJE learning objectives for this course. Please attach an example of the type of assignment you will use to evaluate how successfully students meet the UDJE learning objectives.
- b. Please give specific examples of any course assessment activities (e.g., "pre" and "post" testing, class-wide analysis of individual test questions, etc.) that you use or plan to use in order to measure whether or not the class as a whole successfully meets the General Education learning objectives for this course. Please attach an example of the kind of assessment techniques you use in the course.

For UDJE-CC: Definition and Questions 1-4 as above, remainder as follows:

B--Criteria for Upper Division Area CC Courses:

Questions 5-7 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course belongs in the Humanities category.

On a separate sheet of paper, address the criteria implied by the following instructions. Provide specific examples wherever possible. (Section 40405.2, Article 5 of Title 5).

- 4.5. Please explain how this course presents a balanced picture of past or present approaches to one or more of the following: Please specify how this course represents both past and present approaches to at least one of the following: a) spirituality, b) the arts, c) philosophy or intellectual thought. Describe how you will assess student knowledge of these areas.
- 2.6. Briefly elaborate on how it may enable the student to cultivate Please specify how in this course students address issues involving both the cognitive and affective aspects of the mind through human experience either using critical analysis or creative activity. Describe how you will assess the extent to which students recognize the role these components play in the humanities.
- 3.7. Please provide specific examples of the way in which this course examines at least one of the following: aesthetic, metaphysical, or ethical manifestations of the human intellect and imagination in at least one of the following contexts: a) diverse historical contexts; and/or b) diverse cultural contexts. Describe how you will assess student knowledge of these aspects of the course
4. Please describe how the content of this course can enhance the student's life outside of the classroom or his/her studies in other areas. Describe how you will assess the extent to which students have linked the course material to the real world or other courses.

Assesment for Upper Division Area CC Courses:

Question 6 will help the General Education Committee to evaluate whether you have planned sufficiently for assessing the success of your course.

8. a. Please give examples explaining how the work assigned to students (quizzes, tests, essays, projects, etc.) allows you to measure how successful individual students are in meeting the UDJE learning objectives for this course. Please attach an example of the type of assignment you will use to evaluate how successfully students meet the UDJE learning objectives.
- b. Please give specific examples of any course assessment activities (e.g., "pre" and "post" testing, class-wide analysis of individual test questions, etc.) that you use or plan to use in order to measure whether or not the class as a whole successfully meets the General Education learning objectives for this course. Please attach an example of the kind of assessment techniques you use in the course.

For UDGE-DD: Definition and Questions 1-4 as above, remainder as follows:

B-Criteria for Upper Division Area DD Courses:

Questions 5-7 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course belongs in the Social Sciences category.

Address the criteria implied by the following instructions. Courses satisfying the UDGE Social Science DD requirement focus on broad, unifying themes in the social sciences from cross-disciplinary perspectives. Social science courses should enhance student awareness of and comprehension of human, social, political and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background.

5. Please specify how this course enables students to do one or ~~more-both~~ of the following: (a) analyze problems using social scientific reasoning; and/or (b) understand the historical and/or social context of major political, intellectual, economic, scientific, technological, or cultural developments; ~~and/or (c) use acquired or refined skills to make informed decisions about the future of their community(ies). Describe how you will assess that students have attained these skills.~~
6. Please specify how this course explores the ways in which society and culture are affected by ~~the complex relationships among~~ two or more of the following: (a) gender; (b) ethnicity; (c) class; (d) regional identities; (e) global identities. ~~Describe how you will assess student knowledge of these relationships.~~
7. Please specify how this course ~~makes explicit connections to other fields of inquiry and demonstrates the relevance of these connections to the issues examined in the course. Describe how you will assess the extent to which~~ helps students to recognize the value of multidisciplinary explorations.

Assesment for Upper Division Area DD Courses:

Question 6 will help the General Education Committee to evaluate whether you have planned sufficiently for assessing the success of your course.

8. a. Please give examples explaining how the work assigned to students (quizzes, tests, essays, projects, etc.) allows you to measure how successful individual students are in meeting the UDGE learning objectives for this course. Please attach an example of the type of assignment you will use to evaluate how successfully students meet the UDGE learning objectives.
- b. Please give specific examples of any course assessment activities (e.g., "pre" and "post" testing, class-wide analysis of individual test questions, etc.) that you use or plan to use in order to measure whether or not the class as a whole successfully meets the General Education learning objectives for this course. Please attach an example of the kind of assessment techniques you use in the course.

UPPER DIVISION GENERAL EDUCATION NEW COURSE PROPOSAL
FOR AREA DD – SOCIAL SCIENCES

Please Read Instructions on Next Page of This Form

- o This is a new course. A FORM C is being filed concurrently.
- o This is an existing course not currently satisfying an UDGE requirement. A FORM C-2 is being filed concurrently.
- o This is an existing course currently satisfying an UDGE requirement which is being submitted for recertification. A FORM C-2 is required only if the course is being changed.

1. Please attach a syllabus or draft syllabus of the course.
2. How many units is this course? ____ (Upper-Division General Education courses are limited to 3 units.)

3.a. Does this course have (a) prerequisite (s) other than completion of LDGE requirements?

___yes ___no

b. Does this course fulfill requirements for a major by the academic unit in which the course is offered? Check the YES box even if the course counts as an elective in the major.

