NEAC Recommendations to the Acadaemic Senate
April 9, 2008

Committee	Seat (#)	Term	Recommendation(s)
Arts & Lectures Advisory Committee	At large	Spr. '08	Judy Bauerlein

Curriculum for Consent Calendar
April 9, 2008

Curric. & Sched. No.	Course Prefix	Course Number	New Course #	Course/Program Title	Form	Type Action	Proposal Originator	Rec'd by Curr.& Sched.	C&S Sent to Senate	AS Sent to UCC	UCC Action	Action Date
	BIOL	503L		Genomics and Proteomics Laboratory	C	New	Matthew Escobaar	2/19/08	3/17/08	3/17/08	Approved	4/7/08
1	NURS	496		Special Topics in Nursing	C-2	Change	Judy Papenhausen	3/17/08	3/17/08	3/17/08	Approved	3/17/08

<center>**Assessment Fellow Resolution**</center>

1
2
3 WHEREAS, Academic excellence and educational equity are two of CSUSM's strategic
4 goals; and
5
6 WHEREAS, CSUSM promises a high quality education for all students and assessing
7 student learning is one way to ensure that we reach this goal; and
8
9 WHEREAS, WASC was informed that Cal State San Marcos would have Student
10 Learning Outcome assessment as one of three pillars of our WASC review; and
11
12 WHEREAS, Assessment and creating a culture of accountability are parts of a national
13 movement and higher education is poised to be next in line for "No Child Left Behind";
14 and
15
16 WHEREAS, The curriculum is the purview of the Faculty and Faculty should provide the
17 leadership for curriculum-related matters such as assessment; and
18
19 WHEREAS, It is important to have standards and consistency of Student Learning
20 Outcomes across the entire university; and
21
22 WHEREAS, The Chancellor's Office has new forms for proposing new programs (P-
23 forms) which require Student Learning Outcomes at program and course level; and
24
25 WHEREAS, Cal State San Marcos needs to have a resource on campus where assessment
26 information is gathered in a central place to which departments can go; and
27
28 WHEREAS, Support to provide a foundation for assessment activities was received from
29 Peggy Maki, but the need exists for additional assessment support from a resident expert;
30 and
31
32 WHEREAS, Cal State San Marcos has a positive history of other Faculty Fellows
33 including the eLearning Faculty Fellow, the Faculty Mentoring Program Faculty Fellow,
34 and the Peer Coaching Faculty Fellow; now, therefore, be it
35
36 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate supports the Program Assessment Committee in
37 requesting an Assessment Fellow as described in the attached; and be it further
38
39 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate recommends that the Provost set aside funding
40 for this Faculty Assessment Fellow.
41

42 **Learning Outcomes/Assessment Fellow Job Description**
43 3/6/08
44
45 The Learning Outcomes/Assessment Faculty Fellow will support campus efforts to
46 demonstrate student achievement and to identify opportunities for improvement of
47 student learning. The Faculty Fellow will work collaboratively with a wide range of
48 campus constituencies as they prepare and deliver a plan for the assessment of student
49 learning. Reports to the Associate Vice-President for Academic Programs and, for
50 Graduate Programs, to the Dean of Graduate Programs and Research.
51 Specific Job Responsibilities:
52
53 1. Serve as a consultant to departments and programs to assist programs in continued
54 development and refinement of program level SLOs.
55
56 2. Serve as a consultant to departments and programs to develop assessment plans and
57 use assessment data in program planning, particularly with programs undergoing program
58 review.
59
60 3. Attend conferences and monitor and disseminate literature regarding assessment.
61
62 4. Assist faculty through on-going workshops and meetings relative to SLOs, assessment
63 and use of data for course and program planning.
64
65 5. Establish and maintain a virtual library to give faculty access to assessment tools (e.g.,
66 sample SLO's, rubrics, assessment plans).
67
68 6. Identify and submit information for the Assessment web page.
69
70 7. Archive campus assessment activities.
71
72 8. Participate in appropriate committee activities associated with assessment, such as
73 PAC.
74
75 9. Prepare annual reports for the Academic Senate to document progress.
76
77 Term would be for two years with option for one year extension.
78 Recommend three course releases for first year, and two every subsequent year.

