

p 2, 3, 5

**THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES
USC - UNION
FEBRUARY 17, 1995**

MORNING SESSION: Auditorium, Main Building

Call to order: The meeting was called to order by John Catalano, Chair. Dean Jim Edwards welcomed senators from the Regional Campuses and Lifelong Learning to the USC-Union campus.

I. The Honorable Harvey Peeler - SC Legislature

Senator Peeler reported that the House Ways & Means Committee began budget deliberations this week. The current proposal calls for higher education receiving \$16 million less than in FY1995. The senator advocated for zero-based budgeting, in higher education as well as other areas of state government. Property tax relief was identified as a top priority for the General Assembly this year. Faculty were encouraged to personally contact their house members and state senators "with the facts" to argue in support of higher education. Senator Peeler indicated support for a state tuition assistance program, a pre-paid post secondary expense program, and a post secondary savings program. The General Assembly is aware that significant amount of state revenue is lost every year to the Georgia state lottery, and the senator supports having the citizens of South Carolina "take a look" at a SC state lottery and what it might achieve for education. The senator responded to several questions from the floor.

II. Report of the Deans

USC-Union: Dean Jim Edwards reported that most of the changes to the Union campus that have occurred since the last time the RCFS met here have involved the demolition of several older buildings. An outreach effort is underway to offer USC Union courses off-campus in area high schools.

USC-Beaufort: Professor Jane Upshaw read a report from Dean Plyler (Attachment 1)

USC Lancaster: Professor John Catalano announced that Dean Pappin asked that the flyer describing the "Ethics in Society" lecture series be distributed to the senate today.

Lifelong Learning: Associate Vice Provost John May reported Spring 1995 credit program enrollments appear to be at the same level as this time last year. Efforts in the noncredit area have recently been refocused into professional conferences, short courses and educational travel programs.

USC Salkehatchie: Professor Wayne Chilcote reported that Dean Clayton sent the following information to share with the senate: An alumni reunion dinner with over 200 registered participants is scheduled for this evening in Allendale; the April meeting of the

USC Board of Trustees will be held in Salkehatchie; Spring 1995 enrollment shows a 3% increase over this time last year; the campus has been offered an art gallery; congratulations to Professor Bill Bowers who has recently completed his doctorate in accounting.

USC Sumter: Dean Les Carpenter reported on the planned expansion/renovations of the student union building, which is planned to open late November (1995). The current fund-raising campaign is entering the 14th month, and has just passed the \$420,000 level of pledges and gifts. Strategic planning has begun on the campus involving faculty, students, and administrators. A student retention committee has also been formed, and begun to meet.

III. Standing Committees met

AFTERNOON SESSION: Auditorium, Main Building

Call to order: John Catalano

I. Correction and approval of the minutes of November 18, 1994 meeting

The minutes were approved with the following corrections. On page 19 replace Larry Strong with Jeff Strong under attendance list for Rights and Responsibilities.

II. Reports of University Officers

A. Report of Vice Provost John Duffy (Attachment 2). Dr. Duffy responded to a question from Professor Castleberry (Sumter) related to merger of the USC Regional Campuses recently raised by the SC House Ways & Means Committee chairman (Brown - Charleston). Dr. Duffy reported that nothing "was on the table". A follow-up question was asked concerning a request for a list of UCAM courses passed by the RCTP (Castleberry).

B. Report of Associate Vice Provost John Gardner (Attachment 3).

III. Reports of Standing Committees

A. Rights and Responsibilities - Danny Faulkner, Chair: (Attachments 4, 4a). The committee report was read by Professor Faulkner. Following discussion, *a motion passed changing wording on page 9 in the Guide to Tenure and Promotion section IV, B, 6, b, line 4 to replace "should" with "must".*

B. Welfare - Nora Schukei, Chair. The committee report was read by Professor Schukei. (Attachment 5).

C. System Affairs - Stephen Bishoff, Chair: (Attachments 6, 6a, 6b). The committee report was read by Professor Bishoff. A handout entitled "Criteria for the Assessment of USC General Education" was delivered to the Secretary for inclusion in the minutes and to members of the Executive Committee. Following discussion, *a motion passed to*

have the Secretary of the RCFS forward the details of UCAM courses passed by the RCFS to the Registrar's office for addition to the Columbia master list of courses. A subcommittee report on improving relations between the campuses was presented by Professor Chamberlain (Beaufort) proposing a collegium to restructure USC faculty governance. Discussion followed. A motion was presented, then withdrawn (after a five minute recess) to have the RCFS approve the subcommittee's report. A substitute motion was presented to have the RCFS "endorse the modified draft concerning the collegium" and to pursue approval at all higher levels. Following discussion, the motion was defeated. *A motion passed to informally survey the senators to assess the rationale for the last vote.* Results from the chair's survey revealed that the motion was defeated due to lack of written information about the proposal in advance of today's meeting.

IV. Report of the Executive Committee - Mike Schoen, Secretary. The committee report was read by Professor Mike Schoen (Attachment 7). Following discussion, a *motion from the Executive Committee passed: "It shall be added to the vice chair's duties the job of carrying motions from the body to the appropriate administrative unit and to record the action taken"*. In response to a question from Professor Castleberry (Sumter) the chair ruled that this motion would supercede or override the earlier motion concerning the Secretary's role in forwarding information related to UCAM courses to the Registrar's Office.

V. Reports of Special Committees

- A. University Library Committee** - Professor Bruce Nims read a prepared report. (Attachment 8)
- B. University Committee on Curricula and Courses** - Professor Robert Castleberry read a prepared report. (Attachment 9)
- C. University Committee on Faculty Welfare** - Professor Roy Darby read a prepared report. (Attachment 10)
- D. Faculty/Board of Trustees Liaison Committee** - Professor Deborah Cureton read a prepared report. (Attachment 11). Professor Cureton recommended that the senate's representative to this committee should maintain close contact with the RCFS Executive Committee. Discussion followed.
- E. Academic Advisory Committee** - Professor John Catalano reported that the committee has not met this semester, but indicated that he was planning to write to the Provost to encourage him to activate this committee.
- F. Research and Productive Scholarship Committee** - Professor Chilcote (Salkehatchie) reported for Professor Heisser that the committee is putting together a full report which will be presented at the April RCFS meeting.

G. Savannah River Site Committee - Professor Chilcote reported for Professor Ruff. The committee has not met since the last report was given to this body in November.

H. Insurance and Annuities Committee - Professor Jerry Dockery read a prepared report (Attachment 12).

I. Conflict of Interest Committee - Professor Tandy Willis. The committee has received twenty-seven policies to review from various USC units. Two meetings have been scheduled before the end of March to review these policies. (Attachments 13, 13a).

J. Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness - Professor Susan Pauly reported that a copy of the Guide to Designing a Teaching Effectiveness Portfolio will be put on reserve in the library at each campus, and thanked the committee for their work. Professor Darby's work on the "Report to the Provost on the Use of Student Evaluations in Evaluating Faculty Performance" (Attachment 14a) was acknowledged. It was reported that the Provost has accepted the committee's guidelines for demonstrating effectiveness as a teacher, with the exception of the use of student evaluations in this process. *The following motion was presented from the committee for discussion and a vote at the April meeting: "That the Provost accept the recommendations listed in the Ad Hoc Committee's Report to the Provost on the Use of Student Evaluations and be asked to provide the necessary resources (financial and other) to implement these recommendations".*

K. Ad Hoc Committee on Manual Changes - Professor Wayne Chilcote reported that the committee met on 11-17-94 and revised the 1993 T&P guide revisions. This document has been forwarded to the Vice Provost's office for review. Revisions to the manual section on administration organization (Attachment 5 of 2-18-94 RCFS minutes) are in effect and available at the end of the meeting. The Grievance Policy changes are being forwarded today to the Vice Provost's office for review (Attachments 15, 15a).

VI. Unfinished Business - The chair asked for discussion on a motion presented from the Rights & Responsibilities Committee at the last meeting concerning AAUP's latest statement on sexual harrassment. There was no new discussion. *Following a vote, the motion passed to have the RCFS adopt the latest AAUP statement on sexual harrassment (see Attachment 4b pages 30-34 of the November '94 RCFS minutes).* In addition, the chair directed the senate to the motion presented by Professor Macias (Sumter) at the last meeting (see Attachment 13 of the November '94 RCFS minutes) and asked for discussion. A question was asked by Professor West (Sumter) about the relevance of the motion given the recent USC Board of Trustees' approval of a USC system policy. Professor Macias indicated no interest in pursuing the motion in light of recent USC Board policy. The chair agreed to offer the opinion that the motion on the floor could be considered moot at this time.

VII. New Business - Professor Tandy Willis reported that the Ad Hoc Committee on Outside Professional Activities for the regional campuses met on 2-10-95 to review policies developed by other USC units. A draft policy for the regional campuses has been developed (Attachment 13a) and is presented today to the RCFS as a motion for approval as a USC system policy. Professor West questioned the wording related to "professional activities" in part III, second paragraph. Discussion followed. A motion to amend the motion passed to add "activities related to professional organizations" to the first sentence of paragraph two. *The motion passed to approve the Ad Hoc Committee's Outside Professional Activities policy for the regional campuses.* In other new business, Professor Castleberry asked for clarification from the Chair concerning the designated roles on the RCFS Executive Committee members regarding motions passed by this body. The Chair indicated that it is officially part of the vice chair's duties to take action on passed motions, and to report back the the RCFS at the next meeting. Professor Bishoff asked to have the minutes reflect the concerns of the Sumter delegation that "good faith efforts" by RCFS committees to have draft policies delivered to campuses in advance of scheduled RCFS meetings is not generally an acceptable or ideal faculty governance practice. The Chair acknowledged the point to Professor Bishoff.

VIII. Announcements - Vice Provost Duffy expressed concern that his office has noted a decline in applications for faculty exchange between the campuses, and encouraged faculty to consider participating. In response to a question, Dr. Duffy indicated that faculty are not limited to one exchange. Professor Chilcote announced that the nominating committee will meet 3-10-95 in Columbia. The Nominating Committee report will be included as an attachment in the minutes (Attachment 16).

**Deans Report from Chris P. Plyler to the USC Regional Campuses
Faculty Senate, Friday, February 17, 1995
USC Union**

I apologize for being absent from this February meeting of the Regional Campus Senate. However, in our efforts at USCB to design a long range masterplan for future expansion, I have come across a team of researchers from Cambridge, Massachusetts who have developed a process called Computer Aided Policy Planning (CAPP). Without going into a great deal of detail, the objective of their approach is to develop a new planning paradigm that has been employed in three University systems to date: Arizona, Houston and Wisconsin. As I made Drs. Duffy, Moeser and Garrison aware of this team, they asked for a presentation which, unfortunately, conflicted with today's Senate meeting. I am representing USCB, Dr. Duffy and the Regional Campuses at large.

Personnel Matters: Dr. Edsel Caine, Professor of Marine Biology at USCB for fifteen years, accepted an appointment at the University of Alaska Southeast in Juneau as Chair of the Department of Biology. Filling in throughout our search for a permanent faculty replacement is Dr. Leon Ember, who most recently served as a visiting Professor of Biology at Newberry College. We currently have one other faculty search underway in Sociology. Also Mary Ellen White, Director of our Hilton Head site for the last two years, has recently submitted her resignation to accept the position of Director of Human Resources with the Melrose Company. Beth McCafferty, a very capable doctoral student in Educational Administration, has accepted an appointment as Interim Director until a permanent Director is hired.

Facilities: We have finally gotten to the point in the facilities renovations process where the architects are interviewing the various unit heads and their staffs to obtain input for the design and renovation of the Beaufort College Building and the adjacent Sandstone Building. In addition to the usual inconvenience brought about by such a project, we are going to experience temporary displacement of key academic and academic support personnel.

Cultural and Student Activities:

The USCB African American Student Association is sponsoring a fraternity/sorority step-off contest, "If Ya Don't Know Now, Ya Know"--an improvisational dance and music (without instruments) contest a one of two Black History Month events. The organization's Black History Month banquet on February 25 will conclude the month long observance.

The Office of Continuing Education is sponsoring Savannah Wildlife Bike and Bird-- a ride along the earthen dikes bordering the refuge's system of freshwater impoundments managed specifically for migratory waterfowl (Feb 18) and Coastal Reptiles--a naturalist-led discussion of the reptiles living in the coastal area (Feb 20)

. Last Wednesday, February 15, the USCB Festival Series concluded with a performance by the Chamber Music Society of Lincoln Center, featuring Harolyn Blackwell, soprano. The group performed selections from Haydn, Schubert, and Messiaen.

Faculty Forum: Last month, we were pleased to host Dr. Randy Engle, Professor of Psychology from Columbia Campus, who was the featured speaker at a sandwich luncheon and presentation on Effective Teaching. In March, we will be pleased to have Dr. Betsy Barefoot from University 101.

Next Meeting: We look forward to hosting the April 21 meeting of the Regional Campus Faculty Senate at our Hilton Head site. Information pertaining to accommodations and meeting location will be forthcoming.

END OF REPORT

REPORT OF THE VICE PROVOST AND EXECUTIVE DEAN
FOR REGIONAL CAMPUSES AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
JOHN J. DUFFY
TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES FACULTY SENATE
FEBRUARY 17, 1995

BUDGET

The budget process is still very fluid. Currently, the official statements indicate that the Ways and Means Committee may recommend a two and one-half percent reduction for Higher Education. This figure could actually turn out to be much higher depending on what dollar figures are allocated on a non-recurring basis. There is still a long way to go in this process but I do believe it would be unwise to anticipate any increase in funding.

FRIENDLY REVIEW OF TENURE-TRACK FACULTY IN PROBATIONARY STATUS

At the Provost's request and with the full support of my office and the Regional Campuses Deans we will be implementing a friendly tenure progress review for all faculty during their third year in the tenure track. This review allows the faculty member to take corrective action before the tenure decision year and familiarizes them with the process. The review will benefit both the institution and the individual.

GUIDE FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES

The Guide for Tenure and Promotion Procedures as revised at the November Senate meeting has been reviewed by this Office and forwarded to the Provost for review and approval. I will inform the Senate when we have a response and let you know how we will proceed from there. I would remind the Senate that changes in the Tenure and Promotion process are not effective until they have been reviewed and approved through the appropriate administrative channels.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT POLICY

The University has a policy on Sexual Harassment which has been approved by the Board of Trustees. While the Senate is free to discuss any issues it chooses, I am not inclined to request a different policy for the Regional Campuses.

OUTSIDE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES POLICY

I wish to thank the committee which met Friday, February 10, 1995 to develop a policy on outside professional activities for the Regional Campuses. I also appreciate the Senate's efforts to address this issue today to ensure our compliance with the federal regulations.

