

1 **Definition:** Academic honesty policy delineates student, faculty, and administrative
2 responsibilities in regards to academic honesty. The police defines
3 incidences of Academic dishonesty and the sanctions that can be applied.
4

5 **Authority:** The Cal State San Marcos Interim Student Rights and Responsibilities
6 Policy as expressed in Executive Order 320.
7

8 **Scope:** The purpose of the Academic Honesty Policy shall be to define incidences
9 of academic dishonesty and to delineate student, faculty, and
10 administrative responsibilities.
11

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Karen S. Haynes, President

Approval Date

Robert Sheath, Provost

Approval Date

Deleted: ¶

21 | Each student shall maintain academic honesty in the conduct of his or her
22 studies and other learning activities at CSUSM. The integrity of this academic institution, and the
23 quality of the education provided in its degree programs, are based on the principle of academic
24 honesty.

25
26 The maintenance of academic integrity and quality education is the responsibility of each student
27 within this university and the California State University system. Cheating and plagiarism in
28 connection with an academic program at a campus is listed in Section 41301, Title 5, *California*
29 *Code of Regulations*, as an offense for which a student may be expelled, suspended, put on
30 probation, or given a less severe disciplinary sanction.

31
32 Student Responsibilities:

- 33 1. Students are responsible for knowing and understanding the rules of Academic Honesty
34 as outlined in the university catalog, to include fabricating information and data,
35 cheating, facilitating academic dishonesty, and plagiarizing.
- 36 2. Communicating with the professor if they do not understand how the policy applies to a
37 particular class or assignment. Utilizing the library resources (e.g. the plagiarism tutorial,
38 consulting a librarian, or referring to a style guide) on academic honesty and plagiarism
39 to fully understand the differences between a citation, giving credit, original writing, and
40 plagiarism.

41
42 Faculty Responsibilities:

- 43
44 1. Faculty must report all incidences of Student Dishonesty and the actions taken to the
45 Office of the Dean of Students.

46
47 The reporting must include:

- 48 Student name
- 49 Student ID number as it appears on the class roster
- 50 Class Code, CRN, and Semester taken
- 51 The issues of dishonesty that occurred
- 52 The actions or consequences taken by the professor

- 53
54 2. Each faculty should include a statement on Academic Honesty in their syllabi such as:

55
56 Students will be expected to adhere to standards of academic honesty and integrity,
57 as outlined in the Student Academic Honesty Policy. All assignments must be
58 original work, clear and error-free. All ideas/material that are borrowed from other
59 sources must have appropriate references to the original sources. Any quoted
60 material should give credit to the source and be punctuated with quotation marks.

61
62 Academic Honesty and Integrity. Students are responsible for honest completion and
63 representation of their work. Your course catalog details the ethical standards and
64 penalties for infractions. There will be zero tolerance for infractions. If you believe
65 there has been an infraction by someone in the class, please bring it to the instructor's
66 attention. The instructor reserves the right to discipline any student for academic
67 dishonesty, in accordance with the general rules and regulations of the university.
68 Disciplinary action may include the lowering of grades and/or the assignment of a
69 failing grade for an exam, assignment, or the class as a whole.

70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
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

3. Faculty should keep accurate records and documents regarding the case and their own resolution and consequences for at least one semester.
4. 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.
5. Faculty are encouraged to include creative assignments that require original thought in order to reduce the incidences of student dishonesty.
6. 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 similar.
7. Grading Policy-It is suggested that each faculty member have a consistent grading policy which will be applied in all cases of academic dishonesty. For example, 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".

Administrative Responsibilities:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. The Dean of Students shall report each semester to the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate aggregated data for that semester which includes the number and type of cases reported and the disciplinary actions taken.

Student Sanctions

Student sanctions, imposed by the appropriate administrator, 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:

119 A. CHEATING

120

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

123

124 *Guidelines:*

125

126 1. Faculty members are strongly encouraged to make every reasonable effort to foster honest
127 academic conduct. This includes adequate communication of expectations about what kinds of
128 collaboration are acceptable within the course. Instructors should state in course syllabi their
129 policies and procedures concerning examinations and other academic exercises as well as the use
130 before examinations of shared study aids, examination files, and other related materials and forms
131 of assistance.