Resolution in Support of the Foundational Tenets
of the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning Process

1
2
3
4
5 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate is the official representative body of the faculty on issues of
6 governance; and
7
8 WHEREAS, The Academic Senate provides an avenue for expression on matters of academic
9 concern to the University faculty; and
10
11 WHEREAS, Academic Affairs delivers the core mission of the University; and
12
13 WHEREAS, The Foundational Tenets of the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning Process
14 [Foundational Tenets] address issues of importance to the Academic Senate; and
15
16 WHEREAS, Representatives of the Budget and Long Range Planning Committee of the
17 Academic Senate have actively participated in the formulation of the Foundational Tenets; and
18
19 WHEREAS, Faculty members have participated in providing important feedback during the
20 formation of the Foundational Tenets; and
21
22 WHEREAS, The Foundational Tenets address topics that are directly related to the work of
23 Senate committees; and
24
25 WHEREAS, Developing the academic culture of the University benefits from a shared
26 commitment to the future through a stated vision, mission, core values, and goals; and
27
28 WHEREAS, The Foundational Tenets will provide a common framework to the University in the
29 pursuit of academic excellence; now, therefore, be it
30
31 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate expects the Academic Affairs Strategic Planning
32 Process to set University priorities and resource allocation; and be it further
33
34 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate expects ongoing faculty involvement in the
35 development of the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan; and be it further
36
37 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate expects the Foundational Tenets will drive the
38 Academic Affairs Planning Process; and be it further
39
40 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate supports the Foundational Tenets if the University
41 provides sufficient resources for implementation of the Academic Affairs Strategic Plan.

ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

VISION

CSUSM is a dynamic university with a global vision. Guided by a perspective that transcends borders, Academic Affairs serves the University community by creating a culture of academic excellence that fosters diversity, promotes innovation and sustains intellectual excitement.

Through shared leadership, Academic Affairs

- Challenges intellectual, geographic and technological boundaries.
- Engages students as active participants in their education.
- Empowers every member of the academic community to contribute fully to the vision with passion and purpose.
- Supports active scholars, artists and practitioners as they create effective teaching-learning pathways.
- Expands University engagement with community, business and institutional partners.
- Establishes CSUSM as the university of first choice for students.

MISSION STATEMENT

Academic Affairs prepares students to be life-long learners and productive contributors to a global society by helping them acquire knowledge and develop skills and values.

CORE VALUES

Academic Affairs upholds the University's core values:

- Intellectual Engagement: learning, teaching, discovery, and application of knowledge

- Community: shared commitments to service, teamwork, and partnership

- Integrity: respect, honesty, trust, fairness, academic freedom and responsibility

- Innovation: creativity, openness to change, flexibility, responsiveness, and future focus

- Inclusiveness: individual and cultural diversity, and multiple perspectives

More specifically, the core values that drive our approach to decision making, problem solving, and resource allocation are:

- All students are given the opportunity to reach their full academic/educational potential through the CSUSM academic/educational experience.

- Research and creative activity are essential to high quality teaching.

- High quality teaching is essential to high quality learning.

- Students are active participants in the learning process.

- Learning is transferable into multiple real world settings.

GOALS

- Create and implement innovative approaches and programs that add value to our diverse communities.

- Expand learning opportunities bridging theory and practice.

- Develop relationships that connect CSUSM to external communities and organizations.

- Support faculty research and creative activity to create a community of scholars that collaborates with a community of learners.

CSUSM Academic Senate Meeting Schedule 2008/09

Academic Senate
(Unless otherwise noted, meetings are held in COM 206, begin at 1 p.m., and run until approximately 2:50 p.m.)

Fall 2008

August 21	Convocation (Time/Location TBD)
	New Senator Orientation (2:15 - 3:30 p.m. – Location TBD)
September 3	Senate Meeting
October 1	Senate Meeting
November 5	Senate Meeting
December 3	Senate Meeting

Spring 2009

January 15	Spring Assembly (9 – 10:30 a.m. – location TBD)
February 4	Senate Meeting
March 4	Senate Meeting
April 8	Senate Meeting
April 22	Senate Meeting
May 6	Joint Senate Meeting (with newly elected 09/10 Senators)

Executive Committee
(The EC meets from 12 - 2 p.m. in KEL 5207. On Senate meeting days, the EC meets from 12 – 12:50 p.m. in COM 206.)

Fall 2008

August 19 Planning Meeting (11:30 a.m. – 3:30 p.m. – Location TBD)
August 27
September 3, 10, 17, 24
October 1, 8, 15, 22, 29
November 5, 12, 19
December 3

Spring 2009

January 21, 28
February 4, 11, 18, 25
March 4, 11, 18, 25 *(Spring Break is March 30 – April 4)*
April 8, 15, 22, 29
May 6

All members of the 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 subject to the Brown Act. The decision to allow press/public into an Academic Senate meeting may be made by the Senate.

Approved by the Senate Executive Committee on February 6, 2008.