February 16, 1995

MEMORANDUM

TO: Regional Campuses Faculty Senate

FROM: John Gardner, Associate Vice Provost

SUBJECT: FACULTY SENATE MEETING FEBRUARY 17, 1995

I wanted to indicate to you that any matters that I might have covered in a report will be covered by our Vice Provost today. I regret that I cannot be with you, but unfortunately, the Senate meeting date for this date conflicted with the annual hosting of the National Conference on the Freshman Year Experience in Columbia.

I wish you all a good meeting. If I can help any of you, in the meantime, on anything, as you well know about me, my door is always open.

**Report on Rights and Responsibilities Committee
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
February 17, 1995
Professor Danny Faulkner**

We received from the Vice Provost's office a tabulation of the tenure and promotion votes at each level of review for the past two years. We discussed these and decided that we want vote totals from the local and Regional Campuses committees as well. We are attaching today's report to this meeting's minutes.

We reviewed this year's tenure and promotion process and discussed ways that we could make improvements:

1) We are developing a ballot to be used by the RCTP committee, and we will present this to the Senate in April.

2) We move that in the Guide to Tenure and Promotion section IV, B, 6, b), line 4 "should" be replaced by "must".

3) We would also like to change the way in which the RCTP committee initiates its' procedure. Currently, the Vice Provost appoints a temporary chair to call the meeting to order and to elect a chair. We want to change this so that a chair serves until a new chair is elected. The outgoing chair will function as the temporary chair does now, with additional duties of briefing the new committee on proper procedures and to update the committee of any changes.

This will be fashioned as a motion and attached to the April agenda so that we can vote on this then.

In Attendance: Danny Faulkner, John Blair, Gordon Haist, Bruce Nims, Jerry Dockery, Jeffrey Strong, Paul Stone, John Logue, Maitland Rose, Susan Smith.

1993-94	LOCAL C	DEAN	RCTP	VICE PROV	PROVOS	PRES
TO PROFESSOR						
#1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#3	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#4	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
#5	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
#6	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
#7	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
#8	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
#9	YES	YES	SPLIT	NO	NO	NO
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR						
#1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#2	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
#3	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#4	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
TENURE						
#1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#3	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
1992-93						
TO PROFESSOR						
#1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#3	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
#4	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#5	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#6	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#7	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
#8	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
#9	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
TO ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR						
#1	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO
#2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#3	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#4	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
TO ASSISTANT PROFESSOR						
#1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
TENURE						
#1	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#2	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#3	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#4	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#5	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#6	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#7	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#8	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#9	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
#10	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES

**Report of the Welfare Committee
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
February 17, 1995
Professor Nora Schukei**

The Welfare Committee discussed some of the differences between the salary study we had made and the salary information concerning faculty and staff that was sent to each of our campuses. We will try to get a corrected version. In addition, members of each campus will compare the information from their campus to national averages and try to determine any inequities among faculty and between faculty and administrators.

In Attendance: Kwame Dawes, Nora Schukei, Susan Pauly, Noni Bohonak, Mary Barton, Sal Macias, Carolyn West.

SYSTEM AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Regional Campuses Faculty Senate

Dr. Stephen T. Bishoff, Chair

Minutes of Meeting 17 FEB 1995

Professors: **Sumter:** Stephen T. Bishoff, Robert B. Castleberry, Robert Costello from the Executive Committee;

Beaufort: Roy Darby, Ellen Chamberlain; **Union:** Steve Buchanan; **Salkehatchie:** Marvin Light; **Lifelong**

Learning: David Bowden; **Lancaster:** Dianne Evans, Carolyn Starnes, Nancy Hazam for Wayne Thurmond

I. Subcommittee on Articulations and Transfer of Courses

No unresolved problems remain for action.

II. Subcommittee on Grading Policy Changes

The results of the reexamination of the question by the faculty organizations were:

Salkehatchie	yes, change
Union	no
Sumter	no
Life Long Learning	yes
Beaufort	no

Professor Starnes will present a summary report at the April meeting.

III. Subcommittee on Communications Technology

The possibility of televised meetings with 2-way audio exists. The details of several aspects of communications are currently changing as a result of the merger of several offices overseeing technologies on the Columbia campus.

IV. Report on Activities of the Assessment Advisory Committee

The Provost created the Assessment Advisory Committee in the Fall of 1993 which was charged to create and implement a plan for assessing general education. The committee produced criteria for this purpose in March of 1994. Professor Gardner represented the Regional Campuses until January of this year, now each campus has representation.

The criteria had not been distributed to the faculty of the University. [Those criteria are attached to these minutes.] The criteria should be discussed on the respective campuses and comments sent to:

Robert Cuttino
 801 Carteret Street
 Beaufort, SC 29902
 internet: IBFRT45@UNIVSCM.CSD.SCAROLINA.EDU
 phone:803-521-4137

V. Subcommittee on Improvement of Relations between the Campuses of the University

Professor Darby and Librarian Chamberlain presented a draft for modifications of the existing, yet inactive, Academic Advisory Committee into a more responsive organization. They would re-name the committee and call it a Collegium to emphasize the changes.

The proposed changes include broader representation for the campuses of the University and a more active schedule of meetings. The changes attempt to increase the effectiveness of the communication between campuses without altering the existing faculty organizations'/senates' structures.

Questions on the Assessment Advisory Committee's Criteria

1. Were you aware of the committee's activities prior to this?
2. What is your assessment of the criteria? Deletions? Additions?
3. How would you like to receive the results of the testing that will be used to determine success in meeting these criteria?
4. In your view, how will these impact the Regional Campuses?
5. Additional comments?

Please forward to:

USC BEAUFORT
THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA SYSTEM

ROBERT CUTTINO
Director Institutional Planning and Research

801 Carteret Street
Beaufort, SC 29902

803-521-4137
VOICE MAIL EXT.: 4137
FAX: 803-521-4198
BITNET: IBFRT45@UNIVSCVM
INTERNET: IBFRT45@UNIVSCM.CSD.SCAROLINA.EDU



or

USC SUMTER
THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA SYSTEM

STEPHEN T. BISHOFF, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor of Biology

200 Miller Road
Sumter, SC 29150-2498

VOICE: 803-775-6341, EXT. 3244; INTERCAMPUS 55
FAX: 803-775-2180
INTERNET: STEVER@USCSUMTER.USCSU.SCAROLINA.EDU



**Criteria for the Assessment of
USC General Education**

March 28, 1994

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Sally Boyd
Lifelong Learning

Karen Carey, Chair
Institutional Planning and Research

Paul Fidler
Division of Student Affairs

John Gardner
Regional Campuses and Continuing Education

Carol Garrison
Interim Assoc. Provost
for Institutional Planning & Research

Lynn Glander
Institutional Planning and Research

Don Greiner
Interim Assoc. Provost
for Undergraduate Affairs

Daniel Howard-Greene
USC-Lancaster

Audrey Korsgaard
Business Administration

Jean Massey
Nursing

Fred Medway
Psychology

Walter Peters
Engineering

Richard Showman
Biological Science

Gene Stephens
Criminal Justice

Jim Stiver
South Carolina Honors College

Don Stowe
Applied Professional Sciences

Nancy Thompson
English

Joe Ryan
Education

Bob Weir
History

CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page Number</u>
Overview.....	1
Part I Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication	6
Part II Math and Science.....	22
Part III Social/Behavioral Sciences.....	31
Part IV Humanities and Cultural Goals.....	34

Overview

OVERVIEW – General Education Goals and Objectives

Part I - WRITTEN, ORAL, AND ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION

Written Communication

Goal Students will communicate clearly in written English, demonstrating their comprehension, analysis and critical interrogation of a variety of written texts.

Objectives Students' writing will demonstrate/reflect:

- A. Knowledge of the subject
- B. Awareness of the reader
- C. Organization appropriate to the purpose and to the interaction between writer and reader
- D. Format appropriate to the writing situation
- E. Use of punctuation to establish and clarify meaning
- F. Control of sentence structure to establish and clarify meaning
- G. Style, personal voice, and coherence as a communicator
- H. Description, analysis, and synthesis of data, ideas or information appropriate to the purpose.

Oral Communication

Goal Students will communicate orally in a manner that unites theory, criticism, and practice to produce an effective communicator.

Objectives Students' oral communication will demonstrate:

- A. Knowledge of the subject
- B. Awareness of the audience/group
- C. Organization appropriate to the purpose and to the interaction between speaker and audience
- D. Vocal delivery which encourages listening
- E. Physical presentation, use of body, appropriate to the speaking situation
- F. Appropriate sentence structure and word choice
- G. Skill in listening and extracting information and meaning from oral communication

Overview

Electronic Communication

Goal Students will be able to use computers and other technology to perform tasks appropriate to their major fields.

Objectives Students will use computers to:

- A. Create, edit and revise written texts
- B. Analyze quantitative data
- C. Access information and data bases.
- D. Integrate graphical, visual and statistical information into written presentations
- E. Send and receive electronic communication.

Part II - MATH AND SCIENCE

Math

Goal Students will perform basic mathematical manipulations, display facility with the use of mathematics in framing concepts for mathematical analysis and interpret data intelligently.

Objectives Students will demonstrate:

- A. Understanding the role and value of quantitative reasoning.
- B. Understanding of the language of mathematics and basic mathematical concepts and operations.
- C. Application of basic mathematical operations to problem solving in their personal and working life.
- D. Accurate comprehension and drawing of appropriate inferences from numeric data in various forms and in various disciplines.

Science

Goal Students will demonstrate an understanding of physical and/or life science phenomena and understand the uses of scientific methods and theories.

Objectives Students will demonstrate:

- A. Understanding of the role and nature of scientific inquiry
- B. Students will demonstrate their understanding of scientific theories and perspectives
- C. Critical evaluation of various approaches to research by identifying sound and unsound reasoning in scientific and lay contexts.
- D. Understanding of different research designs and approaches and their application.
- E. Formulating and testing hypotheses or research questions as part of the scientific process.
- F. Use of systematic, empirical approaches to address questions as part of the scientific process.
- G. Identifying and collecting appropriate information as part of the scientific process.
- H. Drawing appropriate conclusions from empirical results in quantitative and qualitative formats.

Part III - SOCIAL/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Goal Students will demonstrate an understanding of the processes of human behavior and social and cultural interaction and the use of social and behavioral science

Overview

perspectives to interpret them.

Objectives Students will demonstrate:

- A. Understanding of theories in the social/behavioral sciences
- B. Understanding of cultural, social and political structures and processes and their effects on individual, group and societal behaviors
- C. Understanding and critical evaluation, interpretation and drawing of inferences from social/behavioral science data.

Part IV - HUMANITIES/CULTURAL GOALS

Goal 1 Students will demonstrate an understanding of the historical development of culture over time and its relation to the present

Objectives Students will demonstrate the ability to:

- A. Understand the construction of history and how history is written
- B. Understand broad outlines of history and make accurate connections between developments separated in time and place
- C. Recognize the contribution of historical antecedents to the understanding of current personal, social, and political situations and developments

Goal 2 Students will become familiar with the diversity of a global culture marked by racial, ethnic, gender and regional differences.

Objectives Students will demonstrate the ability to:

- A. Recognize multiple perspectives and appreciate perspectives which produce a world-view different from one's own
- B. Use another perspective to analyze current or historical social and cultural events and practices

Goal 3 Students will communicate orally (with the exception of Latin and Ancient Greek) and in writing in another language.

Objectives Students will demonstrate the ability to:

- A. Read in one foreign language and comprehend the topic and main ideas in written texts
- B. Understand spoken discourse and converse in a foreign language on familiar subjects

Goal 4 Students will demonstrate an understanding of the contribution of the literary, visual or performing arts and their cultural context and express informed personal responses to artistic creations.

Objectives Students will demonstrate the ability to:

- A. Develop an aesthetic response to at least one of the arts

3

Overview

- B. Express a personal response to works of art and relate the part(s) to the work(s) as a whole, using appropriate concepts and relevant information.
- C. Relate art to the wider cultural context from which it emerges

Goal 3 Students will integrate insights from several disciplines and apply them to value choices and ethical decisions.

Objectives Students will demonstrate the ability to:

- A. Identify ethical dilemmas
- B. Students will apply understandings from several disciplines to clarify ethical conflicts; articulate reasoned personal responses based on expressed values.

4

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Written Communication

Goal: Students will communicate clearly in written English, demonstrating their comprehension, analysis, and critical interrogation of a variety of written texts.

Objective A. Students' writing will demonstrate knowledge of the subject. This criterion describes the accuracy, extensiveness, and perspective of the knowledge which the writer exhibits. This criterion also assesses the degree to which the writer's information meets the content requirements of a specific assignment.

4 OUTSTANDING

Appropriateness: The writer fulfills or exceeds all of the assigned content requirements.
Accuracy: The writer's knowledge of the subject is accurate throughout.
Extensiveness: The writer exhibits convincing range and quality of knowledge, having done appropriate research, if applicable.
Perspective: The information presented reveals the writer's assimilation and understanding of the material. The writer is convincingly aware of alternative points of view AND of implications beyond the immediate subject.

3 EFFECTIVE

Appropriateness: The writer fulfills the important content requirements of the assignment.
Accuracy: The writer's knowledge of the subject is accurate throughout except in minor details.
Extensiveness: The writer seems informed on the subject, having done appropriate research, if applicable.
Perspective: The information presented reveals the writer's assimilation and understanding of the material. The writer seems aware of alternative points of view OR of implications beyond the immediate subject.

2 ADEQUATE

Appropriateness: The writer fulfills some of the important content requirements of the assignment.
Accuracy: The writer's knowledge of the subject is generally accurate, though flawed.
Extensiveness: The writer exhibits limited range or quality of knowledge, having done minimal appropriate research, if applicable.
Perspective: The information presented reveals that the writer has only partially assimilated or understood the material. The writer shows some awareness of alternative points of view OR of implications beyond the immediate subject.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Appropriateness: The writer fails to address the important requirements of the assignment.
Accuracy: The writer's knowledge of the subject is generally inaccurate.
Extensiveness: The writer's knowledge of the subject lacks range or quality.
Perspective: The information presented reveals the writer's failure to assimilate or to understand the material. The writer's assertions lack awareness of alternative points of view AND of implications beyond the immediate subject.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Objective B. Students' writing will demonstrate awareness of the reader. This criterion concerns the writer's awareness of a known, assumed, or likely reading audience. In demonstrating this awareness, the writer must accommodate the reader's attitudes toward or familiarity with the subject, as well as the reader's comprehension level. The writer's development, diction, and emphasis will reflect the degree to which the writer has identified and is addressing those readers.

4 OUTSTANDING

Development: The writer's explanations and uses of evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details are highly appropriate for the reader.
Diction: The writer's word choices clearly demonstrate an awareness of the reader. The language seems deliberately chosen to aid the reader's understanding of the subject (including definitions where appropriate).
Emphasis: The writer's discussion or argumentation is consistently clear and appropriate to the reader and to the purpose. In emphasizing important points, the writer uses evidence logically and carefully.