___yes ___no

c. If you answered "yes" to 3.a. or 3.b., then the course is an exception to the definition printed on the next page of this form, and you must explain why the GE committee should make an exception for this course. Please describe how this course is designed to provide valuable and appropriate learning experiences to both majors and non-majors.

Read Questions 4-8 in the instructions on the next page of this form and submit your answers as attachments. The instructions do not have to be printed or submitted.

Signatures

Originator

Date

Program Director

Date

General Education Coordinator

Date

General Education Committee Chair

Date

FORM INSTRUCTIONS FOR UDGE-DD (WHITE)

**UPPER DIVISION GENERAL EDUCATION NEW COURSE PROPOSAL
FOR AREA DD – SOCIAL SCIENCES**

The Definition of Upper Division GE Courses:

Upper Division General Education provides an opportunity for students to learn about areas of study outside their academic major. Upper Division General Education courses assume satisfaction of Lower Division General Education Requirements and develop upper division skills. Courses should not require discipline-specific prerequisites. Designed for non-majors, these courses make explicit the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the disciplinary or interdisciplinary area of study. This conceptual framework and the applicability of these principles and methods should be emphasized throughout the course.

Upper Division General Education courses should help students see how disciplines, ideas, issues and knowledge are often interrelated, intersecting and interconnected. Upper Division General Education courses can present knowledge which can enhance students' lives outside the classroom or their studies in other subjects. These courses should also provide students with a classroom environment that fosters independent, active, engaged learning and a genuine curiosity about the subject matter.

Upper Division General Education courses shall be three-unit courses so that three such courses will exactly correspond with the 9-unit Upper Division General Education requirement of the CSU.

Attachments and responses to questions 1-4 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course is truly suitable to the General Education student. Please read the definition of Upper Division General Education printed above before answering these questions.

1. Please attach a syllabus or draft syllabus of the course.
2. How many units is this course? Upper-Division General Education Courses are limited to (3) units.
3.
 - a. Does this course have (a) prerequisite (s) other than completion of LDGE requirements?
 - b. Does this course fulfill requirements for a major by the academic unit in which the course is offered? Check the YES box even if the course counts as an elective in the major.
 - c. If you answered "yes" to 3.a. or 3.b., then the course is an exception to the definition printed above, and you must explain why the GE committee should make an exception for this course. Please describe how this course is designed to provide valuable and appropriate learning experiences to both majors and non-majors.
4. **Upper division general-education students may have fulfilled their lower division area D requirements in broad, interdisciplinary courses or in a different discipline than the discipline in which this course is offered. Please explain how this course introduces such students to the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the discipline, and how connection is made between these fundamentals and the particular applications emphasized in the course.**

Criteria for Upper Division Area DD Courses:

Questions 5-7 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course belongs in the Social Sciences category.

Address the criteria implied by the following instructions. Courses satisfying the UDGE Social Science DD requirement focus on broad, unifying themes in the social sciences from cross-disciplinary perspectives. Social science courses should enhance student awareness of and comprehension of human, social, political and economic institutions and behavior and their historical background.

5. Please specify how this course enables students to do one or both of the following: (a) analyze problems using social scientific reasoning; and/or (b) understand the historical and/or social context of major political, intellectual, economic, scientific, technological, or cultural developments.
6. Please specify how this course explores the ways in which society and culture are affected by two or more of the following: (a) gender; (b) ethnicity; (c) class; (d) regional identities; (e) global identities.
7. Please specify how this course helps students to recognize the value of multidisciplinary explorations.

Assessment for Upper Division Area DD Courses:

Question 6 will help the General Education Committee to evaluate whether you have planned sufficiently for assessing the success of your course.

8.
 - a. Please give examples explaining how the work assigned to students (quizzes, tests, essays, projects, etc.) allows you to measure how successful individual students are in meeting the UDGE learning objectives for this course. Please attach an example of the type of assignment you will use to evaluate how successfully students meet the UDGE learning objectives.
 - b. If you use any course assessment activities (e.g., "pre" and "post" testing, class-wide analysis of individual test questions, etc.) that measure whether or not the class as a whole successfully meets the General Education learning objectives for this course, please attach examples of these as well.

UPPER DIVISION GENERAL EDUCATION NEW COURSE PROPOSAL
FOR AREA CC – HUMANITIES

Please Read Instructions on Next Page of This Form

- o This is a new course. A FORM C is being filed concurrently.
- o This is an existing course not currently satisfying an UDGE requirement. A FORM C-2 is being filed concurrently.
- o This is an existing course currently satisfying an UDGE requirement which is being submitted for recertification. A FORM C-2 is required only if the course is being changed.

1. Please attach a syllabus or draft syllabus of the course.
2. How many units is this course? ____ (Upper-Division General Education courses are limited to 3 units.)

3.a. Does this course have (a) prerequisite (s) other than completion of LDGE requirements?

___yes ___no

b. Does this course fulfill requirements for a major by the academic unit in which the course is offered? Check the YES box even if the course counts as an elective in the major.

___yes ___no

c. If you answered "yes" to 3.a. or 3.b., then the course is an exception to the definition printed on the next page of this form, and you must explain why the GE committee should make an exception for this course. Please describe how this course is designed to provide valuable and appropriate learning experiences to both majors and non-majors.