A Resolution in Support of Student Efforts to Lobby for a Fully Funded CSU
Authored by Senator Felipe R. Zañartu (ASI Representative)

Whereas   The governors budget has projected a 10% cut across the board which includes but is not limited to the California State University (CSU); and

Whereas   The CSU is facing a budget cut of approximately 386.1 million dollars which may cut into important university elements which include but are not limited to academic instruction, student support services, and administrative support; and,

Whereas   The California State Student Association (CSSA), System Wide Academic Senate (ASCSU), CSU Employees Union (CSUEU), and The California Faculty Association (CFA) have all pledged to unite efforts to lobby against the cuts that would drastically affect the CSU; and,

Whereas   CSSA is having its annual lobby day and a rally in Sacramento on April 21st 2008 against the cuts given to the CSU as proposed by the Governor; therefore be it,

Resolved   The Academic Senate CSUSM endorses students to participate in official Lobby efforts by the CSU which include the rally in April sponsored by CSSA; and further be it,

Resolved   The Academic Senate will suggest that professors give students an excused absence without penalty to those who participate in official lobby efforts and have proof, which will be provided by Associated Students Inc. and/or the CSSA; and finally be it,

Resolved   That copies of this Resolution be distributed widely, including, but not limited to, President Karen Haynes, CSUSM Professors, Adjunct Faculty, CFA, the Academic Senate CSU, California State Student Association (CSSA), CSU Associated Students, and the University of California Student Association.

RATIONALE
        Associated Students Inc. in conjunction with the CSSA and other segments in the CSU want students to engage in the political process to encourage civic engagement and co-curricular activity. The end goal is to provide a fully funded system that includes a stabilization of fees. In order to do this, there must be active participation from all sectors of the CSU which includes but is not limited to: the Students, Faculty, Staff, and Administration. The resolution is NOT intended to give students a day off, but get them actively engaged about what it means to be a stakeholder in this institution. Students that participate in the lobby day will be educated about the political process and will gain a deeper understanding of the university and be empowered to be lifelong leaders in the State of California.

Resolution: Graduate Studies: Concurrent Master's Degree Credit

WHEREAS, An undergraduate student who applies to a CSUSM master's program must complete the requirements for a baccalaureate degree before admission to a CSUSM master's program; and

WHEREAS, There are occasions in which a CSUSM undergraduate student does not complete the requirements for a baccalaureate degree, as planned, in the term before gaining admission to a CSUSM master's program; and

WHEREAS, According to past practice, a CSUSM undergraduate student in these circumstances may request concurrent master's degree credit before gaining admission to a CSUSM master's program; and

WHEREAS, Concurrent master's degree credit allows a CSUSM undergraduate student to complete the requirements for a baccalaureate degree while enrolled in CSUSM master's degree courses. These master's course units may count toward a CSUSM master's degree in a program that admits the student; and

WHEREAS, Our campus has not officially instituted guidelines for requesting and approving concurrent master's degree credit; and

WHEREAS, The Academic Policies Committee (APC) recommend that a policy for concurrent master's degree credit be established; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate recommends adoption of the attached Concurrent Master's Degree Credit policy.

GRADUATE STUDIES: CONCURRENT MASTER'S DEGREE CREDIT

Definition: This policy defines the guidelines and requirements for undergraduate students to request concurrent master's degree credit and the process for approving such requests.

Authority: Academic Affairs

Scope: The purpose of this policy is to establish guidelines and requirements for undergraduate students to request concurrent master's degree credit and the process for approving such requests.

A CSUSM undergraduate student who has not completed the requirements of the baccalaureate prior to enrolling in a CSUSM master's program may request concurrent master's degree credit for graduate level courses.

I.   Stipulations for Requesting Concurrent Credit

An undergraduate student may request concurrent master's degree credit provided that the following conditions are met:

  A. 1.   The student has a current graduation application for a baccalaureate degree on file with the Office of Registration and Records.

        2.   The student submits a University Graduate Student Application form for a Master's Program for a term subsequent to the term in which the bachelor's degree is to be earned.

  B. The student is within 12 units of completing a baccalaureate degree <u>and</u> in the final semester of baccalaureate studies as specified in the graduation application.

II.   Approval Process

  The following steps must be undertaken to approve and grant a request:

  A. The Graduate Coordinator of the Master's program for which the master's degree credit will be applied must approve the request.

  B. An approved request must be submitted to the Office of Registration and Records by the third week of the semester in which the concurrent master's degree credit will be earned.

III.   Limitations

  A. Concurrent master's degree credit may only be granted for the semester in which the requirements for the undergraduate degree are completed. If a student does not complete the requirements for ~~concurrent master's credit in the final semester of~~ the baccalaureate degree ~~studies~~, any completed master's level units will become ~~remain at the~~ undergraduate units ~~level~~.

  B. Only 500- or 600-level courses will be considered for master's degree credit. Concurrent master's credit cannot be counted toward both undergraduate and graduate degrees.

  C. Total concurrent master's degree credit may not exceed 9 units. Individual master's programs may make exceptions to this limit.

Note: Authorization for concurrent credit does not guarantee acceptance into a Master's program.

