

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
FACULTY ASSEMBLY
AGENDA
January 31, 2014**

2:00 p.m.

Kinard Auditorium

- I. Approval of minutes** of October 18, 2013
Arts and Sciences Faculty Assembly Frank Pullano, Chair
 - i. [See appendix 1](#)

- II. Report from CAS Committees**
 - a. **Curriculum Committee** Jeff Sinn
 - i. [See appendix 2](#): Report from Curriculum Committee

 - b. **Ad-Hoc Committee for Handheld Technology** Sarah Spring
 - i. [See appendix 3](#): Updated Policy for Appropriate Use of Hand-held and Wireless Technology

- III. Unfinished Business**

- IV. New Business**
 - a. Electronic course evaluations Beth Costner
 - i. [See appendix 4](#): CAS common questions

- V. Announcements**

- VI. Dean's Remarks** Karen M. Kedrowski
 - a. Statement about dean's comments on annual reports
 - i. [See appendix 5](#): Faculty Annual Review Process and Timeline
 - ii. [See appendix 6](#): Annual Report Comments Appeal Form
 - b. Travel funds
 - c. President Comstock's inauguration

Appendix 2

Curriculum Committee
Report for Faculty Assembly
January 31, 2014

The Curriculum Committee has met three times (11/19, 12/03, 01/21) since the last Faculty Assembly.

1. The following course change proposals were reviewed and approved:

- a. *Drop course: BIOL 101* Human Biology. Predates existing general education program and does not satisfy the current gen ed requirements. It is no longer a required course in any major, and is only offered online during the summers.
- b. *Modify course: BIOL 300* Scientific Process in Biology. Minor updates and corrections in the description of prerequisites and lab fees.
- c. *Add new course: AAMS 302* Modern Civil Rights Movement
- d. *Add new course: GRNT 550* Special Topics in Gerontology
- e. *Modify course: MDST 305* Research in Medieval Studies. Require permission of the instructor so students can no longer register for the course without being aware that it requires them to come up with a proposal for the course content and to find a faculty member to supervise their independent study.
- f. *Add new course: WMST 305* Marriage and the Family
- g. *Add new course: WMST 308* Psychology of Women
- h. *Add new course: WMST 452* Women in Art
- i. *Drop course: WMST 504* Psychology of Women. Reflect the change in Psychology where PSYC 504 was replaced with PSYC 308.
- j. *Add new course: WMST 506* Human Sexuality
- k. *Modify course: WMST 507* Women's Health Issues. Update prerequisites to include WMST 300 or permission of the instructor, and fill in some previously missing information about goals and graduate student requirements.
- l. *Add new course: WMST 540* Human Ecology
- m. *Add new course: WMST 554* Women in Modern China
- n. *Modify course: MCOM 425* Advanced Broadcast Journalism. Revised into a 4-hour course that includes the basic video production content from MCOM 346; this makes it unnecessary to take 346 before 425 and therefore drops 346 as a prerequisite.
- o. *Modify course: MCOM 441* Multimedia Reporting of Public Institutions and Issues. Add DIFD major status as a prerequisite.
- p. *Modify course: MCOM 446* Advanced Television Production. Revised into a 4-hour course that includes the basic video production content from MCOM 346; this makes it unnecessary to take 346 before 446 and therefore drops 346 as a prerequisite.
- q. *Modify course: MCOM 464* Mass Communication Practicum. Makes course available to all MCOM, IMCO, and DIFD majors; the course was originally developed for students in the broadcast concentration, which no longer exists.
- r. *Modify course: NUTR 610* Global Service Learning in Nutrition. Change title and make a few editorial changes in the course description.