132

133 2. Students completing any examination should assume that external assistance (e.g., books,
134 notes, calculators, conversation with others) is prohibited unless specifically authorized by the
135 instructor.

136

137 3. Students must not allow others to conduct research or prepare any work for them without
138 advance authorization from the instructor. This comment includes, but is not limited to, the
139 services of commercial term paper companies.

140

141 4. Students who are required to do a paper in a course should assume that submitting the same or
142 similar paper to different courses (regardless of whether it is in the same semester or in different
143 semesters) is not permitted without the explicit permission of the instructors of both courses.

144

145 B. FABRICATION

146

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

148

149 *Guidelines:*

150

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

155

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

159

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

163

164 C. FACILITATING ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

165

166 Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another to commit an act of academic
167 dishonesty.

168 *Guidelines:*

169

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

172

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

176

177 D. PLAGIARISM

178

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

181

182 • The act of incorporating the ideas, words, sentences, paragraphs, or parts thereof, or the specific
183 substance of another's work, without giving appropriate credit, and representing the product as
184 one's own work

185

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

188

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

191

192 *Guidelines:*

193

194 1. Direct Quotation: Every direct quote must be identified by quotation marks, or by appropriate
195 indentation or by other means of identification, and must be properly cited with author(s)
196 name(s), year of publication, page number(s), footnotes and/or endnotes, depending on the
197 citation style used. Proper citation style for academic writing is outlined by such manuals as the
198 MLA handbook for writers of research papers, APA: Publication manual of the American
199 Psychological Association, or Chicago manual of style

200

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

206

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

210

211 4. Material which contributes only to the student's general understanding of the subject may be
212 acknowledged in the bibliography and need not be immediately cited. One citation is usually
213 sufficient to acknowledge indebtedness when a number of connected sentences in the paper draw
214 their special information from one source. When direct quotations are used, however, quotation
215 format must be used and prompt acknowledgment is required.

CSUSM Academic Senate Meeting Schedule 2004/05

Academic Senate

(Regular meetings begin at 1:15 p.m. and run approximately 2 hours.)

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 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.

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

FAC Subcommittee on Student Evaluation of Instruction¹
Kathy Norman (Chair), Bettina Huber, Gabriela Sonntag, Marie Thomas

In Spring 2002, FAC charged our Subcommittee with reviewing current procedures for the evaluation of instruction at Cal State San Marcos and with recommending revisions in both existing processes for the evaluation of instruction and the student evaluation instrument.

We began our work by thoroughly reviewing the literature 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 identified. We also had a morning-long briefing with Jennifer Franklin, who has done extensive work on the use of course evaluations.

Our initial review of best practices led us to undertake three initiatives:

1. Develop new procedures for administering the current evaluation form in an effort to encourage students to take the evaluation process seriously.
2. Formulate a new policy governing the use of student evaluation data in personnel reviews.
3. Explore the possibility of devising a new evaluation form.

Our draft procedures for administering evaluations were revised by the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate last Spring and subsequently approved by the Senate as a whole. The new procedures have been in use since Fall 2003.

In the light of the CBA requirement that faculty who teach shall be formally evaluated on a regular basis, we sought feedback from various academic units late in Fall 2002 on two options: (1) use of student evaluation data primarily for performance appraisal and personnel decisions (summative evaluation) or (2) development of a student evaluation form that is appropriate for both personnel decisions **and** the improvement of courses (formative evaluation). Our call for feedback noted that pursuing the second option might well involve changing some of the campus's current procedures. In particular, the literature on best practices we reviewed suggests that only the general evaluative items included in dual-purpose forms should be made available to those involved in performance appraisal and personnel decisions. The remaining information collected, including open-ended responses, goes directly to instructors for use in improving their courses.

The feedback we received from faculty members was varied, but suggested that most were open to the second option we proposed. With the aid of item sets compiled by an array of other institutions, we carefully reviewed more than 150 potential questions and developed a new form with both general evaluative items and more specific items designed to help instructors improve courses. Development of the new form was guided by the following best practices identified in the literature: include both general and specific items; tailor some items to specific courses; allow space for open-ended responses; and focus on student characteristics that make a difference (e.g., interest in a course). We also decided early on to retain the one-page format of the current form.