Read Questions 4-8 in the instructions on the next page of this form and submit your answers as attachments. The instructions do not have to be printed or submitted.

Signatures

Originator

Date

Program Director

Date

General Education Coordinator

Date

General Education Committee Chair

Date

**FORM INSTRUCTIONS FOR UDGE-CC (WHITE)
UPPER DIVISION GENERAL EDUCATION NEW COURSE PROPOSAL
FOR AREA CC – HUMANITIES**

The Definition of Upper Division GE Courses:

Upper Division General Education provides an opportunity for students to learn about areas of study outside their academic major. Upper Division General Education courses assume satisfaction of Lower Division General Education Requirements and develop upper division skills. Courses should not require discipline-specific prerequisites. Designed for non-majors, these courses make explicit the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the disciplinary or interdisciplinary area of study. This conceptual framework and the applicability of these principles and methods should be emphasized throughout the course.

Upper Division General Education courses should help students see how disciplines, ideas, issues and knowledge are often interrelated, intersecting and interconnected. Upper Division General Education courses can present knowledge which can enhance students' lives outside the classroom or their studies in other subjects. These courses should also provide students with a classroom environment that fosters independent, active, engaged learning and a genuine curiosity about the subject matter.

Upper Division General Education courses shall be three-unit courses so that three such courses will exactly correspond with the 9-unit Upper Division General Education requirement of the CSU.

Attachments and responses to questions 1-4 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course is truly suitable to the General Education student. Please read the definition of Upper Division General Education printed above before answering these questions.

1. Please attach a syllabus or draft syllabus of the course.
2. How many units is this course? Upper-Division General Education Courses are limited to (3) units.
3.
 - a. Does this course have (a) prerequisite (s) other than completion of LDGE requirements?
 - b. Does this course fulfill requirements for a major by the academic unit in which the course is offered? Check the YES box even if the course counts as an elective in the major.
 - c. If you answered "yes" to 3.a. or 3.b., then the course is an exception to the definition printed above, and you must explain why the GE committee should make an exception for this course. Please describe how this course is designed to provide valuable and appropriate learning experiences to both majors and non-majors.
4. **Upper division general-education students may have fulfilled their lower division area C requirements in broad, interdisciplinary courses or in a different discipline than the discipline in which this course is offered. Please explain how this course introduces such students to the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the discipline, and how connection is made between these fundamentals and the particular applications emphasized in the course.**

Criteria for Upper Division Area CC Courses:

Questions 5-7 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course belongs in the Humanities category.

On a separate sheet of paper, address the criteria implied by the following instructions. Provide specific examples wherever possible.

5. Please specify how this course represents both past and present approaches to at least one of the following: a) spirituality, b) the arts, c) philosophy or intellectual thought.
6. Please specify how in this course students address issues involving both the cognitive and affective aspects of human experience either using critical analysis or creative activity.
7. Please provide specific examples of the way in which this course examines at least one of the following: aesthetic, metaphysical, or ethical manifestations of the human intellect in at least one of the following contexts: a) diverse historical contexts; b) diverse cultural contexts.

Assessment for Upper Division Area CC Courses:

Question 6 will help the General Education Committee to evaluate whether you have planned sufficiently for assessing the success of your course.

8.
 - a. Please give examples explaining how the work assigned to students (quizzes, tests, essays, projects, etc.) allows you to measure how successful individual students are in meeting the UDGE learning objectives for this course. Please attach an example of the type of assignment you will use to evaluate how successfully students meet the UDGE learning objectives.
 - b. If you use any course assessment activities (e.g., "pre" and "post" testing, class-wide analysis of individual test questions, etc.) that measure whether or not the class as a whole successfully meets the General Education learning objectives for this course, please attach examples of these as well.

**UPPER DIVISION GENERAL EDUCATION NEW COURSE PROPOSAL
FOR AREA BB – MATHEMATICS/QUANTITATIVE REASONING OR PHYSICAL AND LIFE SCIENCES**

Please Read Instructions on Next Page of This Form

- o This is a new course. A FORM C is being filed concurrently.
- o This is an existing course not currently satisfying an UDGE requirement. A FORM C-2 is being filed concurrently.
- o This is an existing course currently satisfying an UDGE requirement which is being submitted for recertification. *A FORM C-2 is required only if the course is being changed.*

1. Please attach a syllabus or draft syllabus of the course.
2. How many units is this course? _____ (Upper-Division General Education courses are limited to 3 units.)

3.a. Does this course have (a) prerequisite (s) other than completion of LDGE requirements?

___yes ___no

b. Does this course fulfill requirements for a major by the academic unit in which the course is offered? Check the YES box even if the course counts as an elective in the major.

___yes ___no

c. If you answered "yes" to 3.a. or 3.b., then the course is an exception to the definition printed on the next page of this form, and you must explain why the GE committee should make an exception for this course. Please describe how this course is designed to provide valuable and appropriate learning experiences to both majors and non-majors.

Read Questions 4-7 in the instructions on the next page of this form and submit your answers as attachments. The instructions do not have to be printed or submitted.