- s. *Add new course: NUTR 611* Global Nutrition
- t. *Modify course: ANTH 315* Forensic Anthropology. Change from a science to a lab science (additional hour credit).
- u. *Modify course: ANTH 540* Human Ecology. This has been an elective for WMST, and would be formalized by cross-listing it as WMST 540.
- v. *Modify course: SOCL 305* Marriage and the Family. Revise description to better reflect the learning goals of the course and provide a better description of materials covered.
- w. *Modify course: SOCL 314* Race and Ethnic Relations. Add prerequisite option to open the course to more students; instead of only accepting SOCL 101 or 201 as prerequisites, this change makes AAMS 300 a third option.
- x. *Modify course: SCWK 305* Human Behavior in the Social Environment. Remove prerequisites that are not essential to course content.
- y. *Modify course: SCWK 306* Working with Multi-Cultural Populations. Remove prerequisites that are not essential to course content.
- z. *Modify course: SCWK 321* Social Welfare as a Social Institution. Remove prerequisites that are not essential to course content.
- aa. *Modify course: SCWK 430* Social Work Intervention I. Revise list of prerequisites to remove burdensome scheduling conflicts for majors and enable better expediency to graduation.
- bb. *Modify course: SCWK 432* Social Work Intervention II. Revise list of prerequisites to remove burdensome scheduling conflicts for majors and enable better expediency to graduation.
- cc. *Modify course: SCWK 433* Social Work Intervention III. Revise list of prerequisites to remove burdensome scheduling conflicts for majors and enable better expediency to graduation.
- dd. *Modify course: SCWK 443* Social Work Field Instruction. Revise course description to more clearly communicate that all course work other than SCWK 463 in the major must be completed prior to enrolling in the field internship.
- ee. *Modify course: SCWK 463* Social Work Field Seminar. Revise course description.
- ff. *Modify course: PHYS 250*. This action will enable us to add astronomy and meteorology content to this physical science course. This will enable efficient delivery of PHYS 250 to education majors. The School of Education is in support of this change. This will accommodate the growing demand and growth of education majors who take this course.
- gg. *Drop course: PHYS 251*. No longer needed with modification to PHYS250.

2. The following program change proposals were reviewed and approved:

- a. *Modify program: Chemistry*. ASBMB accreditation sub-committee recommended more genetics or molecular biology be incorporated into the now-accredited program, so biology requirements have increased from 8 to 16-17 credit hours.
- b. *Modify program: Minor in GRNT*. Revamp the minor to ensure students receive broad exposure to content using an interdisciplinary educational approach.
- c. *Modify program: Minor in WMST*. Change “core” and “non-core” designations to “core courses” and “elective courses” to match the language in other programs.

Move some elective courses to the core course section, and make all core courses in the minor cross-listed with a WMST designator. Change the name of the program to “Women’s and Gender Studies”.

- d. Modify program: BS in IMCO. Drop CSCI 101A. Move MKTG 481 from a requirement to an option among courses to fulfill required hours. Move MGMT 341 from an option among courses to fulfill required hours to a requirement. Add MKTG 382 to list of options for required hours. Add VCOM 354 to list of options for required ARTS and CCOM hours. Revise requirements related to international issues and diversity.
- e. Modify program: Minor in International Studies. Clarify wording about language proficiency requirement, update course list, clarify wording about nine hours counting in one of five categories.

3. The following blanket petitions were reviewed and approved:

a. Department of English

- i. Allow students in all tracks in the major, in all catalogs through 2013-14, to count WRIT 368X, *Editing for Professionals*, towards the requirements in their major.
- ii. Allow students in the BA in English, Writing Track, Creative Writing and Writing for Business Technology options, in all catalogs prior to 2013-14, to count an appropriate special topics WRIT 510 in the major.

b. Department of Interdisciplinary Studies

- i. Allow HIST 350 under title of *The Crusades* to count as an elective in the MDST minor.
- ii. Allow GEOG 350 and 308 (when titled *Introduction to Geospatial Technologies*) to count for both the Environmental Studies and Sustainability minors, and allow those courses to count as an Environmental Social Science choice for the BS in Environmental Sciences and BA in Environmental Studies, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs.
- iii. For the International Studies minor, revise the following sentence, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, in order to clarify the interpretation of the program requirements: “The minor in International Studies (INTS) requires 18 hours of internationally-themed, interdisciplinary course work, at least 9 hours of which must be taken within one of five focus categories: Comparative, Africa/Middle East, Latin America, Europe, Asia.”

c. Department of Human Nutrition

- i. Allow students in the BS in Didactic Program in Dietetics, in all previous catalogs, to substitute 6 hours from the following courses (ACCT 280, NUTR 520, GRNT 300, ATRN 510, PSYC 213, and HCMT 200) to meet the requirements for NUTR 520 and ACCT 280. These two courses used to be required, but would now be two of the six options students could choose from.

d. Department of Social Work

- i. Allow students in the Social Work major, in the current catalog and all previous catalogs, to substitute BIOL 203/204 for the Social Work major requirement of BIOL 150/151.

e. Department of World Languages & Cultures

- i. Allow students in the Spanish major, in the current catalog, to substitute SPAN 390X for SPAN 421 in the Civilization/Culture component of the major's requirements.