3 EFFECTIVE

Development: The writer's explanations and uses of evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details are generally appropriate for the reader.
Diction: The writer's word choices demonstrate an awareness of the reader. The language is consistent and seems generally appropriate to the reader's understanding of the subject (including definitions where appropriate).
Emphasis: The writer's discussion or argumentation is generally clear and appropriate to the reader and to the purpose. In emphasizing important points, the writer generally uses evidence logically and carefully.

2 ADEQUATE

Development: The writer makes some attempt to provide evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details for the reader, but some information is either extraneous or insufficient. The writer's word choices indicate an awareness of the reader, but the identity of the reader is either unclear or inappropriate in some respects. Although the vocabulary seems fairly consistent, the language seems chosen more for the writer's convenience than for the reader's understanding.
Diction: The writer's discussion or argumentation is generally clear or appropriate to the reader and to the purpose, but may be lacking in some aspect of the use of logic or evidence.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Development: The writer generally lacks an awareness of the reader, for the discussion lacks evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details.
Diction: Students' effective speaking will demonstrate: The writer's word choices fail to reflect an awareness of the reader because either the vocabulary or the reference to the reader is inconsistent or inappropriate.
Emphasis: The writer's discussion or argumentation is generally unclear or inappropriate to the reader and to the purpose. The writing lacks emphasis, or is seriously defective in the use of logic or evidence.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Objective C. Students writing will reflect organization appropriate to the purpose and to the interaction between writer and reader. This criterion considers the structure and the coherence of the presentation. Structure refers to the way the writer achieves unity by focusing and ordering the paragraphs or sections of the material. Coherence refers to the way the writer connects the ideas to provide continuity from point to point and throughout the text. These aspects of organization might vary according to the intended reader and the purpose for writing.

4 OUTSTANDING

Structure: Writer focuses and orders the material to convey a unified point or effect (either stated or implied).
Coherence: The writer provides clear and consistent movement within and between paragraphs and from beginning to end.

3 EFFECTIVE

Structure: The writer focuses and orders the material to convey a generally unified point or effect (either stated or implied).
Coherence: The writer provides movement within and between paragraphs and from beginning to end.

2 ADEQUATE

Structure: The writer provides some focus or order (either stated or implied) to the material, but the structure is somewhat unclear.
Coherence: The writer provides movement within and between paragraphs and from beginning to end, but this movement is at times either unclear or awkward.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Structure: The writer provides little or no focus or order (either stated or implied) to the material.
Coherence: The writer provides little movement within and between the paragraphs and from beginning to end.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Objective D. Students writing will reflect format appropriate to the writing situation. Students' writing will demonstrate the use of a written or printed format appropriate to the writing situation. Format may include spelling, capitalization, footnoting/bibliography forms, graphics, or any other elements of typography or appearance.

4 OUTSTANDING

The text is clearly legible. The format is both appropriate and attractive. The writer misspells no words (or makes only a rare misspelling in a long or complex text).

3 EFFECTIVE

The text is clearly legible. The format is appropriate. The writer's misspellings are few in proportion to the length and complexity of the text.

2 ADEQUATE

The text is generally legible. The format is acceptable. The writer makes several misspellings in proportion to the length and complexity of the text.

1 INEFFECTIVE

The text is generally illegible. The format is unacceptable. The writer's misspellings are frequent enough to be distracting, regardless of the length or complexity of the text.

Objective E. The student's writing will demonstrate the ability to use punctuation to establish and clarify meaning. This criterion considers the writer's use of punctuation marks as means of establishing, clarifying, and reinforcing the meaning of the sentences. All aspects of punctuation are included here, ranging from misuse and omission to more sophisticated uses which exhibit the writer's command of punctuation to convey meaning.

4 OUTSTANDING

The writer's punctuation is clear, appropriate, and purposeful. The writer consistently exhibits a command of punctuation, as indicated by the appropriate use of sophisticated or varied punctuation.

3 EFFECTIVE

The writer's punctuation is clear, appropriate, and purposeful. An occasional misuse or omission does not interfere with meaning.

2 ADEQUATE

The writer's punctuation is generally clear, appropriate, and purposeful; although misuses or omissions occasionally interfere with meaning.

1 INEFFECTIVE

The writer's misuses or omissions of punctuation frequently interfere with meaning.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Objective F. Students' writing will demonstrate the use of sentence structure to establish and clarify meaning. This criterion describes the writer's control of the elements of sentence construction to establish, clarify, and reinforce the meaning of the sentences. Concerns here include the writer's use not only of appropriate conventions of grammar and usage (e.g., subject-verb agreement, pronoun-antecedent agreement, verb forms, etc.) but also of sentence patterns to establish relationships among ideas (e.g., coordination, subordination, parallelism).

4 OUTSTANDING

Syntax: The writer's use of clauses to establish sentence patterns consistently reinforces or emphasizes relationships among ideas.
Clarity: All parts of the sentence agree clearly and logically. The writer demonstrates a consistently good grasp of appropriate usage, grammar, and idiom. The Sentences contain no misplaced words or phrases. The word order also seems deliberately and appropriately chosen for emphasis or for reinforcing the intended meaning.
Completeness: All sentences are grammatically complete.

3 EFFECTIVE

Syntax: For the most part, the writer's use of clauses to establish sentence pattern generally reinforces or emphasizes relationships among ideas.
Clarity: An isolated grammar or usage error does not obstruct clear and immediate understanding of the intended meaning. An isolated sentence contains a misplaced word or phrase, but such phrasing does not confuse the meaning.
Completeness: All sentences are grammatically complete.

2 ADEQUATE

Syntax: The writer's use of clauses to establish sentence patterns reflects relationships among ideas, but connections might sometimes be inappropriate or weak.
Clarity: Grammar or usage errors may appear, but they do not seriously confuse the intended meaning. An occasional sentence contains a misplaced word or phrase which confuses the meaning.
Completeness: Except for an isolated error, all sentences are grammatically complete.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Syntax: Few, if any, sentence patterns reflect appropriate relationships among ideas.
Clarity: Grammar or usage errors frequently confuse the intended meaning. More than an occasional sentence contains misplaced words or phrases which confuse the meaning.
Completeness: The writing exhibits more than an isolated failure to recognize the grammatical completeness of the sentence.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Objective G. Students' writing will demonstrate style, personal voice, and coherence as a communicator. Students' writing will demonstrate the writer's personal stance or voice as a communicator, which includes tone, point of view, attitude or personality. It also assesses the originality of the overall presentation, including the writer's ability to control the elements of writing to please, convince, or otherwise affect the reader.

4 OUTSTANDING

The writer's tone or general control of language consistently reflects a confident or authoritative central "voice" or "personality." Word choice is consistently precise, varied, economical or inventive. The writing clearly shows stylistic talent.

3 EFFECTIVE

The writer's tone or control of language generally reflects a confident or authoritative central "voice" or "personality." Word choice is generally precise, varied, economical, or inventive. The writing exhibits some success at style.

2 ADEQUATE

A central "voice" or "personality" is evident, though inconsistent in minor ways. Word choice is occasionally precise, varied, economical, or inventive. Stylistic awkwardness may be evident, but is not seriously distracting.

1 INEFFECTIVE

The writer's tone or general control of language is so lacking in consistency that little central "voice" or "personality" is evident. Word choice generally lacks precision, variety, economy, or inventiveness. Severe stylistic awkwardness is evident.

Objective H. Students' writing will reflect comprehension of other written texts and description, analysis, and synthesis of information and ideas appropriate to the assignment at any level.

4 OUTSTANDING

Identifies the subject very thoroughly; reflects highly developed observational skills; makes appropriate and reasonable inferences from the observations; sees relationships and relates to existing knowledge, skills or larger context.

3 EFFECTIVE

Identifies the subject well; reflects good observational skills; makes inferences which are, for the most part, reasonable and appropriate; sees relationships and relates to existing knowledge.

2 ADEQUATE

Identifies the subject clearly; shows reasonable observational skills; makes several reasonable inferences and relates to existing knowledge.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Identifies the subject somewhat; shows undeveloped observational skills; makes unreasonable or inappropriate inferences; sees most obvious relationship but does not relate to existing knowledge.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Oral Communication

- Goal:** Students will communicate orally in a manner that unites theory, criticism, and practice to produce an effective communicator.
- Objective A:** Students' effective speaking will demonstrate knowledge of the subject. This criterion describes the accuracy, extensiveness, and perspective of the knowledge which the speaker exhibits. This criterion also assesses the degree to which the speaker's information meets the content requirements of a specific assignment. (NOTE: For speaking assessments which are integrated with assessments in Critical Thinking or one or more Perspective Outcomes, those appropriate criteria whole or in part may be substituted for Speaking Criterion #1.)

4 OUTSTANDING

- Appropriateness:** The speaker fulfills or exceeds all of the assigned content requirements.
- Accuracy:** The speaker's knowledge of the subject is accurate throughout.
- Extensiveness:** The speaker exhibits convincing range and quality of knowledge, having done appropriate research, if applicable.
- Perspective:** The information presented reveals the speaker's assimilation and understanding of the material. When appropriate, the speaker is convincingly aware of alternative points of view AND of implications beyond the immediate subject.

3 EFFECTIVE

- Appropriateness:** The speaker fulfills the important content requirements of the assignment.
- Accuracy:** The speaker's knowledge of the subject is accurate throughout except in minor details.
- Extensiveness:** The speaker seems informed on the subject, having done appropriate research, if applicable.
- Perspective:** The information presented reveals the speaker's assimilation and understanding of view OR of implications beyond the immediate subject.

2 ADEQUATE

- Appropriateness:** The speaker fulfills some of the important content requirements of the assignment.
- Accuracy:** The speaker's knowledge of the subject is generally accurate, though flawed.
- Extensiveness:** The speaker exhibits limited range or quality of knowledge, having done minimal appropriate research, if applicable.
- Perspective:** The information presented reveals that the speaker has only partially assimilated or understood the material. When appropriate, the speaker shows some awareness of alternative points of view OR of implications beyond the immediate subject.

1 INEFFECTIVE

- Appropriateness:** The speaker fails to address the important content requirements of the assignment.
- Accuracy:** The speaker's knowledge of the subject is generally inaccurate.
- Extensiveness:** The speaker's knowledge of the subject lacks range or quality.
- Perspective:** The information presented reveals the speaker's failure to assimilate or to understand the material.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

- Objective B:** Students' effective speaking will demonstrate an awareness of the audience/group. This criterion concerns the speaker's awareness of the audience. In demonstrating this awareness, the speaker must accommodate the listeners' attitudes toward or familiarity with the subject, as well as the listeners' comprehension levels. Depending on the characteristics of the audience, then, the speaker's development, language, and emphasis will vary and will reflect the degree to which the speaker has identified and is addressing those listeners.

4 OUTSTANDING

- Development:** The speaker's explanations and uses of evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details are highly appropriate for the listeners.
- Language:** The speaker's word choices clearly demonstrate an awareness of the listeners. The language seems deliberately chosen to aid the listeners' understanding of the subject (including definitions where appropriate).
- Emphasis:** The speaker's discussion or argumentation is consistently clear and appropriate to the listeners and to the purpose. In emphasizing important points, the speaker uses evidence logically and carefully.
- Feedback-Monitoring:** The speaker monitors the audience's/group's responses and adapts the presentation accordingly.

3 EFFECTIVE

- Development:** The speaker's explanations and uses of evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details are highly appropriate for the listeners.
- Language:** The speaker's word choices demonstrate an awareness of the listeners. The language is consistent and seems generally appropriate to the listeners' understanding of the subject (including definitions where appropriate).
- Emphasis:** The speaker's discussion or argumentation is generally clear and appropriate to the listeners and to the purpose. In emphasizing important points, the speaker generally uses evidence logically and carefully.
- Feedback-Monitoring:** The speaker monitors the audience's/group's responses and adapts the presentation accordingly.

2 ADEQUATE

- Development:** The speaker makes some attempt to provide evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details for the listeners, but some information is either extraneous or insufficient.
- Language:** The speaker's word choices indicate an awareness of the listeners, but the identity of the listeners is either unclear or inappropriate in some respects. Although the vocabulary seems fairly consistent, the language seems chosen more for the speaker's convenience than for the listeners' understanding.
- Emphasis:** The speaker's discussion or argumentation is generally clear or appropriate to the listeners and to the purpose, but may be lacking in some aspect of the use of logic or evidence.
- Feedback-Monitoring:** The speaker's interaction with the audience/group is limited.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

1 INEFFECTIVE

Development: The speaker generally lacks an awareness of the listeners, for the discussion lacks evidence, illustrations, or other definitive details.

Language: The speaker's word choices fail to reflect an awareness of the listeners, because either the vocabulary or the reference to the listeners is inconsistent or inappropriate.

Emphasis: The speaker's discussion or argumentation is generally unclear or inappropriate to the listeners and to the purpose. The presentation lacks emphasis, or is seriously defective in the use of logic or evidence.

Feedback-Monitoring: The speaker fails to monitor the audience's/group's responses.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Objective C. Students' effective speaking will demonstrate organization appropriate to the purpose and to the interaction between speaker and audience. This criterion considers the structure and the coherence of the presentation. Structure refers to the way the speaker achieves unity by focusing and ordering the information. Coherence refers to the way the speaker connects the ideas to provide continuity from point to point and throughout the presentation. These aspects of organization should be appropriate to the audience and the purpose for speaking.

4 OUTSTANDING

Structure: The speaker focuses and orders the material to convey a unified point or effect.

Coherence: The speaker provides clear and consistent movement within and between major points and from beginning to end.

Introductory Comments: The speaker's opening comments attempt to reveal the purpose and major points of the presentation and motivate the audience to listen.

Concluding Comments: The speaker's concluding comments are strong both in reemphasizing the purpose and major points of the presentation and in leaving the audience with an appropriate closing statement.

3 EFFECTIVE

Structure: The speaker focuses and orders the material to convey a generally unified point or effect.

Coherence: The speaker provides movement within and between major points and from beginning to end.

Introductory Comments: The speaker's opening comments attempt to reveal the purpose and major points of the presentation and motivate the audience to listen.

Concluding Comments: The speaker's concluding comments are appropriately related to the purpose and major points of the presentation, but they are not very strong or emphatic.

2 ADEQUATE

Structure: The speaker provides some focus or order to the material, but this structure is somewhat unclear.

Coherence: The speaker provides movement within and between major points and from beginning to end, but this movement is at times either unclear or awkward.

Introductory Comments: The speaker's opening comments attempt to reveal the purpose and major points of the and motivate the audience to listen, but in doing so the approach seems somewhat artificial, weak, or unimaginative.

Concluding Comments: The speaker's concluding comments are related to the purpose and major points of the presentation, but they either bring in extraneous information or are unnecessarily redundant.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

1 INEFFECTIVE

Structure: The speaker provides little or no focus or order to the material.
Cohesive: The speaker provides little movement within and between the major points and from beginning to end.
Introductory Comments: The speaker's opening comments are either inappropriate to the presentation, or they are unlikely to motivate the audience to listen.
Concluding Comments: The speaker closes the presentation either abruptly with no apparent concluding statement or with inappropriate remarks.

