

President's Award for Teaching 2008-2009

Purpose of Award:

The President of CSU San Marcos has initiated this award to encourage further innovation in teaching among the faculty. The award seeks to recognize and reward faculty whose introduction of new and innovative techniques, methodologies, exercises, methods of delivery, or technologies in teaching engage students and produce a significant impact on their ability to learn and retain knowledge.

Eligibility:

All current faculty members are eligible for nomination.

Nomination Process:

Faculty are nominated by currently enrolled students for this award.

Students nominating a professor submit a letter to the committee through the staff liaison (cbonomo@csusm.edu).

1. The letter should discuss the innovation in teaching. What was new or different about the faculty member's teaching methodology, techniques or delivery?
2. The letter should describe how this innovation contributed to the student's ability to learn.
3. The letter should describe how the innovation in teaching helped the student to retain the lessons learned.

The University and Associated Students shall publish a request for student nominations of faculty for this award. Faculty members are also encouraged to contact students who may wish to nominate them. Students must nominate by the deadline (November 9) in the form of a detailed letter that addresses the innovation in teaching and its impact as described above.

Accepting the nomination requires the faculty member to submit a small dossier to the committee.

Dossier

The application shall consist of:

1. A narrative essay of 500-750 words describing their teaching philosophy and innovative pedagogy.
2. A complete vita or resume.
3. An optional appendix of up to three items of supporting evidence.

Selection Process:

The Selection Committee shall consist of

1. one member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee
2. one academic administrator selected by the provost
3. one faculty member selected by the President
4. last year's awardee
5. one student selected by ASI

The California State University

The Committee shall receive copies of the nominations from the committee's staff liaison, review them, and make a recommendation to the President of at least two nominees in rank order. The Committee shall elect a chairperson who will make the recommendation to the President, explaining in writing the reason for the recommendations. The Chair shall also provide all other letters of recommendation. The Chair of the Selection Committee may meet with the President to discuss the relative merits of the candidates nominated. The President will make a final selection from the Selection Committee's nominations.

Criteria for Selection:

Many faculty members investigate, test and refine a wide variety of new and innovative means in order to improve student learning and retention of learning. The purpose of this award is to recognize a single outstanding member of the faculty whose exceptional innovations in teaching provide a worthy example of the collective work of faculty in experimenting with new teaching methods that produce significant student learning. The award also serves as a means to highlight the collective work of the faculty in innovative pedagogies teaching that improves teaching and learning at CSU San Marcos.

The single criterion for this award is the faculty member's innovation in teaching. The Selection Committee shall recommend at least two faculty members whose teaching has demonstrated the most innovative approaches to improve student learning. While it is difficult to rate several highly innovative faculty members on the basis of "most", this is the challenge of the Selection Committee. The Committee shall endeavor to make clear to students that their letters must show clear and convincing evidence of innovation, learning and retention of knowledge so that the faculty member will receive full consideration during the selection process.

After the President has selected the recipient of the award, she will make the announcement to the campus community. The Awardee will be recognized at the January Faculty and Staff Awards Reception and will receive a \$2,000 privately funded award.

Timetable for 07/08:

October 5	Committee appointed
November 16 ¹	Deadline for Nominations
December 7	Committee recommendations to President Haynes
December 10	Award announcement
January 17	Faculty and Staff Award Ceremony (takes place after Academic Assembly)

¹ Deadline extended one week to accommodate campus closures.

SAC Lottery Allocation Resolution: Issues Under Discussion after 1st Reading at Senate 4-23

Do we want to continue with an allocation of percentages of the total amount given to CSUSM's Academic Senate Lottery Fund to 7 (or 8) cost centers?

Advantages:

- smaller competition within units/disciplines
- Deans/AVPS set (more knowledgeable) recommendations and amounts; SAC only reviews for adherence to guidelines
- SAC's role made manageable through pre-ranking

Disadvantages:

- Cannot find rationale for initial percentages or changes in Senate documents
- Allocations work as ceilings even with SAC flexibility to reallocate; exceptional proposals may go unfunded
- All methods of deriving allocation percentages potentially inequitable (some units don't have FTES; headcount a laborious judgment call)
- Allocations disadvantage emerging programs like Nursing
- Current allocations do not include First-Year Programs, thus losing a portion of FTEST that is currently on a par with Nursing (DJB)

Other:

CSUSM Guidelines currently make ttf and staff eligible to apply for Lottery funds. Should this be changed as it limits non ttf who support many first-year programs access to Lottery funds? (DJB)

Question: What are our alternatives?

- All university-wide grants, but pre-ranking by units except for cross-unit proposals?
 - Much larger workload for SAC, but no entry to Grants Committee b.c. not just faculty
 - At what point does the administration of the Lottery Grant to faculty *and* staff exceed the responsibilities of the Academic Senate?

EC: What does the Committee recommend as an appropriate next step for SAC?