Signatures

Originator

Date

Program Director

Date

General Education Coordinator

Date

General Education Committee Chair

Date

FORM INSTRUCTIONS FOR UDGE-BB (WHITE)
UPPER DIVISION GENERAL EDUCATION NEW COURSE PROPOSAL
FOR AREA BB - MATHEMATICS/QUANTITATIVE REASONING OR PHYSICAL AND LIFE SCIENCES

The Definition of Upper Division GE Courses:

Upper Division General Education provides an opportunity for students to learn about areas of study outside their academic major. Upper Division General Education courses assume satisfaction of Lower Division General Education Requirements and develop upper division skills. Courses should not require discipline-specific prerequisites. Designed for non-majors, these courses make explicit the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the disciplinary or interdisciplinary area of study. This conceptual framework and the applicability of these principles and methods should be emphasized throughout the course.

Upper Division General Education courses should help students see how disciplines, ideas, issues and knowledge are often interrelated, intersecting and interconnected. Upper Division General Education courses can present knowledge which can enhance students' lives outside the classroom or their studies in other subjects. These courses should also provide students with a classroom environment that fosters independent, active, engaged learning and a genuine curiosity about the subject matter.

Upper Division General Education courses shall be three-unit courses so that three such courses will exactly correspond with the 9-unit Upper Division General Education requirement of the CSU.

Attachments and responses for questions 1-4 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course is truly suitable to the General Education student. Please read the definition of Upper Division General Education printed above before answering these questions.

1. Please attach a syllabus or draft syllabus of the course.
2. How many units is this course? Upper-Division General Education Courses are limited to (3) units.
3.
 - a. Does this course have (a) prerequisite (s) other than completion of LDGE requirements?
 - b. Does this course fulfill requirements for a major by the academic unit in which the course is offered? Check the YES box even if the course counts as an elective in the major.
 - c. If you answered "yes" to 3.a. or 3.b., then the course is an exception to the definition printed above, and you must explain why the GE committee should make an exception for this course. Please describe how this course is designed to provide valuable and appropriate learning experiences to both majors and non-majors.
4. **Upper division general-education students may have fulfilled their lower division area B requirements in broad, interdisciplinary courses or in a different discipline than the discipline in which this course is offered. Please explain how this course introduces such students to the basic assumptions, principles and methods of the discipline, and how connection is made between these fundamentals and the particular applications emphasized in the course.**

Criteria for Upper Division Area BB Courses: Questions 5-7 will help the General Education Committee decide if the course belongs in the Mathematics/Quantitative Reasoning or Physical and Life Sciences category.

Address the criteria implied by the following instructions. (In the following instructions, "scientific" or "science" is meant to pertain to the natural, as opposed to social, sciences). "Mathematical" or "mathematics" is meant to include fundamental studies of quantitative, geometrical, statistical and computational methods, and not merely their application to particular problems. Courses in this area include inquiry into the physical universe and its life forms and into mathematical concepts and quantitative reasoning and their applications.

5. Please specify how the course requires students to use reasoning skills characteristic of common scientific and mathematical practice to do one or more of the following: to solve problems, to interpret observations, to make predictions, to design experiments for the testing of hypotheses, or to prove theorems. Examples given should illustrate how these skills are used throughout the course.
6. Please specify how both past successes and current uncertainties in science or mathematics are well represented in the course, in order that the cumulative, historical nature of the development of science and mathematics can be illustrated. Give examples covered in the course of (a) older, well-established laws and theories that are no longer debated in scientific and mathematical circles, and (b) issues where either fundamental questions remain unanswered or where the application of well-established principles to new situations carries some uncertainty or controversy.

Assessment for Upper Division Area BB Courses: Question 7 will help the General Education Committee to evaluate whether you have planned sufficiently for assessing the success of your course.

7.
 - a. Please give examples explaining how the work assigned to students (quizzes, tests, essays, projects, etc.) allows you to measure how successful individual students are in meeting the UDGE learning objectives for this course. Please attach an example of the type of assignment you will use to evaluate how successfully students meet the UDGE learning objectives.
 - b. If you use any course assessment activities (e.g., "pre" and "post" testing, class-wide analysis of individual test questions, etc.) that measure whether or not the class as a whole successfully meets the General Education learning objectives for this course, please attach examples of these as well.

1 DRAFT Policy on Academic Honesty

Deleted: Approved: Academic Senate
4/12/95

2
3
4
5 Each student must maintain academic honesty in the conduct of his or her
6 studies and other learning activities at CSUSM. The integrity of this academic institution,
7 and the quality of the education provided in its degree programs, are based on the
8 principle of academic honesty.

9
10 The maintenance of academic integrity and quality education is the responsibility of each
11 student within this university and the California State University system. Cheating and
12 plagiarism in connection with an academic program at a campus is listed in Section
13 41301, Title 5, California Code of Regulations, as an offense for which a student may be
14 expelled, suspended, put on probation, or given a less severe disciplinary sanction.

15
16 Student Responsibilities:

- 17 1. Students are responsible for knowing and understanding the rules of
18 Academic Honesty as outlined in the university catalog, to include fabricating
19 information and data, cheating, facilitating academic dishonesty, and
20 plagiarizing.
21 2. Communicating with the professor if they do not understand how the policy
22 applies to the a particular class or assignment.

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

23 Utilizing the library resources (e.g. the plagiarism tutorial, consulting a librarian, or
24 referring to a style guide) on academic honesty and plagiarism to fully understand the
25 differences between a citation, giving credit, original writing, and plagiarism.