- 4. 28 student petitions were approved, and 1 was sent back to the department for further information.**

Appendix 3

Policy for Appropriate Use of Hand-held and Wireless Technology in the College of Arts and Sciences Adopted March 2010

The College of Arts and Sciences at Winthrop University (hereafter “the College”) is committed to educationally sound uses of technology in the classroom, to providing a secure learning environment, and to preventing disruption of students’ and instructors’ educational experiences. The College is also committed to balancing the need for concentration in the course environment with concerns about safety and with students’ outside responsibilities. We recognize that, when used properly, hand-held and wireless technologies can enhance the classroom environment and student learning; used improperly, these same technologies can significantly degrade the quality of learning in the course setting. Each student enrolled in courses in the College has a responsibility to other students and to the instructor to contribute to a courteous, respectful learning environment. This responsibility includes not disrupting instruction or distracting fellow students, maintaining an atmosphere that supports academic integrity, and being committed to learning as required by the Winthrop Dedication for Excellence and the Winthrop Code of Student Conduct.

The instructor may prohibit any use of hand-held or wireless technology that substantially disrupts learning opportunities, degrades the learning environment, or promotes academic dishonesty or illegal activities. Students unsure of whether an activity is appropriate are encouraged to ask their instructors. Students are also encouraged to notify their instructors of disruptive behavior they observe.

Policy

Unless otherwise specified by the instructor on the syllabus, the following statements govern the appropriate use of hand-held and wireless technologies in courses in the College of Arts and Sciences.

1. Students may not use cell phones, pagers, PDAs, or similar communication devices during scheduled course meetings (including class time, laboratories, review sessions, individual instruction, or similar activities) in the College. Such devices must be silenced or turned off and should not be taken out during course meetings. Communication by electronic devices, including but not limited to instant messaging, text messaging, web surfing, and telephoning during class, is strictly prohibited unless expressly designated as part of the learning activities. Electronic audio or video recording of the classroom environment is prohibited unless permission is given by the instructor prior to recording.
2. Laptops, **tablets**, or any wireless computers or similar electronic devices may be used for note-taking or specified course activities (**e.g., electronic surveys, electronic course evaluations**) with the instructor’s permission. Students using these devices for note-taking must turn off the wireless function and close all applications/windows other than the appropriate document or application unless the instructor specifically permits otherwise. Students must avoid non course-related activities such as checking email or social networking sites, web-surfing, or playing games because these diminish their—and their classmates’—engagement with instructional activities.
3. **Because of the increasing prevalence of electronic textbooks, students may, with the instructor’s permission, use e-readers (e.g., Nook, Kindle, etc.) in place of standard textbooks. These and similar devices should be not used during instructional time for activities not directly related to the course.**
4. Unauthorized use of electronic communication or wireless devices during quizzes, examinations, or

other graded activities may warrant disciplinary action under the terms of the Code of Student Conduct. In certain circumstances (exams, laboratories, presentations, etc.), students may be temporarily required to deposit cell phones, laptops, or other electronic devices with the instructor or lab supervisor for the duration of the specific class or activity.

5. A course instructor, administrator, or facility manager may prohibit activities that violate laws and/or University policies, such as those related to intellectual property rights or copyright, eavesdropping, or sexual harassment. (Examples of such activities might include using a camera phone to videotape performances or taking inappropriate photos without the subject's knowledge and permission.)
6. Students who require access to hand-held or wireless technology as assistive measures for documented disabilities may use them according to stipulations in the student's Professor Notification Form.
7. Where personal emergency, family care responsibilities or employment situations *require* access to electronic communication devices, arrangements must be made *in advance* with the instructor. The instructor will decide if such access is appropriate; students may appeal these decisions to the Dean or the Dean's designated representative.
8. Because hand-held communication devices are an integral part of the University's emergency notification system, the instructor's or a designated student's hand-held device should be activated during scheduled course times. In an emergency situation or if a security alert sounds or is sent by the Alertus system, the instructor or his/her designee will consult their devices to determine if an emergency exists and may then give students permission to consult their own devices. Once the alert is over, students' devices should be immediately silenced and put away.
9. Other exceptions to this policy may be granted at the discretion of the instructor.

Sanctions

Sanctions for violation of this policy will be determined by the instructor and may include dismissal from the class, attendance penalties or loss of class participation points, zero grades on quizzes or examinations, failure in the class, or other penalties that the instructor determines to be appropriate. These sanctions should be explicitly stated on the instructor's syllabus.