1	**Resolution on Impact of Budget on Instructional Rigor and Quality**
2	
3	
4	Whereas: The Academic Senate of CSUSM recognizes its responsibility as the
5	representative body of the faculty and that faculty have purview over the academic
6	quality of the credit granting courses offered by the University; and
7	
8	Whereas: The proposed budget cuts will likely necessitate a reduction in adjunct faculty
9	with no commensurate increase in permanent faculty resulting in increased workload for
10	remaining faculty; and
11	
12	Whereas; either an increase in faculty workload or class size will negatively affect rigor
13	and quality; and
14	
15	Whereas: Academic excellence and instructional quality are core values of CSUSM and
16	stated as a primary mission of the University; and
17	
18	Whereas: The faculty of the CSU and CSUSM has accommodated increases in workload
19	and class size over the past decade by working harder to maintain the rigor and quality in
20	all classes; and
21	
22	Whereas: The writing requirement, historically recognized as a unique quality
23	enhancement offered by CSUSM, may be a casualty of increases in faculty workload or
24	class size; and
25	
26	Whereas: Any further increase in class size will exceed many faculty members ability
27	and willingness to accommodate further; therefore, be it
28	
29	Resolved: That the Academic Senate of CSUSM encourage CSUSM faculty to protect
30	the rigor and quality of their classes by informing Department Chairs and Deans of the
31	limits of their ability and degree of their unwillingness to accommodate increased
32	workloads and larger class sizes; and be it further
33	
34	Resolved: That the Academic Senate of CSUSM urge campus administrators to do
35	everything in their power to protect the instructional rigor and quality of classes offered
36	at CSUSM by minimizing the impact of proposed budget cuts on instructional activities;
37	and be it further
38	
39	Resolved: That the Academic Senate of CSUSM recommends that the campus
40	administration commit to the principle that alternative sources of budget cuts will have
41	priority over increases in faculty workload or increases in class size when developing
42	strategies to cope with budget reductions.

I. ADHERENCE TO THE UNIVERSITY RTP POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

    A.   The College of Business Administration (CoBA) uses the same definitions, terms, and abbreviations as defined in the University RTP document.

    B.   Provisions of this document are to be implemented in conformity with University RTP policies and procedures; the CSU Collective Bargaining Agreement (CBA), Articles 13, 14, 15; and the University Policy on Ethical Conduct. The candidate should note, particularly, University procedures that provide guidance on the working personnel action file (WPAF) and describe the responsibilities of the candidate in the review process.

    C.   The CSUSM RTP document specifies a role of departments and chairs in the retention, tenure, and promotion policy in accordance with the CBA. In its present form, CoBA is organized into departments with designated department chairs who have administrative and program responsibilities. Thus, the College of Business Faculty have agreed that the standards set forth in this CoBA Retention, Tenure and Promotion Document provide the following:

        1.   The academic unit reviewing the candidate's file will be a department specific Peer Review Committee.

        2.   Whereas the CSUSM RTP document states that departments may specify standards for retention, tenure and promotion, CoBA Faculty designate the standards set forth in this document as the standard for all departments within CoBA until such time as departments wish to create separate standards.

        3.   Department chairs may make separate recommendations[1]. Such recommendations shall be forwarded to subsequent levels of review. If the chair makes a separate recommendation, he/she shall not participate as a member of the peer review committee (see University RTP policy; CBA Article 15.).

    D.   The College is guided also by the standards of American Association of Colleges and Schools of Business (AACSB), the international accrediting agency for schools of business

II. GUIDING PRINCIPLES

    A.   The performance areas that shall be evaluated include teaching, scholarship, and service. While there will be diversity in the contributions of faculty members to the University, CoBA recognizes that teaching, scholarship and service are all central to the institution; therefore, faculty members must submit a curriculum vita and narrative statements describing the summary of teaching, research and service for the review period. The faculty member must meet the minimum standards in each of the three areas.

    B.   Retention, tenure, and promotion decisions are made on the basis of the evaluation of individual performance. Candidates are responsible for 1) becoming familiar with the standards; 2) understanding the standards; 3) engaging in activities that meet the standards and 4) effectively communicating how they have met the standards.

    C.   Activities counted and assessed in one area of performance shall not be duplicated in any other area of performance evaluation.

    D.   Candidates for retention will show effectiveness in each area of performance and demonstrate progress toward meeting the tenure requirements in the areas of teaching, scholarship and service.

    E.   Candidates for the rank of associate professor require an established record of effectiveness in teaching, scholarship and service to the University.

---

[1] If a department chair makes a separate recommendation for one person, then separate recommendations must also be made for all people in the department who are undergoing RTP review in that cycle.

F.   Candidates for the rank of professor require, in addition to continued effectiveness, an established record of initiative and leadership in teaching, scholarship, and service to the University, the profession and the community. Promotion to the rank of professor will be based on the record of the individual since he/she was promoted to the rank of associate professor.