Deleted: The maintenance of academic integrity and quality education is the responsibility of each student within this university and the California State University system. Cheating and plagiarism in connection with an academic program at a campus is listed in Section 41301, Title 5, California Code of Regulations, as an offense for which a student may be expelled, suspended, put on probation, or given a less severe disciplinary sanction.

26
27
28
29 Faculty Responsibilities:

- 30
31 1. Faculty must report all incidences of Student Dishonesty and the actions taken to the
32 Office of the Dean of Students.

33
34 The reporting must include:

- 35 Student name
36 Student ID number as it appears on the class roster
37 Class Code, CRN, and Semester taken
38 The issues of dishonesty that occurred
39 The actions or consequences taken by the professor

- 40
41 2. Each faculty should include a statement on Academic Honesty in their syllabi such
42 as:

43
44 Students will be expected to adhere to standards of academic honesty and
45 integrity, as outlined in the Student Academic Honesty Policy. All assignments
46 must be original work, clear and error-free. All ideas/material that are borrowed

47 from other sources must have appropriate references to the original sources. Any
48 quoted material should give credit to the source and be punctuated with quotation
49 marks.

50
51 Academic Honesty and Integrity. Students are responsible for honest
52 completion and representation of their work. Your course catalog details
53 the ethical standards and penalties for infractions. There will be zero
54 tolerance for infractions. If you believe there has been an infraction
55 by someone in the class, please bring it to my attention. I reserve the
56 right to discipline any student for academic dishonesty, in accordance
57 with the general rules and regulations of the university. Disciplinary
58 action may include the lowering of grades and/or the assignment of a
59 failing grade for an exam, assignment, or the class as a whole.

- 60
61
- 62 3. Faculty should keep accurate records and documents regarding the case and their own
63 resolution and consequences for at least one semester.
 - 64
65 4. Faculty should have a discussion of academic honesty, expectations, and
66 consequences within the first two or three class meetings in order to maintain
67 consistency and uniformity with all classes and students.
 - 68
69 5. Faculty are encouraged to include creative assignments that require original thought
70 in order to reduce the incidences of student dishonesty.
 - 71
72 6. Faculty have the ultimate responsibility and discretion when grading students who ← - - - **Formatted: Bullets and Numbering**
73 have been dishonest in class, however, faculty also have the responsibility to be fair
74 and equitable to all students within the same class, therefore, consequences for like
75 offenses must be the similar.
 - 76
77 7. Grading Policy-It is suggested that each faculty member have a consistent grading ← - - - **Formatted: Bullets and Numbering**
78 policy which will be applied in all cases of academic dishonesty. For example, if an
79 assignment where a student is caught cheating is worth more than 15% of the grade,
80 the student may receive a “FAIL” in the class. If the assignment is worth less than
81 15%, then the assignment can be given a grade of “0”.

82
83 Administrative Responsibilities:

- 84
- 85 1. Administrators are responsible for knowing and understanding the rules of
86 Academic Honesty to include fabrication, cheating, facilitating academic
87 dishonesty, plagiarism and to take administrative action where necessary.
 - 88 2. Administrators should facilitate a discussion of Academic Honesty at student
89 orientation to ensure that all students are aware of the Academic Honesty
90 issues on campus and how they will be dealt with.
 - 91 3. The Dean of Students will post aggregated data by semester that will include
92 the number of cases reported and the discipline actions taken.

93
94
95
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
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138

Student Sanctions

Student sanctions for violations to the academic honesty policy can include any of the following:

- Warning
- Probation of Student
- Suspension
- Expulsion

Definitions:

Academic dishonesty is an especially serious offense. It diminishes the quality of scholarship and defrauds those who depend upon the integrity of the campus programs. Such dishonesty includes:

A. CHEATING

Using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise.

Comments:

1. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct. This includes adequate communication of expectations about what kinds of collaboration are acceptable within the course. Instructors should state in course syllabi their policies and procedures concerning examinations and other academic exercises as well as the use before examinations of shared study aids, examination files, and other related materials and forms of assistance.
2. Students completing any examination should assume that external assistance (e.g., books, notes, calculators, conversation with others) is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the instructor.
3. Students must not allow others to conduct research or prepare any work for them without advance authorization from the instructor. This comment includes, but is not limited to, the services of commercial term paper companies.
4. Students who are required to do a paper in a course should assume that submitting the same or similar paper to different courses (regardless of whether it is in the same semester or in different semesters) is not permitted without the explicit permission of the instructors of both courses.

B. FABRICATION

Falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.

139

140 *Comments:*

141

142 1. "Invented" information may not be used in any laboratory experiment or other
143 academic exercise without notice to and authorization from the instructor. It would be
144 improper, for example to analyze one sample in an experiment and covertly "invent" data
145 based on the single experiment for several more required analyses.

146

147 2. One must use/acknowledge the actual source from which cited information was
148 obtained. For example, a student may not reproduce sections from a book review and
149 indicate that the section was obtained from the book itself.

150

151 3. Students who attempt to alter and resubmit returned academic work with intent to
152 defraud the faculty member will be in violation of this section. For example, a student
153 may not change an answer on a returned exam and then claim that they deserve additional
154 credit.

155

156 C. FACILITATING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

157

158 Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of
159 academic dishonesty.