¹ 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.

In the process of identifying items for inclusion in a new evaluation form, we examined interrelationships among the items currently in use. We explored 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 four general items, 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 0.77 -- it appears that the specific items currently in use add very little information that cannot be gleaned from students' ratings on the general items.

The new form, which is attached, 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, while Parts B and C of the first section contain more specific items useful to instructors interested in strengthening their courses. The items in Part B will vary, depending on the type of course being evaluated. We have distinguished between six distinct types: "regular" courses (the default), small seminar courses, laboratory/discussion sections, research-based/service learning courses, teaching methods courses, and on-line courses. Although the first three items included in the item sets for distinct course types are identical,² the remainder differ. The inclusion of items tailored to different courses should provide information particularly relevant for the improvement of these specific courses.

The new form should not require a change in the format of the summary sheets currently provided to instructors. Although most of the items summarized would be different, instructors would still receive a detailed break-down of students' responses to individual questions, as well as their responses to the questions in Part II of the form (Information on Students). Comparative data would continue to be provided, with all comparisons limited to the type of course in question (e.g., small seminars, lab/discussion sections, etc.). Insofar as the number of evaluations for given course types is sufficiently large, information would also be presented for the comparison groups currently used by each College. Instructors would continue to receive copies of students' written-in comments.

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. Thus, we are now recommending that the proposed new instrument, which has been revised in the light of comments from groups in all three Colleges, be adopted for a three year period, after which its efficacy will be evaluated.

To ensure that our practices are congruent with current research-based recommendations on student evaluation of instruction, we are also recommending that the evaluation data received by RTP and other personnel committees be limited to student responses to the five core summative items in Section 1A of the new form.³ One important reason for this recommendation is that instructors are more likely to benefit

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

³ Instructors would receive separate reports for inclusion in WPAF files.

from and constructively use the information provided on the course evaluation forms if they can consider it free of the often extreme anxiety that its use in the personnel process evokes. In addition, the literature on the evaluation of instruction points clearly to the importance of using multiple types of evidence to evaluate teaching, at least in part to prevent any single type of evidence (i.e., course evaluations) from being given undue weight. It is our hope that limiting the amount of student evaluation data required for the WPAF will encourage everyone to provide and examine a wider array of evidence of teaching effectiveness.

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.⁴ 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 instruction, 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 instruction.
- Use student rating data as only one source of data about effective instruction.
- 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.

⁴ "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).

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: _____

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

Strongly Strongly Not
Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Disagree Applic.

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. 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	C5. 0 1 2 3 4 5
C2. 0 1 2 3 4 5	C6. 0 1 2 3 4 5
C3. 0 1 2 3 4 5	C7. 0 1 2 3 4 5
C4. 0 1 2 3 4 5	C8. 0 1 2 3 4 5

(o v e r)

2. Information on Students

A. Is this course a requirement for your major/degree program? 1. Yes 2. No

B. Are you taking this course to fulfill a GE requirement? 1. Yes 2. No

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
5. 8-9 hours
4. 6-7 hours
3. 4-5 hours
2. 2-3 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 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 |

3. 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?

B. Course-Specific Questions

B1. Regular classes (default)

- a. I understood the course objectives and requirements early in the term.
- b. Graded work (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor readily met with and helped me outside of class.
- d. The instructor seemed well-prepared for each class.
- e. The instructor's presentations added to my understanding of the material.
- f. The instructor was sensitive to student difficulties with the lecture material.
- g. Insofar as possible, the instructor acknowledged all questions.

B2. Small seminar-type classes (no more than 20 students)

- a. I understood the course objectives and requirements early in the term.
- b. Graded work (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor readily met with and helped me outside of class.
- 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.

B3. Laboratory/Discussion Sections

- a. I understood the course objectives and requirements early in the term.
- b. Graded work (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor readily met with and helped me outside of class.
- 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.