Objective D. Students' effective speaking will demonstrate vocal delivery which encourages listening. This criterion is concerned with those aspects of the speaker's delivery which either encourage or discourage listening: volume, pitch, enunciation, pronunciation, pace, and tone of voice. These aspects of oral projection should be appropriate to the content, the occasion, the setting, and the purpose for which the comments are made. Empty vocalizations/verbal fillers (such as "you know," "uh," and, "uhm," etc.) affect the vocal delivery.

4 OUTSTANDING

Clear enunciation; Appropriate pronunciation, volume, pitch, inflection, and pace throughout. The speaker sounds genuinely interested in the topic. Delivery appears spontaneous throughout; notes may assist but do not interrupt or control delivery.

3 EFFECTIVE

Clear enunciation; Appropriate pronunciation, volume, pitch, inflection, and pace are generally maintained, but occasionally the speaker's voice is lacking somewhat in the appropriate enthusiasm or energy level. Delivery appears spontaneous throughout; notes may assist but do not interrupt or control delivery. A few empty vocalizations are noticeable but are not distracting.

2 ADEQUATE

Enunciation is hampered by occasional lazy articulation (such as slurring or run-together words); some inappropriateness of pronunciation, volume, pitch, inflection, or pace may be noticeable, but such instances do not seriously hinder the speaker's audibility. Delivery generally appears spontaneous, but some moments of apparent recitation, reading of notes, or reference to notes occasionally interrupt. Empty vocalizations are somewhat distracting.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Inappropriate or ineffective enunciation, pronunciation, volume, pitch, inflection, or pace seriously hinder the speaker's audibility or obstruct communication with the audience. Reading of or reference to notes, recitation, inappropriate display or lack of energy level, or empty vocalizations adversely affect the vocal delivery.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Objective E. Students' effective speaking will demonstrate physical presentation appropriate to the speaking situation. This criterion includes all aspects of what is commonly known as body language: facial expressions, eye contact, and body movement. Physical presentation helps reflect the speaker's poise and confidence.

4 OUTSTANDING

The speaker looks genuinely interested; facial expressions are consistently compatible with spoken content; physical presentation is appropriate and purposeful in enhancing the speaker's comments; body movements and gestures are natural, appropriate, and relaxed; eye contact with the audience consistently maintained.

3 EFFECTIVE

The speaker appears interested; facial expressions are consistently compatible with spoken content. Body movements and gestures are usually natural, appropriate, and relaxed. Any nervous movements do not interfere with the presentation. Any lack of eye contact is only momentary.

2 ADEQUATE

The speaker's facial expressions seem either limited or occasionally incompatible with the spoken content. Inappropriate body movements or gestures are occasionally noticeable but do not obstruct communication. For the most part, the speaker maintains eye contact with the audience, but the inconsistency in eye contact is somewhat distracting.

1 INEFFECTIVE

The speaker's facial expressions seem either limited or incompatible with the spoken content. Poor posture, distracting or inappropriate body movements or gestures, or lack of eye contact interferes with the delivery.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Objective F. Students' effective speaking will demonstrate appropriate structure and word choice. This criterion focuses on the speaker's ability to use standard English grammar and to control language to achieve verbal precision, economy, variety, and emphasis.

4 OUTSTANDING

The speaker chooses words and expressions for both maximum clarity and variety; the speaker manifests no grammatical errors; the speaker's sentence structure manifests stylistic strengths -- that is, the sentence structures distinctively create emphasis, dramatic impact, or more effective listening.

3 EFFECTIVE

The speaker's word choices and expressions achieve both clarity and at least some distinctiveness; the speaker manifests no grammatical errors.

2 ADEQUATE

The speaker's expressions are accurate and clear, but rarely distinctive. An occasional sentence structure or grammatical error is noticeable.

1 INEFFECTIVE

The speaker's expressions are, for the most part, accurate and clear but rarely distinctive. The speaker's meaning is often muddled or his/her credibility undercut by distracting faults in sentence structure or usage.

Objective G. Students' listening skills as audience or co-communicators in group discourse will promote accurate extraction of information and meaning.

4 OUTSTANDING

The student's evident active attention to oral communications of others encourages further communication; student recognizes responsibilities for listening and for gaining clarification of incomplete communication. The student demonstrates an accurate and thorough understanding of communication content through oral and written responses.

3 EFFECTIVE

The student's active attention to oral communications of others provides visual feedback to the other of respect and interest; the student's responses indicate understanding of information, opinions and ideas presented orally.

2 ADEQUATE

The student listens with physical and mental attention to oral presentation of others and demonstrates the understanding of the major points or threads of an argument through appropriate oral or written response.

1 INEFFECTIVE

The student's attention lacks focus and is reflected in written or oral responses where meanings and information are incomplete or inaccurately understood.

Electronic Communication

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Goal Students will be able to use computers and other technology to perform tasks appropriate to their major fields.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate the ability to create, edit and revise written texts using computers.

4 OUTSTANDING

Uses advanced word processing skills to produce professional-quality text; shows knowledge of word processing features to control presentation and format of text for various audiences and purposes; proficiency in using editing features, and is clearly controlling improvements from one version to the next.

3 EFFECTIVE

Creates written text using advanced word processing capabilities to produce complex formats for academic writing; technically correct final document shows evidence of rewriting and editing.

2 ADEQUATE

Creates written text using basic word processing capabilities to achieve consistent format and correct spelling; shows original and edited versions of documents.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Avoids use of computer altogether or uses it to create a simple document with no evidence that editing, spelling or formatting functions enhance the original document or improve the revisions.

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Part I - Written, Oral, and Electronic Communication

Objective B. Students will demonstrate the ability to use computers for quantitative analysis.

- 4 OUTSTANDING**
Enters quantitative data, manipulates it with sophistication, and performs complex analyses using the most appropriate spreadsheet, statistical package, modelling or other analytic software. Demonstrates the use of technology to conduct multiple analyses of data for varying purposes and sufficient understanding to adapt principles to use of unfamiliar programs.
- 3 EFFECTIVE**
Enters quantitative data, manipulates it appropriately, and creates usable results by choosing the most appropriate spreadsheet, statistical package, modelling or other analytic software. Demonstrates use of technology to present analysis in several formats, and knowledge to extend use of computer for quantitative analysis independently.
- 2 ADEQUATE**
Enters quantitative data, manipulates it appropriately, and creates usable results using at least one spreadsheet, statistical package, modelling or other analytic software.
- 1 INEFFECTIVE**
Avoids use of computers for quantitative analysis; enters data but does not use analytical software appropriately to produce meaningful results.

Objective C. Students will demonstrate the ability to use computers to access information and data bases.

- 4 OUTSTANDING**
Consistently seeks opportunities to use computers to retrieve information from local data bases, on-line library catalog, and remote locations and uses information appropriately.
- 3 EFFECTIVE**
Uses computers independently to retrieve information from local data bases, on-line library catalogs and remote locations and uses information appropriately.
- 2 ADEQUATE**
Uses computers to retrieve information from local data bases, on-line library catalogs and remote locations and uses information appropriately; and identifies resources for assistance when needed.
- 1 INEFFECTIVE**
Avoids use of computers to retrieve information from data bases; uses on-line library catalog with assistance.

Objective D. Students will demonstrate the ability to integrate graphical, visual and statistical information electronically into written presentations as appropriate.

4 OUTSTANDING

Generates visual representations of data from files in a variety of formats; chooses most appropriate for communication purposes and incorporates the image into text or other files to increase understanding.

3 EFFECTIVE

Incorporates existing electronic graphic information file into a text file to enhance quality of document or final presentation.

2 ADEQUATE

Constructs tables or charts within text documents or adds text to graphic documents to enhance quality of presentation.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Incorporates no graphic information into texts electronically.

Objective E. Students will demonstrate the ability to send and receive electronic communications.

4 OUTSTANDING

Frequently and with facility uses Internet, electronic mail, listserves, electronic bulletin boards, geophers and other vehicles to communicate for educational purposes.

3 EFFECTIVE

On own initiative, occasionally uses Internet, electronic mail, listserves, electronic bulletin boards, etc., to communicate for educational purposes.

2 ADEQUATE

Can use Internet, electronic mail, listserves, electronic bulletin boards, etc., independently to communicate for educational purposes when required.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Seldom or never uses electronic communication for educational purposes and needs considerable assistance to do so.

Part II - Math and Science

Part II - MATH AND SCIENCE

Math

Goal Students will perform basic mathematical manipulations, display facility with the use of mathematics in framing concepts for mathematical analysis and interpret data intelligently.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate their understanding of the role of quantitative reasoning and its application.

4 OUTSTANDING

Regards quantitative reasoning as essential in understanding both multiple academic areas and domains beyond the academic and career related; can articulate and advocate appropriate applications of quantitative reasoning in various settings.

3 EFFECTIVE

Regards quantitative reasoning as very useful and important to domains beyond the academic; demonstrates and articulates an understanding of its uses and can choose appropriate applications.

2 ADEQUATE

Regards quantitative reasoning as useful and important although primarily academic; recognizes appropriate applications and understands explanations.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Regards quantitative reasoning as irrelevant beyond academic applications.

Part II - Math and Science

Objective B. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the language of mathematics and basic mathematical concepts and operations.

4 OUTSTANDING

Demonstrates superior knowledge of the language of mathematics and basic mathematical concepts and operations. Has the ability to teach and explain basic mathematical concepts and operations to others.

3 EFFECTIVE

Demonstrates the appropriate use of the language of mathematics and basic mathematical concepts and operations. Can initiate or contribute to discussions about mathematical concepts and operations.

2 ADEQUATE

Understands the basic language of mathematics and basic mathematical concepts. Can participate in discussions about mathematical concepts and operations and can demonstrate adequate knowledge.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Cannot demonstrate knowledge of the language of mathematics and basic mathematical concepts. Avoids participation in discussions about mathematical concepts and operations.

Part II - Math and Science

Objective C. Students will demonstrate the ability to apply basic mathematical operations to problem solving in one's personal and working life. This criterion demonstrates ability to apply basic mathematical concepts and operations to situations which will be encountered beyond the university and in the "real world".

4 OUTSTANDING

Understands the quantitative frameworks of broad scope, real-world problems; recognizes advantages and disadvantages of several quantitative approaches to a problem and chooses appropriate concepts to describe the problem, accurately performs needed mathematical operations, and articulates the meaning of the solution in terms of the original problem.

3 EFFECTIVE

Once the quantitative framework of real-world problems are clarified, chooses appropriate concepts to describe the problem and accurately performs needed mathematical operations and articulates the meanings of the solution in terms of the original problem.

2 ADEQUATE

Recognizes the quantitative framework of real-world problems of limited scope, and independently chooses appropriate concepts to describe the problem; accurately performs basic mathematical operations on problems of personal or work life and applies the solution to the original problem.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Does not see problems in a quantitative framework unassisted; inability to choose appropriate concepts and/or to perform basic mathematical operations on problems in personal or work life limits options to developing solutions.

Part II - Math and Science

Objective D. Students will accurately comprehend and draw appropriate inferences from numeric data assembled in a variety of forms (e.g., graphs, charts, summary statistics, etc.) and in other disciplines.

4 OUTSTANDING

Comprehends complex and sophisticated displays of data and makes inferences consistent with the data. Can construct data displays from a set of data; explains clearly in everyday language the meaning of the data, and relates it to appropriate context.

3 EFFECTIVE

Comprehends some complex and sophisticated displays of data and makes inferences consistent with simple displays of data; explains the meaning of the data in everyday language; relates to appropriate context.

2 ADEQUATE

Comprehends simple displays of data, makes inferences consistent with the displays of data, and explains the inferences within a limited context.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Inconsistently comprehends some simple displays of data; makes inferences inconsistent with simple displays of data or with its context.

Part II - Math and Science

Part II - Math and Science

Science

Goal Students will demonstrate an understanding of physical and/or life science phenomena and the uses of scientific methods and theories.

Objective A. Students will understand the role, nature and value of scientific inquiry.

4 OUTSTANDING

Understands in depth the role and limitations of science in addressing contemporary quality of life issues (i.e., improved health, a better environment, increased food production, population control, etc.), articulates multiple aspects of the issues, perceives the relationship of self to issues and seeks additional scientific understanding as a guide to action.

3 EFFECTIVE

Understands the role and limitations of science in addressing contemporary quality of life issues, articulates several aspects of the issues, perceives the relationship of self to issues, acts on basis of understanding.

2 ADEQUATE

Understands in general the role of science in addressing some contemporary quality of life issues; articulates several aspects of at least one issue; perceives the relationship of self to issues, occasionally acts on basis of scientific understanding.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Understands minimally the role of science in contemporary quality of life issues; does not perceive the relationship of self to issues; does not understand the nature of scientific work.

Objective B. Students will demonstrate their understanding of scientific theories and perspectives

4 OUTSTANDING

Uses deep understanding of theoretical frameworks, concepts, terms, and important thinkers and ideas from several science disciplines to explain contemporary scientific phenomena; makes connections between science disciplines and identifies separate contributions of disciplines to understanding.

3 EFFECTIVE

Uses knowledge of theoretical frameworks, concepts, terms, and important thinkers and ideas from two sciences to discuss contemporary scientific phenomena; identifies perspectives of each discipline in explaining a particular process or phenomenon.

2 ADEQUATE

Uses basic understanding of concepts, descriptive terms, and important thinkers and ideas from at least one of the sciences to explain contemporary scientific phenomena; recognizes perspectives of other disciplines.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Lacks understanding of relationship of concepts, terms and important ideas to each other or to a science perspective; uses beliefs, applies ideas inaccurately, or uses irrelevant facts to explain science phenomena.

Part II - Math and Science

Objective C. Students will critically evaluate various approaches to research by identifying sound and unsound reasoning in scientific and lay contexts.

4 OUTSTANDING

Is discerning in judging the validity of findings as warranted or not by evidence and research design. Can articulate the basic implications of identified strengths and weaknesses of methods.

3 EFFECTIVE

Can differentiate sound from flawed research methods and evaluate the validity of inferences based on available evidence.

2 ADEQUATE

Recognizes major flaws in research. Critical judgement exercised only when pressed, elicited, or when prior (closely held) assumptions are challenged.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Unable to recognize inappropriate research methods or invalid inferences from evidence. Likely to accept results more on basis of preconceived notions, prejudice or style of presentation than on the basis of a critical assessment of the evidence, concepts, and methods.

Objective D. Students understand the applications of different research designs and approaches.

4 OUTSTANDING

Clearly appreciates the advantages and disadvantages of various approaches, understands the underlying assumptions of various research methods, and readily matches the appropriate design to the problem at hand.

3 EFFECTIVE

Able to assess the appropriateness of research designs for a variety of situations, settings, or problems. Can apply or use simple research methods in uncomplicated cases.