Providing Notice to Students

Instructors should anticipate that issues with wireless communications and electronic devices may arise and publish any policies and restrictions in their course syllabi. Otherwise, a statement such as "The College of Arts and Sciences' Policy for the Appropriate Use of Hand-held and Wireless Technologies is in effect for this class" with a link to the text of the policy should appear on syllabi for all courses in the College. If the instructor plans to use sanctions for disruptions, s/he should publish details about the sanctions in the course syllabus.

Changes

Due to the dynamic nature of technology, any changes or additions to this policy will be published on the College of Arts & Sciences' web site.

Rationale

We are aware that we live in a wired world and that students taking courses in the College are part of a highly technological society. As educators, we also know that focused attention is needed for effective learning and that we have a responsibility to provide an environment where such learning can take place. We know, too, that with easy access to information comes the temptation to use that information inappropriately. Therefore, we have surveyed the existing research on hand-held and wireless technologies in the classroom, reviewed other institutions' policies, and based our recommendations on the best available practices and information. That research is summarized below, followed by a selected bibliography of studies supporting our policies.

One purpose for the proposed policy is to maximize student engagement in the classroom. Research demonstrates that the use of hand-held technology is distracting, leads to attention lapses, and slows reaction time. In addition, the user undergoes physiological changes, including increased heart rate and decreased respiration. These consequences are likely to interfere with a student's ability to pay attention to, participate in, and record information presented in the classroom. As a secondary concern, technology users underestimate or deny the impact that technology use has on their bodies and performance. Thus, students may not be aware of the detrimental impact of inappropriate technology use in the classroom.

Students may also resist policies restricting hand-held technology use in the classroom because of psychological attachment to such technology. For many individuals, electronic communication is a primary way to maintain social ties, with text-messaging being the mode of choice. Young adults prefer and greatly rely on electronic communication. Research also indicates that students perceive their cell phones as a means of self-expression. Restricting access to hand-held technology in the classroom may lead students to feel a loss of control and/or anxiety.

Despite these obstacles, both students and faculty acknowledge a need for hand-held technology policies in the classroom and students have expressed a desire for faculty to enforce such policies consistently. Recent research on students and faculty found that both groups are concerned by ringing phones and support restricted use of technology in college classrooms. Research on this technology-savvy generation suggests that the younger the students, the more tolerant they are of cell phone use in the classroom. Thus, our youngest students may benefit from a more detailed explanation of and rationale for classroom policies than their older peers. Visible reminders, such as signs reminding students of the policy, should also be displayed in classrooms in the College to help reinforce awareness of the policy.

Institutional Policy Models

Few institutions have yet instituted a policy such as the one we are proposing; many institutions seem to handle these situations under existing classroom disruption policies, but the Winthrop Code of Student Conduct currently does not contain specific language that applies to these situations. A list of existing policies that we used as starting points for our policy is appended at the end of this report. The proposed policy has also been reviewed by Chief Frank Zebedis of Campus Police to ensure that it is consonant with Winthrop security practices. 4

Supporting Research

Cell Phones & Attention

- . Reaction time to surrounding events decreased while talking on a hand-held or hands-free phone. People did nothing to counteract their slower reaction times, suggesting that they were unaware that talking on the phone was impairing their performances (Caird, Willness, Steel, & Scialfa, 2008).
- . People were not aware of how distracted they were while talking on the phone. In fact, sometimes, the more distracted people were, the less distracted they believed they were (Horrey, Lesch, & Garabet, 2008).
- . Cell phone conversations were more distracting than in-person conversations, because people talking face-to-face accommodated for and discussed their context. Cell phone conversations did not share the same situational awareness (Drews, Pasupathi, & Strayer, 2008).
- . Cell phone conversations were more distracting than conversations with a passenger or over a loudspeaker. The theory is that information presented in the listener's personal space (i.e., phone on the ear) competed with other external stimuli for attention and was thus highly distracting (Ferlazzo, Fagioli, Di Nocera, & Sdoia, 2008).
- . Talking on the cell phone while driving was associated with attention lapses (Beede & Kass, 2006).

Physiological and Psychological Variables

- . College students experienced physiological changes while text-messaging, including increased heart rate and arousal and decreased breathing. Most students were unaware of these changes (Lin & Peper, 2009).
- . Neurotic students had stronger ties to their mobile phones than other students. Extroverted and neurotic students spent more time text messaging than talking on the phone (Ehrenberg, Juckes, White & Walsh, 2008).
- . College students perceived the style of their cell phones as a form of self-expression (Katz & Sugiyama, 2006).