B4. Research-based/Service Learning Courses (e.g., senior experience, qualitative field research)

- a. I understood the course objectives and requirements early in the term.
- b. Graded work (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor readily met with and helped me outside of class.
- 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.

Course-specific Questions cont'd.

B5. Teaching Methods Courses (CoE)

- a. I understood the course objectives and requirements early in the term.
- b. Graded work (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- c. The instructor readily met with and helped me outside of class.
- 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.

B6. On-Line Courses

- a. I understood the course objectives and requirements early in the term.
- b. Graded work (e.g., exams, papers, projects, etc.) contributed positively to my learning experiences in this course.
- 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.
- h. The instructor responded when I asked for individual help.

Note: item A4 in the Core Questions section may need to be dropped for on-line courses.

Last revised: 3/28/04



MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 24, 2004

TO: Dick Montanari
Chair, Academic Senate

FROM: Karen S. Haynes
President

SUBJECT: Parking

Attached are responses to both Academic Senate resolutions regarding parking which were forwarded to my office on March 8, 2004. I hope that you will consider these sincere and best attempts at responding to the imminent parking crisis as well as a plan to review anticipated future needs, account for changes which will take place this summer, and adequately provide parking access for all of our constituencies.

KSH/sq

cc: Robert Sheath
Stephen Garcia
Linda Leiter

Attachment



*Linda Leiter
Associate Vice President
Human Relations and Campus Enterprises
California State University San Marcos
San Marcos, California 92096-0001 USA
Tel: (760) 750-4954; Fax: (760) 750-4949
lleiter@csusm.edu
www.csusm.edu*

MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 24, 2004
TO: Karen S. Haynes
President
FROM: Linda Leiter
Associate Vice President
Human Relations and Campus Enterprises
SUBJECT: Parking

Below are responses to the resolutions passed by the Academic Senate regarding parking at Cal State San Marcos.

Resolution regarding students receiving faculty/staff parking permits:

1. The CFO/Vice President for Finance and Administrative Services will send a memo to all campus departments reminding them that faculty/staff parking permits are only available to faculty and staff who are hired under a bargaining unit agreement. Student workers are not eligible for a faculty/staff parking permit even if they are working for a department part time.
2. Parking Services will continue to request verification of employment status prior to selling faculty/staff parking permits. This is handled through checking faculty/staff identification cards, through the SNAPPY process, or through verification of employment status by Human Resources. (Many new faculty/staff employees are securing their faculty/staff identification card at the same time that they are purchasing their faculty/staff parking permit.)

Resolution regarding parking issues for faculty/staff:

1. With the move of employees from Rancheros and San Marcos City Hall this spring, existing parking spaces allocated for employees at these off site locations will be re-established in Lot N on campus. Therefore, seventy to eighty-five parking spaces (exact number to be determined) in Lot N will be designated for faculty/staff. Parking Services will be working on the temporary marking of these spaces through the rest of spring semester. Permanent marking of these designated spaces will occur over the summer.

2. Credential students in the College of Education will begin student teaching assignments after spring break which will decrease the impact on general parking lots on campus.
3. The move of Rancheros employees back to campus is slightly behind schedule. It now appears that the majority of the Rancheros employees will not be moved until after May 1. This will occur toward the end of spring semester and should not have a major impact on parking at this time.
4. I have contacted Sam Strafaci at the Chancellor's Office who will contact the statewide CFA and CSEA to see if they are willing to support the negotiating of a side agreement regarding parking fees at Cal State San Marcos.

Long term solutions:

1. Lots X, Y and Z were completed in fall 2003 which allowed the designation of 992 spaces to students who paid higher fees to fund the construction of these lots.
2. Lot K (next to University Village) will be completed in June 2004. This lot will provide 257 spaces designated to student residents in University Village. The completion of this lot will allow the return of 202 spaces in Lot N and 55 spaces in Lot O to general parking.
3. During Summer 2004, reconfiguration of several lots will occur that will enable the moving of some disabled and carpool spaces from Lot E to Lot C. The exact number of spaces is still being determined.
4. Reinstating a campus shuttle or campus-based stack parking is being reviewed. A limited trial may occur for Fall 2004.
5. The 120 space parking lot next to the new business building will be a general parking lot and may be open as early as Fall 2005.
6. One more surface lot and the first parking structure are being planned for the future. The exact number of spaces and timing of construction depends on parking being able to fund these endeavors from existing revenues and reserves.