2 ADEQUATE

Recognizes conspicuously inappropriate design applications. Understands that different problems or settings require different approaches, but requires guidance in discerning most appropriate methods for a given situation without considerable guidance.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Assumes all research is alike or that one method is as good as another. Avoids solving problems, seeks easy answers if possible. Has no interest in or understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of various approaches, the assumptions required, or how the nature of the problem affects the choice of approach.

28

Part II - Math and Science

Objective E. Students will formulate research questions and test hypotheses as part of using the scientific process.

4 OUTSTANDING

Can generate and appropriately state research questions/hypotheses about simple or complex relationships that are logically consistent with existing information (e.g., literature review).

3 EFFECTIVE

Can generate research questions/hypotheses for simple relationships. Can appropriately interpret and critique stated hypotheses.

2 ADEQUATE

Can appropriately interpret and critique stated hypotheses. Has difficulty generating research questions/hypotheses.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Has difficulty generating hypotheses and interpreting stated hypotheses.

Objective F. Students use systematic, empirical approaches to address questions as part of the scientific process.

4 OUTSTANDING

For a given research question, the student can correctly identify independent, dependent, and extraneous variables, describe a research design to control the extraneous variable(s), or identify why extraneous variables cannot be controlled for a given research question.

3 EFFECTIVE

For a given research question, the student can correctly identify independent, dependent, and extraneous variables, and describe a research design to control the extraneous variable(s).

2 ADEQUATE

For a given research question, the student can correctly identify independent, dependent, and extraneous variables.

1 INEFFECTIVE

For a given research question, the student cannot correctly identify independent, dependent, and extraneous variables.

29

Part II - Math and Science

Objective G. Students will identify and collect appropriate information as part of the scientific process.

4 **OUTSTANDING**

For a given research situation, the student can correctly identify and describe appropriate and realistic measures for the independent, dependent, and extraneous variables, and describe strengths and weaknesses for each measure.

3 **EFFECTIVE**

For a given research situation, the student can correctly identify and describe appropriate and realistic measures for the independent, dependent, and extraneous variables.

2 **ADEQUATE**

For a given research situation, the student can correctly identify appropriate and realistic measures for the independent, dependent, and extraneous variables.

1 **INEFFECTIVE**

For a given research situation, the student cannot correctly identify appropriate measures for the independent, dependent, and extraneous variables.

Objective H. Students will draw appropriate conclusions from empirical results in quantitative and qualitative formats.

4 **OUTSTANDING**

Can express empirical findings in "plain English" (own words) and identify the impact of findings on theory development and/or practical application.

3 **EFFECTIVE**

Can express most empirical findings but limited in ability to identify practical or theoretical implications.

2 **ADEQUATE**

Can express empirical findings reported in simple numerical, graphical or prose but has difficulty identifying implications.

1 **INEFFECTIVE**

Has difficulty expressing empirical findings of any form.

Part III - Social/Behavioral Science

Part III - SOCIAL/BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

Social/Behavioral Sciences

Goal Students will demonstrate an understanding of the processes of human behavior and social interaction and use social and behavioral science perspectives to interpret them.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate their understanding of behavioral and social science theories and perspectives

4 **OUTSTANDING**

Uses deep understanding of theoretical frameworks, concepts, terms, and important thinkers and ideas from several social/behavioral science disciplines to explain contemporary social phenomena; makes connections between disciplines and identifies separate contributions of disciplines to understanding.

3 **EFFECTIVE**

Uses knowledge of theoretical frameworks, concepts, terms, and important thinkers and ideas from two social sciences to discuss contemporary social phenomena; identifies perspectives of each discipline in explaining a particular event or scenario.

2 **ADEQUATE**

Uses basic understanding of concepts, descriptive terms, and important thinkers and ideas from at least one of the social/behavioral sciences to explain contemporary social phenomena; recognizes perspectives of other disciplines.

1 **INEFFECTIVE**

Lacks understanding of relationship of concepts, terms and important ideas to each other or to a social/behavioral science perspective; uses beliefs, applies ideas inaccurately, or uses irrelevant facts to explain social phenomena.

Part III - Social/Behavioral Science

Objective B. Students will understand the cultural, social and political structures and processes and their effects on individual, group and societal behaviors.

4 OUTSTANDING

Accurately describes cultural, social and political structures and processes in depth and can use several as frameworks for analysis; applies knowledge and appropriate terminology to understanding cultures and in explaining the interactions of political and social structures and processes and their effects on individuals and groups.

3 EFFECTIVE

Describes cultural, social and political structures and processes and applies knowledge to understanding and explaining their effects on human behavior; understands terms used to discuss these phenomena and the interactions of structures and processes and uses them to explain specific social problems and their effects on individuals.

2 ADEQUATE

Describes basic cultural, social and political structures and processes and accurately uses basic terminology; recognizes them in contemporary issues and can use structures and processes as analytical frameworks; understands the effects of these structures and processes on cultural, social or political groups and individuals within them.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Cannot accurately differentiate cultural, social and political phenomena; understands that they effect the behaviors of groups and individuals, but cannot use accurately to discuss or analyze a given situation or phenomenon.

32

Part III - Social/Behavioral Science

Objective C. Students will critically evaluate, interpret, and make inferences from social/behavioral science data.

4 OUTSTANDING

Recognizes points of view and value assumptions in formulation of social science questions and their effects on the nature and interpretation of data collected, and articulates the point of view in a given situation. Identifies distortions in the presentation of qualitative and quantitative data and the logical and empirical fallacies in inferences drawn from data; recognizes the consequences of inaccurate data interpretation and articulates appropriate alternative presentations or inferences. Independently extracts complex data from a variety of sources – qualitative and quantitative, presents that data in summary form, makes appropriate connections and inferences consistent with the data and relates it to a larger context.

3 EFFECTIVE

In the work of others, recognizes the contribution of point of view to social science data collection and analysis. Identifies distortions in the presentation of qualitative and quantitative data and some of the logical and empirical fallacies in inferences drawn from data; recognizes consequences of inaccurate data interpretation. In her own work, extracts complex data from a variety of sources – qualitative and quantitative, presents data in summary form, and makes connections and inferences consistent with the data.

2 ADEQUATE

In the work of others, recognizes the contribution of point of view to formulating social science questions. Identifies distortions in the presentation of qualitative and quantitative data. Ability to identify some logical and empirical fallacies in inferences drawn from data. In the student's own work, extracts basic data from a variety of sources – qualitative and quantitative, presents that data in summary form, and makes inferences consistent with the data.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Perceives social science research as isolated from context, or lacks conceptual framework for evaluation of social science data; identifies very obvious logical errors or distortions within the immediate context. Extracts some simple data from a variety of sources – qualitative and quantitative, but has difficulty presenting that data in summary form, or making inferences consistent with the data.

33

Part IV - Humanities/Cultural Goals

Part IV - HUMANITIES/CULTURAL GOALS

Goal 1. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the historical development of culture over time and its relation to the present.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate understanding of the construction of history and how history is written.

4 OUTSTANDING

Understands the existence of various perspectives on any historical event, the processes that contribute to inclusions or exclusion of those perspectives on written histories, and articulates the relationship of "official" histories to subsequent historical developments and to historical understanding.

3 EFFECTIVE

Understands the existence of more than one perspective on any historical event, the processes that contribute to inclusions or exclusion of those perspectives on written histories, and the relationship of "official" histories to subsequent developments.

2 ADEQUATE

Understands the existence of more than one perspective on any historical event and the processes that contribute to inclusion or exclusion of perspectives.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Assumes a single point of view for any historical event.

Objective B. Students will demonstrate an understand of broad outlines of history and make accurate connections between developments separated in time or place.

4 OUTSTANDING

Knows major chronologies and patterns of historical developments of Western and some non-Western culture and their relationships; understands and articulates historical relationships of developments within and across cultures.

3 EFFECTIVE

Knows major patterns of historical developments of Western cultures and is aware of non-Western cultures; understands and accurately articulates relationships of historical developments within Western cultures.

2 ADEQUATE

Knows general chronologies and patterns of historical developments of Western cultures; understands relationships between disparate events.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Knows about some historical events; perceives them as isolated rather than related.

Objective C. Students will demonstrate the ability to recognize the contribution of historical

Part IV - Humanities/Cultural Goals

antecedents to the understanding of current personal, social, and political situations and developments.

4 OUTSTANDING

Understands relevance of history to current global situations and accurately articulates relevant historical antecedents of particular recent events.

3 EFFECTIVE

Understands the relevance of history to understanding present developments in the Western world and articulates appropriate connections.

2 ADEQUATE

Within a limited geographical or historical context, recognizes antecedents of present in past and articulates several connections accurately.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Perceives current social and political developments as framed only in the recent past.

Part IV - Humanities/Cultural Goals

Part IV - Humanities/Cultural Goals

Goal 2. Students will become familiar with the diversity of a global culture marked by racial, ethnic, gender and regional differences.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate the ability to recognize multiple perspectives and appreciate perspectives which produce a world-view different from one's own.

Objective B. Students will demonstrate the ability to use another perspective to analyze current or historical social events and cultural practices.

4 OUTSTANDING

Recognizes differing perspectives on contemporary issues both globally and within the United States; is aware of limits of own perspective; understands several sources of diversity and the possible differences in values and behaviors and interpretations of events in American culture; articulates relationship of other perspectives to understanding of self.

3 EFFECTIVE

Recognizes differing perspectives on contemporary issues within the United States; is aware of limits of own perspective; understands several sources of diversity and the possible differences in values and behaviors and interpretations of events in American culture; articulates relationship of other perspectives to understanding of self.

2 ADEQUATE

Recognizes at least one differing perspective on contemporary issues within the United States; is aware of limits of own perspective; understands sources of this difference and the diversity in values and behaviors and interpretations of events which result; articulates relationship of other perspectives to understanding of self.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Avoids recognition of differing perspectives on contemporary issues within the United States; is unaware of limits of own perspective; considers events from own point of view; devalues differences in behavior or cultures and interpretations of events which result; sees no relationship of other perspectives to understanding of self.

Goal 3. Students will communicate orally (with the exception of Latin and Ancient Greek) and in writing in another language.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate the ability to read in one foreign language and comprehend the topic and main ideas in written texts.

Objective B. Students will demonstrate the ability to understand spoken discourse and converse in a foreign language on familiar subjects.

4 OUTSTANDING

See explanations of foreign language proficiency placement and testing program in the University Bulletin.

3 EFFECTIVE

2 ADEQUATE

1 INEFFECTIVE

Goal 4. Students will demonstrate an understanding of the contribution of the literary, visual or performing arts and their cultural context and express informed personal responses to artistic creations.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate the ability to develop an aesthetic response to at least one of the arts.

4 OUTSTANDING

Knows the major forms of several of the arts and articulates an aesthetic response to artistic works using appropriate concepts and relevant information; carefully observes and accurately describes the elements of the work and their relationship to its overall design or structure; articulates the understanding of aesthetic uses of its medium.

3 EFFECTIVE

Knows the major forms of one of the arts and articulates an aesthetic response to artistic works using appropriate concepts and relevant information; carefully observes and accurately describes the elements of the work and their relationship to its overall design or structure; articulates the understanding of aesthetic uses of its medium.

2 ADEQUATE

Knows several forms of one of the arts and articulates an aesthetic response to an artistic work using appropriate concepts and relevant information; observes and describes the main elements of the work and their relationship to its overall design or structure.

1 INEFFECTIVE

Knows several forms of one of the arts; knows some relevant information but neither observes and describes the main elements of the work nor sees their relationship to its overall design or structure.

Part IV - Humanities/Cultural Goals

Objective B. Students will express a personal response to works of art using appropriate concepts and relevant information.

- 4 **OUTSTANDING**
Responds to the expressive qualities of the arts and recognizes particular elements of the work and reactions to them; expresses an informed personal response to artistic works using relevant information and relating personal responses to the work(s) to understanding of self or others.
- 3 **EFFECTIVE**
Responds to the expressive qualities of the arts; expresses an informed personal response to the arts using relevant information and relating the personal responses to the work(s) to understanding of self or others.
- 2 **ADEQUATE**
Responds to works of art and expresses a personal response to the work(s) using relevant information and personal observations.
- 1 **INEFFECTIVE**
Does not express a personal response to artistic works.

Objective C. Students can relate art to the wider cultural context from which it emerges.

- 4 **OUTSTANDING**
Understands the interaction of cultural context, artists' lives, and their works, including conditions which contribute to perceptions of what is art, and the historical development of the philosophy and techniques of the arts; interprets the contribution of artist(s) or art works in relation to values and assumptions of place, time, and the broader culture from which the arts emerge.
- 3 **EFFECTIVE**
Understands the interaction of cultural context, artists' lives, and their works, including conditions which contribute to perceptions of what is art and historical patterns of artistic techniques; interprets the contribution of artist(s) or art works in relation to values and assumptions of place, time, and the broader culture from which the arts emerge.
- 2 **ADEQUATE**
Understands the interaction of cultural contexts, artists' lives and their works; interprets artistic creations in relation to values and assumptions of particular place, time and culture from a work of art emerges.
- 1 **INEFFECTIVE**
Understands that there is an interaction of art and cultural context but cannot interpret arts in their broader cultural context.

Part IV - Humanities/Cultural Goals

Goal 5 Students will integrate insights from several disciplines and apply them to value choices and ethical decisions.

Objective A. Students will demonstrate the ability to identify ethical dilemmas in a variety of contexts.

- 4 **OUTSTANDING**
Identifies and accurately describes complex ethical dilemmas from life situations and theoretical scenarios.
- 3 **EFFECTIVE**
Identifies and describes complex ethical dilemmas in scenarios derived from everyday life situations.
- 2 **ADEQUATE**
Identifies and describes simple ethical dilemmas in scenarios derived from everyday life situations and from theoretical works.
- 1 **INEFFECTIVE**
Has difficulty in identifying and describing even simple ethical dilemmas in scenarios derived from everyday life situations and from theoretical works.

Objective B. Students will apply understandings from several disciplines to clarify ethical conflicts; articulate reasoned personal responses based on expressed values.

- 4 **OUTSTANDING**
Uses appropriate insights from several disciplines to make connections and elucidate ethical dilemmas; articulates sources of insights and relation to understanding of self; recognizes and articulates personal values in reasoned response.
- 3 **EFFECTIVE**
Uses insights from more than one discipline to make connections and elucidate ethical dilemmas; articulates sources of insights and relation to understanding of self; incorporates personal values into response.
- 2 **ADEQUATE**
Uses insights from more than one discipline to clarify ethical dilemmas; articulates connections to personal values as related to dilemmas.
- 1 **INEFFECTIVE**
Clarifies response to ethical dilemma solely in terms of rules or personal values.