160

161 *Comments:*

162

163 1. For example, a student who knowingly allowed copying from his or her paper during
164 an examination would be in violation of this section.

165

166 2. Providing information about the contents of an examination to a student who will later
167 take the examination, or taking an examination on behalf of another student are violations
168 of academic honesty.

169

170 D. PLAGIARISM

171

172 Intentionally or knowingly representing the words, ideas, or work of another as one's own
173 in any academic exercise.

174

175 -The act of incorporating the ideas, words, sentences, paragraphs, or parts thereof, or the
176 specific substance of another's work, without giving appropriate credit, and representing
177 the product as one's own work

178

179 -The act of putting one's name as an author on a group project to which no contribution
180 was actually made; and

181

182 -Representing another's artistic/scholarly works such as musical compositions, computer
183 programs, photographs, paintings, drawings, sculptures, or similar works as one's own.

184

185 *Comments:*

186

187 1. Direct Quotation: Every direct quote must be identified by quotation marks, or by
188 appropriate indentation or by other means of identification, and must be promptly cited in
189 a footnote. Proper footnote style for academic departments is outlined by such manuals as
190 the *MLA Style Sheet*, *APA Publications Manual*, or K. L. Turabian's *A Manual for*
191 *Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations*.

192

193 2. Paraphrase: prompt acknowledgment is required when material from another source is
194 paraphrased or summarized in whole or in part in your own words. To acknowledge a
195 paraphrase properly, one might state: "to paraphrase Locke's comment..." and conclude
196 with a footnote identifying the exact reference. A footnote acknowledging only a directly
197 quoted statement does not suffice to notify the reader of any preceding or succeeding
198 paraphrased material.

199

200 3. Borrowed Facts or Information: Information obtained in one's reading or research
201 which is not common knowledge among students in the course must be acknowledged.
202 Examples of common knowledge might include the names of leaders of prominent
203 nations, basic scientific laws, etc.

204

205 Material which contributes only to the student's general understanding of the subject may
206 be acknowledged in the bibliography and need not be immediately footnoted. One
207 footnote is usually sufficient to acknowledge indebtedness when a number of connected
208 sentences in the paper draw their special information from one source. When direct
209 quotations are used, however, quotation format must be used and prompt
210 acknowledgment is required.

211

212 | 8. →

213

214 | ↓

215 | ↓

Deleted: Faculty Responsibilities:¶

¶
¶<#>Faculty must report all incidences of Student Dishonesty and the actions taken to the Office of the Dean of Students.¶

¶
¶The reporting must include:¶
¶ Student name¶
¶ Student ID number as it appears on the class roster¶
¶ Class Code, CRN, and Semester taken¶
¶ The issues of dishonesty that occurred¶
¶ The actions or consequences taken by the professor¶

¶<#>Each faculty should include a statement on Academic Honesty in their syllabi such as:¶

¶
¶Students will be expected to adhere to standards of academic honesty and integrity, as outlined in the Student Academic Honesty Policy. All assignments must be original work, clear and error-free. All ideas/material that are borrowed from other sources must have appropriate references to the original sources. Any quoted material should give credit to the source and be punctuated with quotation marks.¶

¶<#>Faculty should keep accurate records and documents regarding the case and their own resolution and consequences for at least one semester.¶

... [1]

Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Deleted: Student Responsibilities:¶

¶
¶<#>Students are responsible for knowing and understanding the rules of Academic Honesty as outlined in the university catalog, to include fabrication, cheating, facilitating academic dishonesty, plagiarism.¶

¶<#>Communicating with the professor if they do not understand how the policy applies to the a particular class or assignment.¶

¶<#>Utilizing the library resources on academic honesty and plagiarism to fully understand the differences between a citation, giving credit, original wri...

... [2]

Deleted: Administrative Responsibilities:¶

¶
¶<#>Administrators are responsible for knowing and understanding the rules of Academic Honesty to include fabrication, cheating, facilitating academic dishonesty, plagiarism and to take administrative action where necessary.¶

¶<#>Administrators should facilitate a discussion of Academic Honesty at student orientation to ensure that all students are aware of the Academic Honesty issues on campus and how they will be dealt with.¶

217 Inappropriate conduct by students or by applicants for admission is subject to discipline
218 as provided in Sections 41301 through 41304 of Title 5, California Code of Regulations.
219 These sections are as follows:

220

221 41301. Expulsion, Suspension and Probation of Students. Following procedures
222 consonant with due process established pursuant to Section 41304, any student of a
223 campus may be expelled, suspended, placed on probation or given a lesser sanction for
224 one or more of the following causes which must be campus related:

225

226 A. Cheating or plagiarism in connection with an academic program at a campus.

227

228 B. Forgery, alteration or misuse of campus documents, records, or identification or
229 knowingly furnishing false information to campus officials.

230

231 C. Misrepresentation of oneself or of an organization to be an agent of a campus.

232

233 D. Obstruction or disruption, on or off campus property, of the campus educational
234 process, administrative process, or other campus function.

235

236 E. Physical abuse on or off campus property of the person or property of any member of
237 the campus community or of member of his or her family or the threat of such physical
238 abuse.

239

240 F. Theft of, or non-accidental damage to, campus property, or property in the possession
241 of, or owned by, a member of the campus community.