G.   The granting of tenure at any rank recognizes accomplishments and services performed by the faculty member during his/her career. The record must show sustained and continuous activities and accomplishments. The granting of tenure is an expression of confidence that the faculty member has both the commitment to and the potential for continued development and accomplishment throughout his/her career. Tenure will be granted only to individuals whose record meets the standards required to earn promotion to the rank at which the tenure will be granted.

H.   The recommending of early tenure (prior to the 6th year in rank) for assistant professors is considered an exception. An individual should have a minimum of three years of service at CSUSM. A positive recommendation requires that the candidate's record clearly exceeds the articulated standards for the granting of a tenure/promotion decision and that the record demonstrates a sustained level of accomplishment at CSUSM in all areas.

I.   Faculty who are hired at an advanced rank without tenure may apply for tenure after two years of service at CSUSM (i.e., in Fall of their third year at CSUSM). A positive recommendation requires that the candidate's record at CSUSM clearly demonstrates a continued level of accomplishment in all areas and, together with the candidate's previous record, is consistent with the articulated standards for the granting of tenure at the Faculty member's rank.

III.   STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR TEACHING

A.   For retention, tenure, and promotion, College faculty members are expected to demonstrate sustained effective teaching. "Effective teaching" is instructional activity in support of the College Mission and is demonstrated by information in the *teaching portfolio* section of the WPAF.

B.   "Teaching" includes instructional activity such as the following:

- classroom teaching
- laboratory teaching
- supervision of Senior Experience and Masters projects
- course development
- curriculum development
- program development
- pedagogical self-development
- supervision of student independent study
- student advising and counseling

C.   The teaching portfolio

A candidate's teaching performance shall be based on an evaluation of the entire teaching portfolio.

1.   The following documentation is *required*:

- University-approved student evaluation of teaching forms and summary and grade distributions for all classes taught (e.g. all sections of BUS 304)
- Representative syllabi for courses taught)

2.   The following documentation is *optional*:

108	• Other course instructional materials such as candidate-prepared cases and
109	assignments, handouts, and exams
110	• University-generated Grade Confirmation Reports in the courses for which student
111	evaluations of teaching are furnished (reports should not include student names or id
112	numbers).
113	• Written peer evaluations
114	• Documentation regarding course, curriculum, or program development
115	• Documentation regarding pedagogical innovations
116	• Documentation regarding pedagogical self-development
117	• Documentation regarding supervision of student independent study
118	• Documentation regarding student advising and counseling
119	• Additional summary information regarding grading
120	• Letters from former students (identified as solicited or unsolicited)
121	• Teaching awards
122	• Other items chosen by the faculty member

123
124   3.   Occasionally, candidates may conclude that their Student Evaluation of Teaching ratings
125 are not an accurate reflection of their teaching effectiveness. In these cases, candidates may believe that their peers
126 would be better able to evaluate their teaching effectiveness. Accordingly, candidates may obtain written peer
127 evaluation of their teaching, which they may submit as supplementary evidence of their teaching performance.

128
129   D.   Evaluative Criteria.

130
131   1.   Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor

132
133   At the Assistant Professor level, evidence of effective teaching that meets standards
134 includes but is not limited to: student evaluations that demonstrate classroom effectiveness for the types of courses
135 taught and, syllabi that clearly articulate course objectives and requirements and currency in the field, assignments
136 that help students accomplish the course objectives, and assessments that measure how successfully students
137 accomplish the course objectives.   While not required, evidence of teaching effectiveness may include
138 documentation of course, curriculum, or program development.

139
140   2.   Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor

141
142   As more experienced faculty, Associate Professors being considered for promotion to
143 Professor are held to a higher standard. Accordingly, to be rated *meets standards*, a candidate at the Associate
144 Professor level is expected to demonstrate leadership and initiative in curriculum related activities. These
145 activities include course, curriculum and program development, refinement and renewal. This is in addition to
146 documentation of continued teaching effectiveness (See Section III. D1). See also Section II. F.

147
148   3.   Retention

149
150   Candidates for retention are to include the required items for courses taught and
151 additional optional materials in their teaching portfolio to show evidence of efforts and effectiveness in teaching.
152 Because this is an evaluation intended to provide guidance, candidates will be assessed on their current teaching
153 performance as well as on efforts that have made to address prior performance feedback.

154
155   4.   Tenure

156
157   Candidates for tenure, at Associate and Full, who are not requesting a promotion in rank
158 must show evidence of effective teaching at CSUSM that meets standards appropriate for their rank as specified in
159 Sections III D1 and 2.

160
161 **IV.   STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR SCHOLARSHIP**
162

163   A.   For retention, tenure, and promotion, College faculty members are expected to engage in
164 scholarship and creative activity. The emphasis is on **quality** and **sustained** scholarship over the entire period of
165 the review.