** DRAFT **

USC INSTITUTIONAL FACULTY GOVERNANCE REORGANIZATION PROPOSAL
Submitted by Ellen Chamberlain, M.L.S. and Roy Darby, Ph.D.
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate Subcommittee
on System Reorganization

INSTITUTION-WIDE ISSUES

The first step is to identify and mutually agree upon those issues that extend beyond individual campus boundaries to affect students, faculty, and staff at other campuses of the institution. Examples of possible issues are as follows:

Institutional Curricula
Course designations
Course descriptions
Core requirements
Role of distance education
Role of developmental education
Library & technical support

Institutional Policies
Transferability/acceptance of courses
Sexual harassment, etc.
Benefits
Salary equity/compression
Welfare
Inter-campus degree-delivery agreements
Jurisdiction/authority/duplication

Faculty Development/Scholarship
Institution-wide departmental credential approval
Sanctioning experimental courses
Faculty exchange
Allocation of laboratory/office space on main campus

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

In order for any reorganization to succeed, we believe it must build upon structures currently in place. These structures have developed over many years and serve a useful function. In formulating our plan, we accepted the following basic assumptions:

1. It is unlikely that the system of faculty governance currently in place at all USC campuses will be changed or dramatically altered in our lifetimes. Any plan that tampers with this organization in a substantive way will fail. We must work within the present structure.

page 2

2. Individual faculty senates and organizations are responsible for their own internal governance and the RCFS is responsible for decision-making on issues pertaining to its member institutions.
3. Currently, there are no established lines of communication between the four-year faculty senates and the Columbia faculty senate or the four-year faculty senates and the RCFS. For the benefit of the University as a whole, there is a real and pressing need for greater coordination and collaboration at the faculty leadership level among the campuses.
4. Representatives from the RCFS who sit on USC Columbia faculty committees have little or no voice in the decision-making process. While their attendance may expedite the flow of information from the Columbia campus outward, there is no corresponding flow in the other direction. This situation needs to be rectified.

INCREASED OPPORTUNITIES

By creating the Collegium, a door is opened to increased opportunities institution-wide for cooperation and for support of faculty development, research and scholarship activities. As we begin to work together and know each other better, mutual respect and understanding grow. Some examples follow:

1. If Columbia campus academic department chairs were given the opportunity to sign-off on all new regional campus faculty hires, they would have a greater proprietary interest in these people and accept them more readily as peers and as departmental colleagues.
2. Avenues could be created for the approval of experimental courses developed on regional campuses as regular course offerings within the University on all campuses.
3. Regional campus faculty may arrange for exchange of teaching assignments with other USC faculty on the Columbia campus or on a four-year or other regional campus.
4. A regional campus might arrange teaching schedules to give faculty members useful blocks of time to work away from the home campus and the sister campus might allocate laboratory and/or office space to them so that they could pursue research and scholarship activities.
5. The institution may call an annual meeting of faculty members from all campuses to be addressed by the President and by the Provost.

page 3

** DRAFT **
REORGANIZATION PLAN

USC COLLEGIUM

Description

The USC Collegium is a unicameral body of faculty representatives drawn from all segments of the institution for the purpose of addressing institution-wide faculty governance issues in order to advise the Provost and to alert individual faculty senates on the impact of their actions upon other campuses and administrative offices of the institution. The Collegium will meet quarterly.

Procedure

The Provost, Columbia campus faculty senate, either four year campus faculty senate, or the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate (RCFS) may determine that an issue, policy or decision exceeds individual campus boundaries and is an appropriate subject for review by the Collegium. At this point in time, they shall submit it to the Collegium.

When an issue, policy or decision is brought before the Collegium, the Collegium shall create an Ad Hoc Committee to address the problem. Members appointed by the Collegium to the Ad Hoc Committee shall come from all areas of the institution, some neutral and some having a stake in the outcome. The Ad Hoc Committee shall look into the problem and prepare a report of its findings and recommendations. This report shall first be sent to the Columbia faculty senate, to the four-year campus faculty senates and to the Regional Campus Faculty Senate (RCFS) for comment and input. The RCFS, in turn, shall send the report to its campus faculty organizations for comment and input. Any of these groups may append additional information or comments to the report as they see fit. The report of the Ad Hoc Committee, with addenda, shall then be sent back to the Collegium for its final recommendation. The Collegium shall decide the issue on the basis of the information put before it.

It should be understood from the outset, however, that the extent of the authority of the Collegium is advisory to the Provost who makes the final decisions. In addition, each representative should not forget that he/she is still accountable to his/her own senate or constituency.

page 4

Organization

There is no need to create a new body to serve as the Collegium for the University. The currently constituted Academic Advisory Committee, with representative institutional membership and headed by the Provost, represents a prototypical model for the proposed Collegium. We understand its present membership breakdown is as follows:

- Provost, Chair
- 5 Columbia ex-faculty senate chairs
- 2 Aiken faculty departmental chairs
- 2 Spartanburg faculty departmental chairs
- 2 representatives for RCFS (1 chair of organization; 1 elected by membership and approved by the Vice Provost)
- 1 representative from the Legal office

At the outset, in order to avoid a Collegium of unwieldy size, we recommend the present membership of the Academic Advisement Committee become the membership of the Collegium. However, once the new faculty governance organization is operational, we recommend the Collegium membership be expanded to ensure greater participation and representation from individual campuses, distance education, and lifelong learning.

RESULTS

One of the problems cited by University of Wisconsin personnel is that, even when considered sensible and fair, institutional policy decisions made by the main campus in Madison are opposed by the other campuses simply because the others have had no voice in the decision-making process.

As a more formally structured body, the Collegium could avoid such problems by concentrating on disseminating information in all directions and building cooperation and consensus among all the campuses on faculty governance issues.

END OF DRAFT PROPOSAL

**Report of the Executive Committee
February 17, 1995
Submitted by Mike Schoen, Secretary**

The Executive Committee met Friday, February 3rd at the Faculty House in Columbia. The following Executive Committee members from the Regional Campuses were present: John Catalano (Lancaster), Wayne Chilcote (Salkehatchie), Mike Schoen (Lifelong Learning), Jane Upshaw (Beaufort), Robert Costello (Sumter), and Tandy Willis (Union), Nora Schukei (Beaufort), Steve Bishoff (Sumter), and Danny Faulkner (Lancaster). Vice Provost John Duffy, Associate Vice Provost John Gardner, and Mary McDonald from Dr. Duffy's office were also in attendance.

Dr. Duffy provided an update on the budget for next year, as well as recent legislative activity. Executive committee members were encouraged to contact their state legislators to provide support for funding higher education. Dr. Duffy also reported that progress was being made with the BAIS proposal for the regional campuses; there continues to be an emphasis on distance education programs; and that there was a conflict between the April senate meeting in Beaufort and the USC Board of Trustees meeting in Columbia.

Following reports from the campuses, Secretary Mike Schoen reported that the minutes from the November RCFS meeting were back from USC printing and were available to take back to the campuses for distribution.

Reports from the System Affairs and Rights and Responsibilities standing committees were given by Steve Bishoff and Danny Faulkner, respectively. Nora Schukei reported from the Welfare committee. Tandy Willis reported that the outside activities committee will be presenting to the RCFS in Union a draft policy and reporting form.

A discussion followed concerning developing an effective procedure for sending approved motions from the RCFS to Dr. Duffy's office. The following motion was passed by the Executive Committee, and is now being presented to the senate for approval:

"It shall be added to the vice chair's duties the job of carrying motions from this body to the appropriate administrative unit and to record the action taken".

There was no other new business. Dr. Duffy announced that Kathy Gue' in his office would be from this point forward the contact person for senate business, communication, and activities. The meeting was adjourned following lunch.

MEMORANDUM

From: Bruce Nims, USC-Lancaster

To: Regional Campuses Faculty Senate

Subject: Report of the Faculty Senate Committee on Libraries

Date: February 17, 1995

The Faculty Senate committee on Libraries met December 2, 1994, and February 3, 1995, in the Mezzanine Conference Room of the Thomas Cooper Library.

At the December meeting Vice Provost Terry announced that the Thomas Cooper Library would be the site of one the "classrooms of the future," funded by \$225,000 from the Provost's office. It would be used primarily for UNIV 101 classes, but would be available for other kinds of instruction also. Terry also announced that Cooper Library, Distance Learning, Instructional Services, and Computer Services would be embarking on a new strategic plan with an eye to consolidation of functions.

A steering committee is now being organized to plan the use of the new storage facility, which should be completed by 1996.

At the February meeting, further arrangements for departmental visitations were discussed. The Vice-Provost's representative indicated that the million dollar infusion for next year promised by the Futures Committee was not endangered by the possible 5% budget cut. The Library Annex plans were also discussed and were reported to be on schedule. Thomas Cooper Library will be pressed for space in the meantime, so special space utilization plans are being implemented.

The next meeting of the committee will be March 31.

**Report on Courses and Curriculum Committee
Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
February 17, 1995
Professor Robert Castleberry (Sumter)**

Since our last meeting the Committee has met three times (December 2, January 20, and February 3). The Columbia Faculty Senate met December 7, January 18, and February 1. Please note the Columbia Faculty Senate minutes to keep current on the courses and curricular changes which have been approved and which are potentially important to you.

Of interest:

1. A rather extensive revision of the English course offerings and curriculum has been approved.
2. Biology 111 - 113 will be changed to Biology 101 and 102.
3. There is a proposal to renumber some Education courses.
4. Some MART courses have been deleted.
5. There have been some changes to a few MATH descriptions.
6. UNIV 101 is now available to non-freshmen in their first semester of enrollment.
7. PSYC 470 = LING 300 = ANTH 373 is a proposal relating to language sciences.

Again, please check the minutes of the Columbia Senate. Also, BADM will be seeking the creation of new departmental designators, including IBAD.

USC Columbia Faculty Welfare Committee
Report to the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
February 17, 1995

The Faculty Welfare Committee of the USC Columbia Faculty Senate met on December 6, 1994, and on January 12, and February 7, 1995, at the Faculty House, USC Columbia.

FACULTY WELLNESS: Professor Harriet Williams of the Faculty Welfare Committee also chairs the Subcommittee on the Wellness Center of the University Committee on Health Programs. The Subcommittee is preparing a survey to sample students, faculty and staff, in an attempt to assess the awareness by members of the university, their judgements regarding its adequacy, their interest in the programs and their willingness to support and participate in these programs.

The University Committee on Health Programs is also exploring the possibility of using Student Health Services (SHS) as an access portal for certain routine and acute services for an expanded university population including faculty. This would work only if a close relationship with the Medical Schools's Primary Care Center was established to provide access to specialty clinics and back-up for SHS. Thus, SHS would then become part of a larger managed care system. One of the difficulties would be that if such a program could be worked out would be that SHS facilities would have to provide services for all state employees although physical accessibility might limit this.

The subcommittee is presently formulating a survey to assess interest among faculty and staff. The possibility of future links with other campuses would be a natural outgrowth of the establishment of a more comprehensive managed health plan because with the installation of HMO's there is usually a reduction in hospital bed usage, thus necessitating an expanded referral area.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT SUBCOMMITTEE: No further action or discussions have taken place.

SEXUAL ORIENTATION POLICY SUBCOMMITTEE: The chair of the committee has confirmed that the Board of Trustees is not considering the amendment to the Equal Opportunity Policy of the University pending receipt by the President of information about such policies from other institutions.


SALARY COMPRESSION SUBCOMMITTEE: The report of the Salary Equity Task Force was finally presented to the USC Faculty Senate by Professor Caroline Strobel, who also serves on the Faculty Welfare Committee. The Faculty Welfare Committee is in the process of drafting a series of resolutions to effect changes in current policy to prevent occurrences of salary compression and salary inequities. The first set of these recommendations will be presented to the USC Faculty Senate at the March 1st meeting.

SUMMER TEACHING STIPENDS SUBCOMMITTEE: Professor Don Wedlock has prepared a lengthy report on summer school pay structures. The report first compares USC's

pay structure to those of other institutions in the Southeast. USC occupies the bottom spot of all these universities. The report then addresses USC and state problems and resistances to increasing the summer school pay rates. Finally, the report presents a profile of the current summer school employment and expenditures by departments. There has been considerable resistance within the administration from the departmental level up. State law also apparently caps summer stipends at 15%. Resolutions will be presented in April by the Faculty Welfare Committee.

Changes to the Tenure and Promotions policies have been referred back to committee in response to numerous objections from the Faculty Senate. Faculty Welfare will not consider the matter for now.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Roy Darby".

Roy O. Darby, III, Ph.D.
Faculty Welfare Committee

**ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE
USC BOARD OF TRUSTEES**

February 17, 1995

To: Regional Campuses Faculty Senate
From: Deborah B. Cureton

The Academic Affairs Committee of the USC Board of Trustees met on December 8, 1994, and on February 9, 1995.

December 8, 1994:

In open session, Mr. Mark W. Buyck, Jr., was reelected as chair of the committee. The committee then received a report from Dr. Dan Barron on "Teaching: A Major Focus of USC Faculty". Dr. Barron spoke of the activities surrounding the enhanced emphasis on quality teaching by USC faculty at the undergraduate level. The committee was very interested in the report, indicating that the public perception of teaching at USC is at odds with the faculty perception. The Board members posed questions such as the following to Dr. Barron and to the administration: Do tenure, promotion, and award criteria effectively promote the value of teaching effectiveness? Should faculty be required to be mentors? Is the mentoring of students clearly given attention in advancement and pay discussions? The committee members indicate their intent that USC to be known for effective teaching at the undergraduate level and their support for the reward structure to reflect support of undergraduate teaching excellence.

The following new program proposals were approved to be sent to the full board:

- A. **Master of Teaching in Secondary Education in the College of Education, USC Columbia**
"The purpose of the Master of Teaching (MT) in Secondary Education is to prepare exemplary entry level professional educators through a five year professional program. The proposed Master of Teaching Degree in Secondary Education is designed for initial certification in secondary education and incorporates an undergraduate major in a subject matter area and an undergraduate component in education. The proposed five year professional program will replace the existing Extended Baccalaureate Program in Secondary Education for those students entering the university in June 1994 or later. ... The College of Education ... is committed to moving all initial teacher certification programs in early childhood, elementary, and secondary education to the graduate level."
- B. **Ph. D. in Special Education in the College of Education, USC Columbia**
- C. **Establishment of Center for Electrochemical Engineering in the College of Engineering, USC Columbia**

The committee approved the following amendment to the USC Columbia Faculty Manual (p. 44): *Instructional staff members must refrain from engaging in any romantic or sexual relations with students over whom they have academic or supervisory control.* Including this statement in the manual allows for termination for cause.

The committee also approved several changes to the USC Spartanburg Faculty Manual, including a policy on consensual relations, the establishment of Sabbatical Review Committee, and extensions of probationary terms for tenure and promotion.

Dennis Pruitt reported on enrollment and scholarship funding. Other reports received were on academic integrity and the work of the Office of Fellowships and Summer Programs.

The College of Humanities and Social Sciences received approval from this committee to change its name to the **College of Liberal Arts**.

The final report received in open session dealt with the fiscal aspects of the USC IMBA/Vienna Program.

In executive session, the committee considered personnel matters.

February 9, 1995

In open session, the committee received a report on academic integrity.