242

243 G. Unauthorized entry into, unauthorized use of, or misuse of campus property.

244

245 H. On campus property, the sale or knowing possession of dangerous drugs, restricted
246 dangerous drugs, or narcotics as those terms are used in California statutes, except when
247 lawfully prescribed pursuant to medical or dental care, or when lawfully permitted for the
248 purpose of research, instruction or analysis.

249

250 I. Knowing possession or use of explosives, dangerous chemicals or deadly weapons on
251 campus property or at a campus function without prior authorization of the campus
252 President.

253

254 J. Engaging in lewd, indecent, or obscene behavior on campus property or at a campus
255 function.

256

257 K. Abusive behavior directed toward, or hazing of, a member of the campus community.

258

259 L. Violation of any order of a campus President, notice of which had been given prior to

260 such violation and during the academic term in which the violation occurs, either by
261 publication in the campus newspaper, or by posting on an official bulletin board
262 designated for this purpose, and which order is not inconsistent with any of the other
263 provisions of this Section.

264

265 M. Soliciting or assisting another to do any act which would subject a student to
266 expulsion, suspension or probation pursuant to this Section.

267

268 N. For purposes of this Article, the following terms are defined:

269

270 1. The term "member of the campus community" is defined as meaning California State
271 University Trustees, academic, nonacademic and administrative personnel, students, and
272 other persons while such other persons are on campus property or at a campus function.

273

274 2. The term "campus property" includes:

275

276 (a) real or personal property in the possession of, or under the control of, the Board of
277 Trustees of The California State University, and

278

279 (b) all campus feeding, retail, or residence facilities whether operated by a campus or by
280 a campus auxiliary organization.

281

282 3. The term "deadly weapons" includes any instrument or weapon of the kind commonly
283 known as a blackjack, slingshot, billy, sandclub, sandbag, metal knuckles, any dirk,
284 switchblade knife, pistol, revolver, dagger, or any other firearm, any knife having a blade
285 longer than five inches, any razor with an unguarded blade, and any metal pipe or bar
286 used or intended to be used as a club.

287

288 4. The term "behavior" includes conduct and expression.

289

290 5. The term "hazing" means any method of initiation into a student organization or any
291 pastime or amusement engaged in with regard to such an organization which causes, or is
292 likely to cause, bodily danger, or physical or emotional harm, to any member of the
293 campus community; but the term "hazing" does not include customary athletic events or
294 other similar contests or competitions.

295

296 O. This Section is not adopted pursuant to Education Code Section 89031.

297

298 P. Notwithstanding any amendment or repeal pursuant to the resolution by which any
299 provision of this Article is amended, all acts and omissions occurring prior to that
300 effective date shall be subject to the provisions of this article as in effect immediately
301 prior to such effective date.

302

303 41302. Disposition of Fees: Campus Emergency; Interim Suspension. The President of
304 the campus may place on probation, suspend, or expel a student for one or more of the
305 causes enumerated in Section 41301. No fees or tuition paid by or for such student for the

306 semester, quarter, or summer session in which he or she is suspended or expelled shall be
307 refunded. If the student is readmitted before the close of the semester, quarter, or summer
308 session in which he or she is suspended, no additional tuition or fees shall be required of
309 the student on account of the suspension.

310
311 During periods of campus emergency, as determined by the President of the individual
312 campus, the President may, after consultation with the Chancellor, place into immediate
313 effect any emergency regulations, procedures, and other measures deemed necessary or
314 appropriate to meet the emergency, safeguard persons and property, and maintain
315 educational activities.

316
317 The President may immediately impose an interim suspension in all cases in which there
318 is reasonable cause to believe that such an immediate suspension is required in order to
319 protect lives or property and to ensure the maintenance of order. A student so placed on
320 interim suspension shall be given prompt notice of charges and the opportunity for a
321 hearing within 10 days of the imposition of interim suspension. During the period of
322 interim suspension, the student shall not, without prior written permission of the
323 President or designated representative, enter any campus of The California State
324 University other than to attend the hearing. Violation of any condition of interim
325 suspension shall be grounds for expulsion.

326
327 41303. Conduct by Applicants for Admission. Notwithstanding any provision in this
328 Chapter 1 to the contrary, admission or readmission may be qualified or denied to any
329 person who, while not enrolled as a student, commits acts which, were he enrolled as a
330 student, would be the basis for disciplinary proceedings pursuant to Sections 41301 or
331 41302. Admission or readmission may be qualified or denied to any person who, while a
332 student, commits acts which are subject to disciplinary action pursuant to Section 41301
333 or Section 41302. Qualified admission or denial of admission in such cases shall be
334 determined under procedures adopted pursuant to Section 41304.

335
336 41304. Student Disciplinary Procedures for The California State University. The
337 Chancellor shall prescribe, and may from time to time revise, a code of student
338 disciplinary procedures for The California State University. Subject to other applicable
339 law, this code shall provide for determinations of fact and sanctions to be applied for
340 conduct which is a ground of discipline under Sections 41301 or 41302, and for qualified
341 admission or denial of admission under Section 41303; the authority of the campus
342 President in such matters; conduct related determinations on financial aid eligibility and
343 termination; alternative kinds of proceedings, including proceedings conducted by a
344 Hearing Officer; time limitations; notice; conduct of hearings, including provisions
345 governing evidence, a record, and review; and such other related matters as may be
346 appropriate. The Chancellor shall report to the Board actions taken under this section.
347

Faculty Responsibilities:

Faculty must report all incidences of Student Dishonesty and the actions taken to the Office of the Dean of Students.