167   1.   It is essential to the University's Mission that each faculty member demonstrate
168 continued commitment, dedication, and growth as a scholar. Faculty seeking promotion are expected to provide
169 evidence of a **continual** record of quality scholarship. In all cases, scholarship results in dissemination of that
170 knowledge or understanding beyond the classroom.

172   2.   Scholarship must be in the field of Business/Management or a related discipline and may
173 be basic, applied, integrative, and/or pedagogical. This policy is intended to be in-line with AACSB standards:
174 "Schools with a mix of undergraduate and graduate programs, but without doctoral programs, may have a balance
175 among basic scholarship, applied scholarship, and instructional development."

178   3.   Measurement of scholarly achievement will include evaluation by professional persons
179 in a position to assess the quality of the contribution to the candidate's discipline. Evidence of professional
180 evaluation includes, but is not limited to, acceptance of scholarly work by an academic peer reviewed publication
181 or acceptance of scholarly work by an editorial board of a practitioner-oriented publication. Scholarship needs to
182 be substantive. Reviewers consider factors such as single authorship, lead authorship, relative contribution to
183 multiple-authored pieces, and contribution of the work to the faculty member's field as evidence of substantive
184 work.

186   B.   Scholarship and evidence of scholarly activities include, but are not limited to:

188   1.   Category A:
189
190
- papers published or accepted for publication in peer reviewed or editorial-board reviewed journals recognized as reputable and of good quality .
191
192
- books or manuscripts published or accepted for publication as works that contribute new knowledge as demonstrated by professional and academic reviewers
193
194
- peer or editorial reviewed published book chapters of original material and original monographs

196   2.   Category B:
197
- papers published in refereed proceedings
198
199
- refereed paper presentations at professional meetings including abstracts published in proceedings
200
- invited papers presented at professional meetings
201
- published computer software
202
- published case studies
203
- .

205   3.   Category C: (only considered for retention decisions, however these items   may still be
206   included in the WPAF for all decisions)
207
- working papers
208
- submitted papers
209
- sponsored or contract research
210
- technical reports
211
- special recognition and awards for research

213   C.   Standards: The following standards are intended to be consistent with AACSB standards.

215   1.   Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor: The following paragraphs
216 (a and b) describe the research standards for a faculty member to be promoted from Assistant to Associate:

218   a.   Three items from Category A

220   b.   Three additional items from Categories A and/or B

222   2.   Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor: Candidates for a promotion from
223 Associate to Full professor must meet the standards of :
224   a.   Three items from Category A*

226   b.   Three additional items from Categories A and/or B*

228 *Only published items not considered in the last promotion may be considered.(Also see Section II. F.)

230   3.   Retention: Candidates for retention may include documentation from Category C (in
231 addition to A and B) to show effectiveness in performance and demonstrate progress toward meeting the tenure
232 requirements in the area of scholarship.

234   4.   Tenure: Candidates for tenure at Associate and Full who are not requesting a promotion
235 in rank must meet the scholarship standards for their current rank as specified in Sections IV. C. 1. and 2., and
236 have demonstrated a continual record of quality scholarship.

V.   STANDARDS AND CRITERIA FOR SERVICE ACTIVITIES

240   A.   For retention, tenure and promotion, College faculty members are expected to demonstrate a
241 sustained record of effective service contributions, both internally and externally.   Service activities will be
242 evaluated based on the quality of the service and its relevance to the College and University Missions. Each
243 faculty member is expected to participate in service activities; however, the appropriate mix and magnitude of
244 service will vary with the faculty member's rank. Assistant professors are expected to participate primarily in
245 internal service activities whereas Associate and Full professors are expected to participate in both internal and
246 external activities and in leadership roles. Attendance at meetings is expected but attendance alone is not
247 sufficient to demonstrate significant contribution. To demonstrate the quality and the effectiveness the candidates
248 should describe in the narrative their relative contribution and outcomes of the service activity. Where appropriate
249 the candidate will show the product or outcome.

251   B.   Service activities may include, but are not limited to the following:

253   1.   Internal Service Activities
254   a.   Department level activities
255   • program development
256   • curriculum development
257   • membership and offices held on committees or task forces
258   • leadership and/or administrative activities
259   • special assignments/initiatives
260   • student advising/mentoring
261   • faculty mentoring

263   b.   College level activities
264   • membership and offices held on committees or task forces
265   • governing groups
266   • leadership and/or administrative activities (e.g. department chairs,
267   program chairs, etc..)
268   • special assignments/initiatives
269   • student advising/mentoring
270   • faculty mentoring