Provost Moeser recommended to the committee that there be no move^{at this time} to establish a common faculty manual for the entire university, given the diversity of the various campuses. He noted the difficulties of achieving a common grievance policy, but indicated that the grievance policy was close to becoming a reality.

The committee approved the following name changes to be presented to the full board: the Department of Civil Engineering at USC Columbia will become the **Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering**, the School of Humanities and Sciences at USC Spartanburg will become the **College of Arts and Sciences**.

New program proposals were also approved.

- A. **Bachelor of Science in Business Administration, Managerial Accounting Track, Accounting Major**, at USC Spartanburg for delivery at University Center Greenville
- B. **Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education with Certification in Chemistry** at USC Aiken
- C. **Bachelor of Science in Secondary Education with Certification in Secondary Comprehensive Science** at USC Aiken

Provost Moeser stated that he received the report from the Reeves Committee on the College of Criminal Justice on February 8, 1995. That report will be shared with the appropriate audiences.

In executive session, the committee considered personnel matters.

INSURANCE AND ANNUITIES COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE REGIONAL CAMPUSES SENATE
 February 17, 1995
 Submitted by Jerry Dockery

The committee met on January 17, 1995.

Jane Jameson met with the committee to review the Merastar Insurance plan to offer auto, homeowner, boat, motorcycle, liability and other insurance to USC employees through payroll deduction.

She discussed some legal questions which had been raised with respect to the plan. The concerns were prompted because of a letter which Dan McLeod, Attorney General under Governor Edwards, had written expressing reservations on a City of Charlotte effort to deduct union dues and State statute 8-11-80. The committee felt that this issue was moot because the issues were entirely different and one of the first things the committee had done when considering this policy was to have legal clear it.

She then asked individual committee members their feelings about the policy. The discussion centered on the financial health of Merastar (it was found to be "sound" eventhough its rating was not the highest) the savings offered by Merastar (in some cases they would be substantial, in others minimal) the liability incurred by the university (none), the convenience the plan would offer our employees (it was agreed that the biggest beneficiaries would be employees at the lower end of the pay scale) and the ease of administration (information furnished by companies currently using the plan indicated no problems).

Jane Jamison will take the proposal to the administration for approval.

The committee discussed the Paul Revere Plan's handling of preexisting conditions. Paul Revere offered us two options. The committee discussed both and will make a decision at its next meeting.

The committee discussed the Prudential Group Life Plan. The issues discussed centered on;

1. Can the plan continue to support the Retired Life feature?

Options

- a. Continue the feature for all current and new members (this would entail a significant price increase.
- b. Grandfather current members as of the date of the policy amendment and discontinue for all new members. (this would create a two-tiered level of benefits.)
- c. Grandfather only retired members as of the date of amendment and discontinue Retired Life for current members and new members who have not retired as of policy amendment.
- d. Discontinue Retired Life as of the policy amendment date for all current and retired members. (this would create ill feelings and make the plan less attractive for members)

The committee agreed that the printing costs of the new brochure should be kept in-house in order to save money.



THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Office of Research

106 Osborne Building
Columbia, SC 29208

803-777-9520 458
FAX 803-777-9577 2467

Post-It™ Fax Note	7671	Date	3/10/95	# of pages	1
To	Mike Schoen	From	Andy Willis		
Co./Dept.	Alpha Learning	Co.			
Phone #	777-8155	Phone #	777-6864		
Fax #	777-9359	Fax #	427-3682		

TO: Dean John Duffy, Regional Campuses and Continuing Education

FROM: Ardis M. Savory, Associate Vice Provost for Sponsored Programs and Research
Ardis M. Savory

RE: Outside Professional Activities Policy

DATE: March 3, 1995

The University Conflict of Interest Committee met on Monday, February 27. I am pleased to report that the policy for the Regional Campuses was reviewed by the Committee and recommended to be sent forward with no changes to the Legal Department and the Provost.

Thank you for the time and effort you and the faculty devoted to this process and for a well-drafted policy.

AMS/scf

cc: Committee members

REGIONAL CAMPUSES

POLICY ON OUTSIDE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES FOR FACULTY

I. POLICY

In accordance with the policies of the University and the Regional Campuses, faculty will seek prior administrative approval of outside professional activities and will report these activities annually.

II. PREAMBLE

Two areas in which either the mission of the Regional Campuses or the professional and ethical conduct of their faculties might be compromised are **conflicts of interest** and/or **conflicts of commitment**.

Conflicts of interest are defined as situations in which individuals may have the opportunity to influence the Regional Campuses' activities in a way that could lead to inappropriate personal gain or give improper advantage to their associates.

Conflicts of commitment are defined as situations in which an individual's external activities interfere with the individual's obligations to students, colleagues, and the campus. Outside professional activities are allowed and encouraged so long as they do not conflict with the expected performance of duties and obligations to the campus.

The Regional Campuses and their faculties have a joint obligation to see that fair and reasonable standards and procedures covering outside professional activities are developed, disseminated, and implemented.

III. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

In conjunction with each full-time faculty member's annual administrative review, the faculty member will report any outside professional activities from the previous year and any anticipated activities for the coming year to the Dean of the campus.

Outside professional activities to be reported should not normally include colloquia, textbooks, paintings, performances and activities related to professional organizations, but special attention should be given to compensated services, private or for-profit activities.

Personal activities which are not directly related to a faculty member's profession and are not performed during the faculty member's normal work hours are not germane to this policy and are not to be reported on the Regional Campuses Outside Professional Activities Report.

Faculty should seek review for potential conflict of interest and/or conflict of commitment in the following areas:

A. Compensated Services

1. Contract with any private sector entity (individual, business, or corporation), ownership of or equity holding in a business or corporation, management or board position in a business or corporation.
2. Participation in a contract or proposal through an entity other than the University.
3. Participation in a service or teaching contract with another college or university.
4. Academic remuneration noted as honoraria or fees.
5. Other activities under unique circumstances for which the faculty may be compensated for their expertise.

B. Unpaid Consulting/Pro Bono Service

The University encourages pro bono work for reasonable time periods and without substantial allocations of University resources, as a normal and desirable activity for faculty. Reporting pro bono work allows the University to recognize such work which benefits the University, but which currently may not be reported formally.

IV. REPORTING PROCEDURES

Reporting occurs on an annual basis simultaneously with the individual's annual performance review.

- A. Individual faculty members will comply with the Regional Campuses' policy and will report to the Dean of the campus through established procedures.
- B. The Dean of the campus will review each individual's report and respond accordingly. Any appearance of conflict of interest and/or commitment must be reviewed fully by the Vice Provost and Executive Dean for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education (Vice Provost for Regional Campuses). Should a case arise of a perceived appearance of conflict of interest and/or commitment, the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses will direct the Dean of the campus to prohibit the faculty member from engaging in the activity or advise the faculty member to modify the proposed activity. The Dean of the campus will be responsible for keeping a record of all steps

taken leading to the resolution of the issue. The Vice Provost for Regional Campuses will advise the Vice Provost for Research of the nature of the problem, the steps taken in dealing with it, and further, the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses will suggest any changes in the Regional Campuses' procedures which may assist in preventing recurrence.

- C. The Vice Provost for Regional Campuses will report annually to the Vice Provost for Research, indicating the Regional Campuses' compliance with approved policies and noting instances deserving review and actions taken.
- D. The Vice Provost for Research will review the Regional Campuses' report and will investigate any instances deserving review, as well as actions taken by the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses and the Deans of the Regional Campuses.
- E. If a faculty member disagrees with the Dean's assessment of whether a given activity constitutes a conflict of interest and/or conflict of commitment, the faculty member may appeal that decision through the following administrative channels: to the Vice Provost for Regional Campuses and Continuing Education, then to the Vice Provost for Research, and finally, to the University Committee on Conflict of Interest. The University Committee will review the circumstances of the decision and make a recommendation to the Provost. If a faculty member disagrees with the decision of the Provost, the faculty member may appeal the decision through the faculty grievance procedures outlined in the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual.

REGIONAL CAMPUSES
OUTSIDE PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES REPORT

FISCAL YEAR _____ - NAME _____ CAMPUS _____

DISCIPLINE _____ FACULTY RANK _____

CONTRACT BASIS (9 mths, 10.5 mths, 11 mths, 12 mths) _____

I. NON-UNIVERSITY NON-INCOME PRODUCING ACTIVITIES

CHECK ONE: REPORT BELOW _____ NONE TO REPORT _____ (PROCEED TO SECTION III)
List all such activities performed/proposed during University contract period covered. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

	19__ to 19__ Retrospective Days Spent During Previous Reporting Period	19__ to 19__ Prospective Estimated Days to Be Spent in Reporting Period
Nature of Activity	For whom (e.g., Company/ Organization)	

II. NON-UNIVERSITY INCOME-PRODUCING ACTIVITIES

CHECK ONE: REPORT BELOW _____ NONE TO REPORT _____ (PROCEED TO SECTION III)
List all such activities performed/proposed during University contract period covered. (Do not include amounts of compensation.) Attach additional sheets if necessary.

	19__ to 19__ Retrospective Days Spent During Previous Reporting Period	19__ to 19__ Prospective Estimated Days to Be Spent in Reporting Period
Nature of Activity	For whom (e.g., Company/ Organization)	

III. POTENTIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

- A. I have a managerial role or a financial interest in (check all that apply):
1. a company that does business with the University _____
 2. a company in my field of research _____
 3. a sponsor of my research _____
 4. none of the above _____
- (If you checked any 1 - 3, describe in an attached statement.)
- B. I do _____ /do not _____ have any other relationships, commitments, activities (including uncompensated activities), or financial or fiduciary interests that present potential conflicts of interest. Remember to include interests of your immediate family in your considerations in answering this question. (If you checked "do," please describe in an attached statement.)
- C. I do _____ /do not _____ have non-University professional or income-producing activities involving other University of South Carolina students, staff, or faculty. (If you checked "do," please describe in an attached statement.)

IV. AFFIRMATION

In submitting this form, I affirm that the above is true to the best of my knowledge and that I have read both the University's and the Regional Campuses' Policies on Outside Professional Activities regarding conflicts of interest and conflicts of commitment.

SIGNATURE _____ DATE _____

REPORT from the Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness

Professor Susan Pauly (Lancaster)

February 17, 1995

1) The Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness has completed its work on the Guide to Designing a Teaching Effectiveness Portfolio. Each regional campus will have a copy put on reserve in the campus library. The "Effectiveness as a Librarian" guidelines will also be included in the Guide. We hope that over time each campus will add to this initial edition with voluntary contributions from faculty members who donate parts of their T&P portfolios.

2) The committee would like to go on record as offering a special thanks to Professor Roy Darby for putting together a thorough, impressive "Report to the Provost on the Use of Student Evaluations in Evaluating Faculty Performance". The report includes a review of research on the use/abuse of student evaluations and summarizes very effectively what the literature indicates. The report concludes with six recommendations.

3) The committee asks: First- that Senators share copies of this report with the faculty members on their campuses. Secondly- we ask for feedback from faculty and this body on a motion which the committee would like to present:

"That the Provost accept the recommendations listed in the Ad Hoc Committee's Report to the Provost on the Use of Student Evaluations and be asked to provide the necessary resources (financial and other) to implement these recommendations".

Report to the Provost on the Use of Student Evaluations in Evaluating Faculty Performance

The Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness of the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate

The research literature clearly affirms the value of student ratings in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of faculty (Arreola, 1994; Cohen, 1980; Cashin, 1988; Seldin, 1980; Seldin, 1984). Carefully designed, properly administered and judiciously interpreted, student evaluations constitute one of the most reliable and valid measures of several areas of instructor performance in the classroom. Studies examining the relationship between student evaluations of instructors and courses and student learning outcome measures generally obtain higher correlations than any other single measure of teaching effectiveness. According to Arreola (1994), in order to generate the same degree of reliability as student evaluations, an instructor would have to be observed in the classroom by at least 3-4 trained peer observers on at least 8-9 occasions by each one.

Curiously, while there is extensive research literature concerning the use of student evaluations over the last seventy years, there remain widely held myths among even the most rigorous and tough-minded faculty scholars. Some of the more common misconceptions include:

1. Student ratings are nothing more than popularity contests.

In reviewing studies of both written student comments and objective ratings, Aleamoni (1976) found that students did praise instructors for friendly and humorous behavior. However, if the course itself was poorly run or the methods used to stimulate students were ineffective, students equally strongly criticized them in those areas.

2. Peers, not students, are the only ones qualified to evaluate the quality of instruction. Students cannot make consistent judgments about the instructor and instruction because of their immaturity, lack of experience and capriciousness.

Evidence dating back to 1924 suggests that this is simply not true. Student ratings tend to remain stable from one year to the next obtaining correlation coefficients ranging from .70 to .87 (Arreola, 1994).

The widely held belief that good instruction and good research and good teaching are closely related is challenged by objective research. While some studies (e.g., McDaniel and Feldhusen, (1970) show weak positive correlations, others (e.g., Aleamoni and Yimer, 1973) show no significant relationship between research productivity and colleagues' ratings of their effectiveness.

3. Instructors who grade more liberally or require less of students obtain higher ratings than those who grade more stringently or require more work.

Arreola (1994) cites 22 studies in which there was zero relationship between the grades received and ratings of course and instructor and 28 in which the correlation was positive but weak. The mean correlation of these latter studies was .18 with a standard deviation of .16. In all there are over 400 studies which have addressed this question and the results clearly do not support the belief that student ratings are highly correlated with grades either anticipated or actually received.

Cashin (1988) notes that there is a correlation between workload and student evaluations; however, it is positive! Students give higher ratings in difficult courses in which they have had to work hard.

4. Students tend to evaluate instructors more favorably after completion of the course, after graduation and after being out of school for several years, i.e., when they have had time to recognize the value of their instructors.

This popular belief is largely supported through anecdotal evidence passed from instructor to instructor. However, studies of alumni, five to ten years after they were enrolled tend to show that the alumni tend to rate instructors much the same as students currently enrolled (e.g., Marsh and Overall, 1979).

5. Student ratings are both unreliable and invalid.

While this may be true for most of the student rating forms in use today, in those studies in which professional, well-developed student rating forms were used, reliabilities averaged from .81 to .98 (Costin et al., 1971; Aleamoni, 1978)

Fourteen studies cited by Aleamoni and Hexner (1980) comparing student ratings to (1) colleague rating, (2) expert judges' ratings, (3) graduating seniors' and alumni ratings and (4) student learning measures, indicated moderate to high positive correlations.

While these myths do not withstand the challenge of scientific inquiry, these same studies do reveal features of student evaluation data which have significant impact on their interpretation.

1. Some disciplines do tend to obtain statistically lower ratings than others.
Cashin (1988) cites studies which suggest that humanities and arts

type courses receive higher ratings than social science type courses which in turn receive higher ratings than math-science type courses. This has been found for 44 academic fields using a reliable and valid instrument (the iDEA). The reason for these differences is not clear.