The reporting must include:

Student name

Student ID number as it appears on the class roster

Class Code, CRN, and Semester taken

The issues of dishonesty that occurred

The actions or consequences taken by the professor

Each faculty should include a statement on Academic Honesty in their syllabi such as:

Students will be expected to adhere to standards of academic honesty and integrity, as outlined in the Student Academic Honesty Policy. All assignments must be original work, clear and error-free. All ideas/material that are borrowed from other sources must have appropriate references to the original sources. Any quoted material should give credit to the source and be punctuated with quotation marks.

Faculty should keep accurate records and documents regarding the case and their own resolution and consequences for at least one semester.

Faculty should have a discussion of academic honesty, expectations, and consequences within the first two or three class meetings in order to maintain consistency and uniformity with all classes and students.

Faculty are encouraged to include creative assignments that require original thought in order to reduce the incidences of student dishonesty.

Faculty have the ultimate responsibility and discretion when grading students who have been dishonest in class, however, faculty also have the responsibility to be fair and equitable to all students within the same class, therefore, consequences for like offenses must be the similar.

Grading Policy-the following grading policy will be applied in all cases of academic dishonesty—If an assignment where a student is caught cheating is worth more than 15% of the grade, the student may receive a “FAIL” in the class. If the assignment is worth less than 15%, then the assignment can be given a grade of “0”.

Student Responsibilities:

Students are responsible for knowing and understanding the rules of Academic Honesty as outlined in the university catalog, to include fabrication, cheating, facilitating academic dishonesty, plagiarism.

Communicating with the professor if they do not understand how the policy applies to the a particular class or assignment.

Utilizing the library resources on academic honesty and plagiarism to fully understand the differences between a citation, giving credit, original writing, and plagiarism.

CSUSM Academic Senate Meeting Schedule 2004/05

Academic Senate

(Regular meetings are held from 1:15 - 3 p.m.)

Fall 2004

August 25	Convocation (a.m.) & New Senator Orientation (2:15 - 3:30 p.m.)
September 1	Senate Meeting
October 6	Senate Meeting
November 3	Senate Meeting
December 1	Senate Meeting

Spring 2005

January 13 (<i>tent.</i>)	Spring Assembly (a.m.)
January 19	Senate Meeting
February 2	Senate Meeting
March 2	Senate Meeting
April 6	Senate Meeting
April 20	Senate Meeting
May 4	Joint Senate Meeting

Executive Committee

(Regular meetings are held from 12 - 2 p.m., or until 1 p.m. when preceding a Senate meeting)

Fall 2004

August 24	Retreat (9:30 p.m. – 1:30 p.m.)
September 1, 8, 15, 22, 29	
October 6, 13, 20, 27	
November 3, 10, 17	
December 1	

Spring 2004

January 19, 26	
February 2, 9, 16, 23	
March 2, 9, 16, 23	<i>(Spring Break is March 28 – April 2)</i>
April 6, 13, 20, 27	
May 4	

Unless otherwise noted, the Academic Senate Meetings are held from 1:15-3:00 pm in Commons 206. All CSUSM faculty are encouraged to join us. *Only elected Senators may vote.*

Because the Senate is not a governing board, meetings of the Academic Senate are not covered under the Brown Act. The decision to allow press/public into an Academic Senate meeting may be made by the Senate.

TO: Dick Montanari, Academic Senate
FROM: Faculty Affairs Committee
DATE: March 11, 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 the first 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.

Attached are FAC's final reports:

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.



Committee Name: **Arts & Lectures Advisory Committee**
COMMITTEE DATA FORM

Please fill in shaded fields.

Committee Chair: Merryl Goldberg

Date: 3/4/04

Purpose:

What is the purpose/charge of the committee? This is an ad-hoc advisory committee to solicit input and determine plan for Arts and Lectures series for 2004-2005.

Committee will meet up to four times per semester to discuss possible events for the series.

Committee will also create guidelines and procedures for soliciting input from the university in terms of programming and outreach. This is a terrific opportunity for second or third year faculty to engage in some university-wide service.

Membership:

What is the composition of committee members (e.g., number of faculty, staff, students, administrators, etc.)? The committee will be comprised of 11 individuals including the director. 5 faculty members: one from CoBA, one from COE, one Library, two from COAS (one must be from VPA Department); one student, one staff, one representative from the community (if possible) and one administrator. Committee will also include the Multicultural Coordinator (or designee) for the university.

Faculty members: Is representation at-large or college/area specific? At large with the exception of 1 faculty member from VPA.

Is each member a voting member? If not, please list non-voting positions. Yes

How long does each member serve (term limits)? One year with a possibility to continue into the second.

**Will the committee chair be elected or appointed? Elected Appointed.
If appointed, by whom?**

Meeting Schedule:

How often will the committee meet? Approximately four times a semester.

This is a protected document and cannot be saved. Please return to the Senate Office via intracampus mail (file-print), e-mail (file-save as-rename, and attach), or fax (file-print).

Academic Senate Office, Craven Hall 1201, Fax 760-750-3041

Phone 760-750-4058

E-mail: senate@csusm.edu