272   c.   University level activities

273   •   membership and offices held on committees or task forces
274   •   governing groups
275   •   special assignments/initiatives
276
277   2.   External Service Activities
278
279   a.   Service in/to the profession and professional organizations
280   •   membership and offices held
281   •   committees, task forces and advisory boards
282   •   organizing conferences, workshops, and seminars
283   •   serving as referee, editor or advisor
284   •   special assignments
285
286   b.   Service in/to community organizations
287   •   membership and offices held
288   •   committees, task forces and advisory boards
289   •   organizing events and programs
290   •   special assignments
291
292   c.   Grati**s** Professional consulting
293
294   d.   Service awards and special recognition for service
295
296 C.   Standards
297
298   1.   Promotion from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor**:** Candidates for promotion
299 from Assistant to Associate Professor must provide evidence of effective internal service contributions. While
300 not required, external service contributions will be considered in the evaluation.
301
302   2.   Promotion from Associate Professor to Professor: Candidates for promotion from
303 Associate Professor to Professor must provide evidence of leadership in one or more service activities in addition
304 to demonstrating active participation in both internal and external service activities (see Section II. F).
305
306   3.   Retention: Candidates for retention must provide appropriate and effective evidence of
307 significant internal service. While not required, external service contribution will be considered
308 in the evaluation.
309
310   4**.**   Tenure: Candidates for tenure at Associate and Full who are not requesting a promotion
311 in rank must meet the service standards for their current rank as specified in Sections V. C1 and 2.

1   **Resolution: Graduate Studies: Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)**
2
3
4 WHEREAS, CSU Chancellor's Executive Order 665 specifies that each campus adopt a graduate
5 level Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) based on the following three
6 guidelines:
7
8   1. Campuses may require demonstration of writing proficiency as a condition for admission
9   to a graduate program.
10
11   2. Campuses shall require demonstration of writing proficiency prior to the award of a
12   graduate degree. The level of proficiency shall be no less than the level required for
13   GWAR certification at the baccalaureate level.
14
15   3. Campuses may require additional demonstration of advanced-level writing proficiency as
16   a condition for admission to a graduate program and/or award of the graduate degree.
17
18 WHEREAS, The CSUSM GWAR has been the same for both graduate and undergraduate
19 studies since its inception.
20
21 WHEREAS, It is the consensus of the Graduate Studies Committee (GSC), a committee
22 comprised of representatives from CSUSM graduate programs, that master's students should
23 demonstrate advanced-level writing proficiency prior to the award of the graduate degree; now,
24 therefore, be it
25
26 RESOLVED, That the Academic Senate endorse the attached procedures and rubric for
27 developing graduate program GWARs; and be it further
28
29 RESOLVED, That, the procedures shall serve as general guidelines for individual graduate
30 programs to develop and implement their respective GWAR.
31
32 _____
33
34 Definition: The Graduate Studies: Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR)
35 outlines the procedures for assessing master's student writing proficiency and the criteria for
36 each CSUSM master's program to determine that a master's student has met the GWAR.
37
38
39 Authority: Academic Affairs
40
41
42 Scope: The purpose of this policy is to fulfill the California State University
43   (CSU) Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) for
44   master's students.
45
46

GRADUATE STUDIES: GRADUATION WRITING ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT

1. This Graduation Writing Assessment Requirement (GWAR) applies to graduate students enrolled in master's programs.

2. The writing requirement must be completed before a graduate student advances to candidacy. A student may satisfy the graduate writing requirement in one of two ways.

   - an acceptable standardized test score, such as the Analytical Writing subtest of the Graduate Management Admissions Test (GMAT) or the Graduate Record Examinations (GRE).
   - a paper(s) that receive(s) a passing score as described in Point 5 below

3. The College/Department/Program from which the student will receive the graduate degree determines the manner by which a student satisfies or does not satisfy the graduate writing requirement.

4. The College/Department/Program from which the student will receive the graduate degree determines the passing score on standardized tests.

5. If a student is satisfying the graduate writing requirement through a submission of a paper(s), the student's writing should demonstrate graduate level skills in:

   - Style and Format
   - Mechanics
   - Content and organization
   - Integration and Critical Analysis

   The paper(s) will be scored using a rubric (1 - 4) in each of four areas: "I. Style and Format", "II. Mechanics", "III. Content and Organization", and "IV. Integration and Critical Analysis". The minimal acceptable combined score from all of the four (I-IV) sections is 10 points, with no scores of "1" on any section, resulting in a minimum of a 2.5 average for all sections. A master's program may establish a higher minimum average score for passing.

6. Each master's program will have a remediation protocol for admitted graduate students who do not satisfy the graduate writing requirement on their first attempt. Each master's program will specify the maximum number of attempts that students may be allowed to satisfy the GWAR.

7. Each master's program will file its respective GWAR and remediation protocol with the Office of Graduate Studies and Research (OGSR). Each master's program will provide the OGSR with annual aggregate student GWAR performance data.

89 **RUBRIC USED TO EVALUATE STUDENT SUBMISSIONS TO SATISFY THE GRADUATE**
90 **STUDIES GRADUATION WRITING ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENT.**

91 **I. Style and Format**

92 **4:** In addition to meeting the requirement for a "3," the paper consistently models the language and
93 conventions used in the scholarly/ professional literature appropriate to the student's discipline. The
94 manuscript would meet the guidelines for submission for publication in a peer reviewed journal in the
95 student's field of study.