Please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

C: Stephen G. Garcia
Robert Sheath
Dora Knoblock

CURRICULUM TRACKING
Academic Year 2003-04

Curric. & Sched. No.	Course Prefix	Course Number	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
19	BUS	304	Data Analysis	C-2	Change	Robert Aboolian	2/12/04	2/17/04	2/17/04	Approved	3/16/04
64	EDMX	532A	Technology and Communication - Special Populations	D	Deletion	Kathy Hayden	10/17/03	11/17/04	11/17/03	Approved	3/16/04
118	HTM	302	Foundations of Operations Management	C-2	Change	Robert Aboolian	2/12/04	2/17/04	2/17/04	Approved	3/16/04
121	HTM	305	Operations Management	C-2	Change	Robert Aboolian	2/12/04	2/17/04	2/17/04	Approved	3/16/04
130	LING	301B	Introduction to Linguistics	C	New	Jule Gomez de Garcia	3/15/04	3/16/04	3/16/04	Approved	3/23/04
153	LTWR	431	U.S. Environmental Literature	C	New	Lance Newman	4/22/03	11/17/03	11/17/03	Approved	3/16/04
166	MATH	480	Introduction to Optimization	C-2	Change	Andre Kundgen	4/3/03	11/17/03	11/17/03	Approved	3/23/04
170	MUSC	304	Recording Techniques	C-2	Change	Bil Bradbury	3/15/04	3/16/04	3/16/04	Approved	3/23/04
172	PE	203	Physical Education for Elementary School Children	C-2	Change	Stephen Nichols	3/15/04	3/16/04	3/16/04	Approved	3/23/04

ELEMENTARY SUBJECT MATTER PREPARATION CERTIFICATE (ESMPC)

Another pathway to careers in K-8 teaching is provided through the Elementary Subject Matter Preparation Certificate (ESMPC). This certificate is designed for prospective teachers who choose a Major other than Liberal Studies. Students may select and complete any Major offered at CSUSM, and concurrently complete the coursework for the certificate. The ESMPC prescribes a particular pathway through most of the General Education requirements of the bachelor's degree, and it prescribes additional coursework to ensure breadth of study across disciplines. In many cases, depending upon the Major selected by the student, the ESMPC and Major may be completed within the normal total of 120 units for the Bachelor of Arts degree. (Students should consult a Liberal Studies Advisor for specific guidance on how to combine the certificate with various Majors.)

The ESMPC helps students to strengthen their grasp of the core subject matter areas of the K-8 curriculum and prepare themselves for passage of the CSET. The certificate confers formal recognition that the student has completed the full breadth of ESM coursework needed for effective elementary-level instruction. The certificate demonstrates that the student's expertise in the subject matter areas extends beyond the minimum standard indicated by passage of a standardized test.

The ESMPC is awarded at time of graduation to students who have completed all certificate coursework along with any Major degree program. All courses applied to the certificate must be completed with a grade "C" or better. Coursework applied to the certificate may also be applied to fulfill Major, Minor, and GE requirements.

Course Requirements of the ESMPC

		Units	
History & Social Science (HSS)			
World History to 1500	HIST 201	3	(LDGE C2)
US History 1500-1865	HIST 130	3	(LDGE D6)
World & Regional Geography	GEOG 201 Or GEOG 302	3	(LDGE D)
California History	HIST 347	3	
Multicultural Studies	ID 340, or SOC 311, or SOC 313 or WMST 301	3	UDGE DD UDGE CC
Mathematics (MATH)			
Math for Elementary Teaching I	MATH 210	3	
Math for Elementary Teaching II	MATH 212	3	(LDGE B4)
Mathematics for K-8 Teaching	MATH 311	3	
Science (SCI)			
Physical Science	GES 105	3	(LDGE B1)
Life Science (w/ lab)	GES 102	3	(LDGE B2)