1 **Resolution on Lottery Grant Funding Allocation at Cal State San Marcos**
2
3

4 WHEREAS, the General Guidelines for Expenditures of California State Lottery Funds,
5 set forth by Government Code Section 8880.5, Attachment C, specify a set of General
6 Guidelines for Expenditures of Lottery Fund campus allocationsⁱ; and
7

8 WHEREAS, those Guidelines emphasize that Lottery funds “are allocated to achieve
9 maximum impact in enhancing instruction”; and
10

11 WHEREAS, the Budget and Long-Range Planning Standing Committee of the Academic
12 Senate Resolution of 1997 stated that Lottery Funds would be allocated to 7 campus cost
13 centers according to “*rough* guidelines established by BLP in AY 1996-97,” and that “the
14 Academic Senate Student Affairs Standing Committee...serve as the final level of
15 committee review for the University”; and
16

17 WHEREAS, the rough guidelines for allocating Lottery funds to a mix of instructional
18 and co-curricular units (cost centers) have evolved over time into a “head count” method
19 to establish numbers of staff in each unit directly associated with student instruction, and
20

21 WHEREAS, this method has been imprecise and ~~cumbersome~~ labor-intensive; and,
22

23 WHEREAS, revision to the allocation process violates neither a policy nor a procedure,
24 and is in the purview of the Student Affairs Committee (SAC); and
25

26 WHEREAS, ~~the SAC Student Affairs Committee~~ has developed a revised method of
27 allocating Lottery funds that eliminates the challenge of using the same problematic
28 method to measure contributions to instruction from two inherently different types of
29 campus unit, as well as refining the allocation process at Cal State San Marcos to better
30 meet the principles of the General Guidelines for Expenditures of Lottery Funds; now,
31 therefore, be it
32

33 RESOLVED, that ~~the SAC Student Affairs Committee~~ implements an allocation method
34 based on Calendar Year (CY) FTES for instructional units and historically derived
35 percentages for co-curricular units, ⁱⁱ and further, be it
36

37 RESOLVED, that SAC has the flexibility to reallocate funds to high-quality proposals
38 from any unit should there be additional funds available (for example, if there are units
39 who submit no proposals in a funding cycle), and further, be it
40

41 RESOLVED, that SAC implement the proposed method ~~will be implemented~~ for 3
42 academic years (2008-09, 2009-10, and 2010-11) and then reviewed ~~it by the Student~~
43 ~~Affairs Committee~~ for its equity and functionality, and further, be it
44

45 RESOLVED, that no other changes to the Budget and Long-Range Planning Committee
46 Resolution of 1997 are implied by these changes to the allocation process.

ⁱ ***The California State Lottery Act of 1984 states:***

... all funds allocated from the California State Lottery Education Fund shall be used exclusively for the education of pupils and students and no funds shall be spent for acquisition of real property, construction of facilities, financing of research or any other non-instructional purpose.

1. The activity funded must represent a bonafide educational experience for students, or result in the development of materials to be used with students, or lead to the development of a program or course.
2. Lottery funds may not be used to pay faculty salaries for classroom instruction.
3. Lottery funds may not be used to finance increases in the rate of compensation paid to existing staff; thus, stipends and honoraria are not permissible.
4. Lottery funds may not be used to finance faculty overloads. However, existing faculty may work a summer period under a personal services contract.
5. Expenditure of any funds, including lottery funds, which are used for faculty development activities, must be in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement, which includes a specific list of development activities (see below).
6. Lottery funds should be used to augment and supplement state-funded budget programs so that lottery revenue is not used to replace current or prospective state funding.
7. Lottery fund may be used to pay for part-time instructors when such instructors are hired as replacement faculty for faculty members working for a CSU lottery designated program.

ⁱⁱ The new allocation formula will be based on historical figures (what each unit has received in the past), using a three-year average. The allocation will be split into two pots, one for Instructional Units with FTES (students) and one for Co-curricular units with no FTES.

Instructional Units (CoAS, CoBA, CoE, Nursing) will share 56% of the total, in percentages based on Calendar Year (CY) FTES numbers for the previous Academic Year, as of Fall census.

Co-curricular Units (Library, IITS, Student Affairs) will share 34% of the total, in percentages based on a 3-year average of their most recent Lottery allocations. While these percentages were derived from staff head count, they are the best numbers SAC has to work with at present. SAC envisions a future refinement of the process, reflecting the dynamic history of the University and the allocation method itself; our 3-year evaluation period is based on that premise.

University-wide grants will be allocated 10% of the total.

Working Assumptions:					
-Calendar Year (CY) FTES should drive allocation among Instructional Units					
-past 3 year average drives allocation among Co-Curricular Units					
-keep these allocation guidelines for the next 3 years					
Proposed Allocation Guidelines for the next 3 Years					
	Percentage	Percentage	Percentage		
	Allocation	Allocation	Allocation		
	3-yr average	2008-2009	Proposed		
			by SAC		
Instructional Units					
COAS	35%	35%	42%		
COBA	9%	9%	7%		
COE	11%	10%	6%		
NURS	1%	1%	1%		
Total Instr.	56%	55%	56%		
Co-Curricular Units					
LIB	8%	8%	8%		
IITS	11%	11%	11%		
STUD AFF	15%	15%	15%		
Total Co-Curric.	34%	34%	34%		
University-Wide					
UNIVERSITY	10%	11%	10%		
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%		