96 **3:** While there may be minor errors, conventions for style and format are used consistently throughout the
97 paper. Demonstrates thoroughness and competence in documenting sources; the reader would have little
98 difficulty referring back to cited sources. Style and format contribute to the comprehensibility of the
99 paper. Suitably models the discipline's overall journalistic style.

100 **2:** The style and format are broadly followed, but inconsistencies are apparent. There is selection of less
101 suitable sources (non-peer reviewed literature, web information). Weak transitions and apparent logic
102 gaps occur between topics being addressed. The style may be difficult to follow so as to detract from the
103 comprehensibility of the manuscript.

104 **1:** While some discipline-specific conventions are followed, others are not. Paper lacks consistency of
105 style and/or format. It may be unclear which references are direct quotes and which are paraphrased.
106 Based on the information provided, the reader would have some difficulty referring back to cited sources.
107 Significant revisions would contribute to the comprehensibility of the paper.

108 **II. Mechanics**

109 **4:** In addition to meeting the requirements for a "3," the paper is essentially error free in terms of
110 mechanics. Writing flows smoothly from one idea to another. Transitions effectively establish a sound
111 scholarly argument and aid the reader in following the writer's logic.

112 **3:** While there may be minor errors, the paper follows normal conventions of spelling and grammar
113 throughout. Errors do not significantly interfere with topic comprehensibility. Transitions and
114 organizational structures such as subheadings are effectively used which help the reader move from one
115 point to another.

116 **2:** Grammatical conventions are generally used, but inconsistency and/or errors in their use result in
117 weak, but still apparent, connections between topics in the formulation of the argument. There is poor or
118 improper use of headings and related features to keep the reader on track within the topic. Effective
119 discipline-specific vocabulary is used.

120 **1-:** Frequent errors in spelling, grammar (such as subject/verb agreements and tense), sentence structure,
121 and/or other writing conventions make reading difficult and interfere with comprehensibility. There is
122 some confusion in the proper use of discipline-specific terms. Writing does not flow smoothly from point
123 to point; appropriate transitions are lacking.

124

III. Content and Organization

4: In addition to meeting the requirements for a "3," excels in the organization and representation of ideas related to the topic. Raises important issues or ideas which may not have been represented in the literature cited. Would serve as a good basis for further research on the topic.

3: Follows all requirements for the paper. Topic is carefully focused. Clearly outlines the major points related to the topic; ideas are logically arranged to present a sound scholarly argument. Paper is interesting and holds the reader's attention. Does a credible job summarizing related literature. General ideas are expanded upon in a logical manner thereby extending the significance of the work presented beyond a re-statement of known ideas.

2-: Ideas presented closely follow conventional concepts with little expansion and development of new directions. Certain logical connections or inclusion of specific topics related to the student's area of study may be omitted. Ideas and concepts are generally satisfactorily presented although lapses in logic and organization are apparent. The reader is suitably introduced to the topic being presented such that the relationship to the student's area of study is obvious.

1-: The paper is logically and thematically coherent, but is lacking in substantial ways. The content may be poorly focused or the scholarly argument weak or poorly conceived. Major ideas related to the content may be ignored or inadequately explored. Overall, the content and organization needs significant revision to represent a critical analysis of the topic.

IV. Integration and Critical Analysis

4: In addition to meeting the requirement of a "3," the document presents the current state of knowledge for the topic being addressed utilizing a diversity of opinions. These various, and possibly conflicting, opinions are presented in a balanced manner and seamlessly woven together to illustrate a complete grasp of the literature across multiple research approaches utilizing appropriate national and international peer-reviewed journals. Essential findings of multiple sources are accurately and concisely paraphrased, analyzed, and integrated. Original sources are clearly identified and correctly cited in both the body of the text and the reference section. Organizationally, smooth and effective transitions between topics lead the reader through an orderly discussion of the topic being addressed. The gaps in current knowledge are clearly identified and significant directions and approaches that fill these gaps are identified.

3: There are inconsistencies in the organization and logic of the presentation, but still clear analysis of the presented materials. While synthesis of all aspects of the topic may show varying degrees of development, the overall consistency, thoroughness, and analysis result in a well-crafted document.

2: Identification of key topics or uncertainties in the field may be incomplete. New concepts resulting from a synthetic presentation of ideas is poorly developed or lacking. Complex topics and related concepts are awkwardly presented and linkages among topics may be unclear.

1: Weakness is evident in the coverage of the field and analysis resulting in incorrect or poorly developed synthesis of results. Analysis is limited to categorizing and summarizing topics. The resulting manuscript degrades the comprehensibility of the document and the identification of knowledge gaps.