Earth Science	ES 100	3	
Reading, Language, & Literature (RLL)			
Introduction to Literature	LTWR 100	3	(LDGE C2)
OR one of the following: LTWR 208A, 208B, 210			
Syntax and Grammar	LING 100	3	
American Linguistics	LING 300	3	
Visual & Performing Arts (VPA)			
Introduction to interdisciplinary Arts	VPA 101	3	(LDGE C1)
Or one of the following: DNCE 120, MUSC 120, TA 120, VSAR 120			
Any VPA Studio Course**		3	
**See an advisor for recommended studio courses. Examples include:			
DNCE 201, 301, 320, 390;			
MUSC 302, 390, 391, 392, 394, 395, 480;			
TA 301, 401, 480, 489;			
VPA 321;			
VSAR 302, 303, 480			
Human Development (HD)			
Introduction to Developmental Psychology	PSYCH 210	3	(LDGE D7)
Physical Education (PE)			
PE for Elementary Teachers	PE 203	3	(LDGE E)
Total Units for the Certificate		54	

**TIMETABLE FOR PERIODIC EVALUATION AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW
2004/05**

REVIEW	WPAF due	Pre-review for completeness		Candidate adds requested material no later than	Peer Review Committee Review		Candidate picks up recommendation no later than	End of rebuttal/response period *	End of PRC response period **	Dean Review		Candidate picks up recommendation no later than	End of rebuttal/response period *	End of Dean's response period **	P&T Committee Review		Candidate picks up recommendation no later than	End of rebuttal/response period *	End of P&T Committee response period **	President or President's Designee Review		
	Begin	End	Begin		End	Begin				End	Begin				End	Begin				Decision		
Periodic Evaluation (typically 1st, 3rd, and 5th year)	JAN 13	JAN 14	JAN 25	FEB 02	FEB 03	MAR 02	MAR 10	MAR 17	MAR 25	MAR 28	APR 22	MAY 02	MAY 09	MAY 17	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2nd Year Retention	SEP 07	SEP 08	SEP 16	SEP 24	SEP 27	OCT 15	OCT 25	NOV 01	NOV 09	NOV 10	NOV 30	DEC 08	DEC 15	DEC 23	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	JAN 03	FEB 15	
2nd Year Retention w/ optional Tenure and/or Promotion	Use above timeline for 2nd Year Retention and continue with the following P&T Committee/President schedule:														FEB 14	MAR 25	APR 11	APR 18	APR 26	APR 27	TENURE JUN 01	
																					PROMO JUN 15	
3rd thru 5th Year Retention (typically 4th year)	SEP 20	SEP 21	SEP 29	OCT 07	OCT 08	NOV 12	NOV 22	NOV 29	DEC 07	DEC 08	JAN 19	JAN 27	FEB 03	FEB 11	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	FEB 14	JUN 01	
3rd thru 5th Year Retention w/ optional Tenure and/or Promotion	SEP 20	SEP 21	SEP 29	OCT 07	OCT 08	NOV 12	NOV 22	NOV 29	DEC 07	DEC 08	JAN 19	JAN 27	FEB 03	FEB 11	FEB 14	MAR 25	APR 11	APR 18	APR 26	APR 27	RET/TEN JUN 01	
																					PROMO JUN 15	
Tenure and/or Promotion Review	SEP 20	SEP 21	SEP 29	OCT 07	OCT 08	NOV 12	NOV 22	NOV 29	DEC 07	DEC 08	JAN 19	JAN 27	FEB 03	FEB 11	FEB 14	MAR 25	APR 11	APR 18	APR 26	APR 27	TENURE JUN 01	
																					PROMO JUN 15	

Holidays/Breaks:
 Labor Day: Sep 06
 Thanksgiving: Nov 25-27
 Winter Holiday/Break: Dec 24 - Jan 11
 M L King Jr.'s Birthday: Jan 17
 Spring Break: Mar 28 to Apr 02

* Candidate may submit a rebuttal/response within 7 days of receipt of the recommendation or by the end date listed on timeline - whichever comes first.
 ** Reviewing committee/administrator may submit response to a candidate's rebuttal within seven days or by the end date listed on timeline - whichever comes first.