2. Required courses obtain overall lower ratings than elective course.

Higher ratings were received from students who took a course because of general interest or were taking the course for elective credit rather than because it was required (e.g., Pohlmann, 1975; Marsh, 1984; Marsh, 1987).

3. The level of the course (e.g., freshman, sophomore, junior, senior, graduate) affects the rating of a course.

Aleamoni and Hexner (1980) found eighteen studies reporting higher ratings for graduate and/or upper division course and only eight which showed no significant relationship.

4. While students may legitimately and accurately evaluate instructional delivery skills and, perhaps, instructional design skills, there are aspects of teaching effectiveness that students cannot reliably evaluate, e.g., content expertise of instructor, appropriateness and comprehensiveness of specific course objectives, and course management (e.g., bureaucratic skills such as making arrangements for facilities and resources required in the teaching of a course).

The total teaching act requires a number of component skills. No one person or group can have a sufficiently detailed and comprehensive view of the entire process of teaching, nor the expertise to properly evaluate these skills.

5. Most importantly, student evaluations should never be the sole measure of teaching effectiveness. Rather, they should be part of a battery of measures derived from students, peers and administrators (e.g., department heads) (Seldin, 1980; Cashin, 1988; Arreola, 1994).

Underlying the extensive body of research on student evaluations is the important assumption that the evaluative instrument being used has been systematically and scientifically designed and has demonstrated high statistical reliability and validity. These two statistical measures, reliability and validity directly affect the confidence with which conclusions regarding a faculty member's classroom performance may be made. When the conclusions are to be used for "summative" purposes, those which determine tenure, retention, promotion, pay raises, teaching assignments, etc., the necessity of accurate measurement

becomes even more critical. Nationally, an increasing number of legal actions are being brought by faculty based on the premise that there was a lack of due process and an absence of objective evaluative procedures used by administrators in the decision-making process. Increasingly, administrators are being compelled to justify their decisions based on "objective" data, inevitably raising the reliability-validity question (Seldin, 1984).

Reliability refers to the statistical consistency of measurement. A student evaluation instrument which obtains widely varying scores from student to student, between items of similar design or between different sections of the same class, seriously limits the confidence with which conclusions regarding the attribute being measured may be made. When items are ambiguous, (subject to varying interpretations) reliability is poor. For example, "the instructor allows ample time for expressing myself and asking questions and respects my opinions" is a multi-part question subject to several interpretations. What is the meaning of a number of "Disagree" responses on the numerical summary on this question? Is it that the instructor does not allow time for expressing opinions? Does he/she not allow time for questions? Or, does the instructor not respect student opinions? Similarly, what would be the meaning of a low (strongly disagree rating on the item "the instructor meets class for the scheduled time." Does this mean the instructor was seldom there or does it mean that he kept the class well beyond the scheduled length. These question would likely have large variability and low reliability. Some researchers recommend that student comments not be revealed to evaluators because they tend to be weighted more heavily while lacking any objective reliability (Arreola, 1994).

Validity refers to how well an instrument actually measures what it purports to measure, the truthfulness of the measure. Thus, "construct validity" represents the extent to which the instrument actually reflects the theoretical construct it is intended to measure. For example, the questions "the instructor has a pretty smile, and "the instructor always begins class on time," may have high reliability (most students strongly agree or strongly disagree) and yet have little to do with teaching effectiveness.

If the results of student evaluations are to be truly useful, the results must be viewed in context, i.e., the scores must be compared to some reference group. Such comparisons may be made with all faculty at an institution, only with faculty of the same rank, only faculty in the same discipline at the institution, only faculty teaching the same course at the institution or comparisons may be made with a much broader group, e.g., other 2 or 4 year institutions or all institutions of higher education. The larger and more specific the comparison group upon which norms are base, the more meaningful the comparisons become. Ratings of an instructor by a freshman level chemistry class are much more meaningful if they are compared nationally to a large number of other instructors in their freshman chemistry classes. Many well-researched instruments present such comparative data using a decile format to aid in interpretation. This method is used because it has been found that numerical data obtained from faculty evaluations tend not to be distributed normally, but rather are positively skewed.

The foregoing review suggests that obtaining accurate and meaningful data regarding teaching effectiveness based on student evaluations is necessarily a difficult and painstaking process.

There is no single evaluative instrument or common set of procedures currently in use on the Regional Campuses. None of the instruments have been produced or validated following rigorous psychometric and statistical procedures required to produce a professional, well-developed student rating form with established validity and reliability. The most common procedure has been for a committee of experienced faculty to generate questions that they believe intuitively would yield useful information. The data collected in this fashion, especially the comments by students, may well provide interesting feedback which an instructor may use to improve his classroom performance, . However, to claim that data collected from these instruments is representative of a faculty member's teaching effectiveness does not appear to be empirically justified.

Several commercial forms (e.g., Student Instructional Report (SIR), Course Instructor Evaluation Questionnaire (CIEQ), and the Instructional Development and Effectiveness Assessment (iDEA)) with high reliability and validity are available. These instruments in addition to their statistical soundness have a substantial research base and extensive normative data upon which summary reports may be generated. Most of the commercial forms allow considerable flexibility in providing additional data to an instructor by allowing the inclusion of additional items generated by the instructor or the institution.

An alternative approach to remedying the current lack of an acceptable student evaluation form is to generate one from within the system. Professional estimates (e.g., Arreola, 1994) project at least a two-year process and one which involves the collection of items, construction of the test, pilot studies, revisions, and the construction of a data base upon which to generate norms. It also requires the skills of persons trained in psychometrics and test design. It would take several additional years to have enough experience with the instrument to comfortably make interpretations based on local norms.

It would be more convenient if all campuses use the same student evaluation form since proper interpretation of summary reports is based on familiarity with the instrument being used for the assessment. Thus, if six different forms are being used on the Regional Campuses, it would prove more difficult for the system tenure and promotion committee members as well as administrators to interpret six different presentations of data.

CONCLUSIONS: The Ad Hoc Committee on Teaching Effectiveness concludes that:

1. Student evaluations of instructors have a legitimate role in the overall evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
2. It is essential that student evaluations not constitute the sole basis upon which administrative decisions regarding faculty members (e.g., tenure, promotion, merit salary increases and teaching assignments) are made. Multiple measures from multiple sources, including the faculty member, students, peers and administrators provide the most comprehensive and valid view of faculty performance.

References

- Aleamoni, L. (1976). Typical faculty concerns about student evaluation of instruction. National Association of Colleges and Teachers of Agriculture Journal, 38, 1063-1067.
- Aleamoni, L.M. and Yimer, M. (1973). An investigation of the relationship between colleague rating, student rating, research productivity and academic rank in rating instructional effectiveness. Journal of Educational Psychology, 64, 274-277.
- Aleamoni, L.M. and Hexner, P.Z. (1980). A review of the research on student evaluation and a report on the effect of different sets of instructions on student course and instructor evaluation. Instructional Science 9, 67-84.
- Arreola, R.A. (1994). Developing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. Memphis, TN: Center for Educational Development and Assessment.
- Cashin, W.E. (1988). "Student ratings of teaching: A summary of the research." iDEA Paper No. 20. Manhattan, KS: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.
- Cohen, P. (1980). "Effectiveness of student-rating feedback for improving college instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. Research in Higher Education, 13, 321-341.
- Costin, F., Greenough, W.T. and Menges, R.J. (1971). Student ratings of college teaching: Reliability, validity and usefulness. Review of Educational Research, 41, 511-535.
- Marsh, H.W. (1984). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 707-754.
- Marsh, H.W. (1987). Students' evaluations of university teaching: Research findings, methodological issues, and directions for future research. International Journal of Educational Research, 11, 253-388.
- Marsh, H.W. and Overall, J.U. (1979) Long-term students' evaluations: A note on Feldman's consistency and variability among college students in rating their teachers and course. Research in Higher Education, 10, 139-147.
- McDaniel, E.D., and Feldhusen, J.F. (1970). Relationships between faculty ratings and indexes of service and scholarship. Proceedings of the 78th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 5, 185-189.
- Pohlman, J.T. (1975). A multivariate analysis of selected class characteristics and student ratings of instruction. Multivariate Behavioral Research, 10(1), 81-91.
- Seldin, P. (1980). Successful faculty evaluation programs: A practical guide to improve faculty performance and promotion/tenure decisions. Crugers, NY: Coventry Press.
- Seldin, P (1984). "Court challenges to tenure, promotion and retention decisions." iDea Paper No. 12. Manhattan, KS: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development.

3. If student evaluations are to be used for decision making, such evaluations must have adequate, documented reliability and validity.
4. Administrators and other persons using student evaluation data must be knowledgeable regarding the capabilities and limitations of the instrument.
5. Numerical summaries of student evaluations should be accompanied by reliable normative data and the group used for comparison purposes clearly identified.
6. There are no student evaluation instruments currently in use on the Regional Campuses which meet the requirements for providing reliable and valid data upon which to base personnel decisions regarding faculty members.
7. There is a need on the Regional Campuses for a valid and reliable student evaluation instrument. The options available are to purchase commercially available instruments or to generate one from within.
8. Standard procedures need to be established for the administration and handling of student evaluations.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Committee recommends that:

1. Student evaluations should never be used as the sole basis upon which to evaluate a faculty member's teaching effectiveness.
2. A standard commercial evaluation form selected by the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate be used on all the Regional Campuses.
3. A standard set of guidelines for the administration and handling of student evaluation forms be established for the Regional Campuses.
4. In the interim, data from student evaluations should be viewed with caution and with an awareness of the specific deficiencies in the evaluation form upon which the data is based.
5. The portfolio method be used in compiling tenure and promotion files. The provost and local tenure and promotion units should specify which elements are required in the portfolio.
6. Numerical summaries should be based on appropriate norms which have been developed through sound statistical procedures. Such normative data should accompany any summary of student evaluations of faculty.

PROCEDURE FOR GENERAL GRIEVANCE

1. Grievant formal requests oral and written explanation from immediate supervisor. The supervisor has **15 days** in which to respond.
2. Within **30 days** of receiving response from supervisor, faculty member files grievance with the next administrative official (Dean, Vice Chancellor, Vice Provost). In Tenure and Promotion grievances the official is expected to supply a written summary of evaluations and reason for the action. The official has **15 days** to respond.
3. Within **15 days** of receiving response from the Dean, Vice Chancellor, or Vice Provost, grievant requests review by the Provost (Columbia and regional campuses) or the Chancellor (Aiken and Spartanburg). A response is due in **15 days**.
4. Within **10 days** of receiving response from the Provost or Chancellor, the grievant submits the case to the Grievance Committee. The Committee may recommend remandment to any faculty or administrative level for reconsideration. The Grievance Committee makes its recommendation for a resolution to the Chancellor (Aiken and Spartanburg), Vice Provost (regional campuses), or President (Columbia) within **30 days**.
5. Within **15 days** of receiving response from the Chancellor, Vice Provost, or President the grievant may submit an appeal to the President who has **20 days** to respond.
6. Final appeals to the Academic Affairs and Faculty Liaison Committee of the Board of Trustees must be filed within **15 days** after receiving the President's decision. The Committee has **30 days** to respond.


Notes:

All requests and responses are to be in writing.

All days referred to in this procedure are calendar days, however, when the last day of such a period falls on a weekend or University holiday, the effective date shall be the next regular business day. The day following the actual day of notification shall be the first day in the series.

The grievance procedure may be lengthy, and the grievant who initiates a grievance procedure is advised to maintain a file of dated correspondence sent and received as well as dates and notes of conferences held concerning the case. Failure of any administrative official or reviewing authority to comply with the deadlines for action specified herein shall not operate to reverse or modify a tenure or promotion decision, but shall permit the grievant to proceed directly to petition the next level in the Grievance Procedure.



To: John Catalano, Chair
From: Wayne Chilcote, Vice-Chair 
Date: March 17, 1995
Re: Nominating Committee report

The Nominating Committee of the RCFS met on March 10 and reports the following nominees to the Executive and Special Committees.

Executive Committee

Chair: Prof. Wayne Chilcote (Salkehatchie)
Vice-Chair/Chair Elect: Prof. Jerry Dockery (Lifelong Learning)
Secretary: Prof. Jane Upshaw (Beaufort)
At Large: Prof. Robert Costello (Sumter)
At Large: Prof. Mary Barton (Union)

Special Committees

University Committee on Curricula and Courses: Prof. Robert Castleberry (Sumter)
Faculty/Board of Trustees Liason Committee: Prof. Carolyn West (Sumter)
Research and Productive Scholarship Committee: Prof. David Heiser (Salkehatchie)

c: Mike Schoen, Secretary



UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
SALKEHATCHIE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

P.O. Box 617
Allendale, SC 29810
(803) 584-3446
FAX 584-5038

P.O. Box 1337
Walterboro, SC 29488
(803) 549-6314
FAX 549-6007


February 17, 1995

Dr. John Duffy
Vice Provost for Regional Campuses
and Continuing Education
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dear Dr. Duffy:

Please find attached copies of revisions to the Regional Campuses Faculty Manual which have been approved by the Regional Campuses Faculty Senate. Upon your review, please advise the Senate of their disposition.

Respectfully,


Wayne L. Chilcote
Vice-Chair, RCFS

/mjr

c: John Catalano, Chair, RCFS

ATTACHMENT 15a

Note: Following is the timetable and the reasons for grievances worked out by the subcommittee. No one's rights have been curtailed in the process; in fact, the schedule below is more generous than what some campuses currently ordain. Moreover, it is important to realize that the dates are important, whereas our wording is not. We assume that each campus will work the new timetable into its own grievance procedures, retaining or discarding as much of the old language as seems to fit.

FACULTY GRIEVANCES

Individual USC faculty members have the right to grieve any administrative decisions affecting their employment, including but not limited to the following matters:

1. Denial of tenure or promotion, on the grounds of unlawful discrimination; violation or denial of procedural due process; inadequate or improper documentation, use of impermissible criteria, or improper evaluation of criteria; or denial of academic freedom.
2. Salary and compensation, on the grounds of unlawful discrimination; violation or denial of procedural due process; inadequate or improper documentation, use of impermissible criteria, or improper evaluation of criteria; or denial of academic freedom.
3. Non-reappointment of tenure-track faculty, on the grounds of violation or denial of procedural due process or denial of academic freedom.
4. And other matters (*e.g.*, work assignments and disciplinary actions are grievable, although the faculty member should exhaust all other administrative procedures first) on the grounds of unlawful discrimination; violation or denial of procedural due process; or denial of academic freedom.

A grievant may not ask the Grievance Committee to substitute its judgment for the qualitative professional judgments of any authorized university party or official who has already reached a decision on the matter in question. The Grievance Committee has authority only to review the process leading to the action or decision in question. Its function is to determine if there is substance to the allegations of the grievant. The Committee is limited to recommending appropriate action to the Chancellor (Aiken and Spartanburg), Vice Provost (regional campuses), or President (Columbia).