Social Interaction

- . The most popular form of electronic communication is text messaging; it serves the purpose of maintaining social networks for students (Harley, Winn, Pemberton, & Wilcox, 2007).
- . College students communicate using technology an average of 5.5 hours per day, half of the time spent in written and half spent in verbal communication (Diamanduros, Jenkins & Downs, 2007).
- . Young adults prefer electronic to personal communication because it allows them more control over the interaction (Madell, & Muncer, 2007).

Classroom-Relevant Research

- . The students most likely to engage in uncivil behavior in the classroom (e.g., cell phone use, leaving class early) had a consumer orientation, narcissistic tendencies, and a belief that such behaviors are appropriate. Men and students with no plans to attend graduate school were more likely to behave in an uncivil manner (Nordstrom, Bartels, & Bucy, 2009).
- . Multitasking decreases efficiency, learning, and retention (Abate, 2008).
- . Faculty and students perceived a ringing phone to be distracting in a college classroom. Younger participants were most tolerant of mobile phones in the college classroom (Campbell, 2006).
- . Early research on mobile phone use revealed that adults consider the college classroom to be one of the least appropriate places for mobile cell phone use (Campbell & Russo, 2003; Wei & Leung, 1999).

Academic Integrity

- . Research indicated that students use hand-held technology in the classroom to play video games, communicate, and cheat (Gilroy, 2004; Katz, 2005).
- . Research indicated that as many as one third of all teens have used cell phones to cheat in classes. This cheating includes storing information in the phone to be retrieved during the examination or texting others to get answers. (Miners, 2009).
- . Two thirds of teens reported seeing other students use cell phones or other wireless devices to cheat on assignments and tests. (Common Sense Media, 2009).
- . As many as half of teens admitted to using the Internet to cheat on assignments and tests. (Read, 2004).

References

1st annual global mobile learning congress 2012 explores education's exciting future. (2012). Retrieved from <http://news.hct.ac.ae/2012/09/1st-annual-global-mobile-learning-congress-2012-explores-educations-exciting-future/>

Abate, C. J. (2008). You say multitasking like it's a good thing. Downloaded at http://www.nea.org/assets/img/PubThoughtAndAction/TAA_08_02.pdf, 9/20/09.

Beede, K. E. & Kass, S. J. (2006). Engrossed in conversation: The impact of cell phones on simulated driving performance. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 38(2), 415-421.

Brown, M. & Long, P. (2006). Trends in learning space design. In D.G. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning Spaces* (pp. 9.1-9.11). Boulder, CO: EDUCASE.

Caird, J. K., Willness, C. R., Steel, P., & Scialfa, C. (2008). A meta-analysis on the effects of cell phones on driver performance. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 40(4), 1282-1293.

Campbell, S. W. (2006). Perceptions of mobile phones in college classrooms: Ringing, cheating, and classroom policies. *Communication Education*, 55(3), 280-294.

Campbell, S. W. & Russo, T. C. (2003). The social construction of mobile telephony: An application of the social influence model to perceptions and uses of mobile phones within personal communication networks. *Communication Monographs*, 70, 317-334.

Common Sense Media (2009). Hi-Tech Cheating: Cellphones and Cheating in Schools. Downloaded at <http://www.common sense media.org/sites/default/files/Hi-Tech%20Cheating%20-%20Summary%20NO%20EMBARGO%20TAGS.pdf>.

Diamanduros, T., Jenkins, S. J., & Downs, E. (2007). Analysis of technology ownership and selective use among undergraduates. *College Student Journal*, 41(4), 970-976.

Drews, F. A., Pasupathi, M., & Strayer, D. L. (2008). Passenger and cell phone conversations in simulated driving. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 14(4), 392-400.

Ehrenberg, A., Juckes, S., White, K. M. & Walsh, S. P. (2008). Personality and self-esteem as predictors of young people's technology use. *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 11(6), 739-741.

Ferlazzo, F., Fagioli, S., Di Nocera, F. & Sdoia, S. (2008). Shifting attention across near and far spaces:

Implications for the use of hands-free cell phones while driving. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 40(6), 1859-1864.

Gee, L. (2006). Human-centered design guidelines. In D.G. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning Spaces* (pp. 10.1-10.13). Boulder, CO: EDUCASE.

Gilroy, M. (2004). Invasion of the classroom cell phones. *Education Digest*, 69(6), 56-60.

Gordon, S. (2013, September 28). The jury is still out when it comes to classrooms and handheld devices. *U.S. News and World Report*. Retrieved from http://www.usnewsuniversitydirectory.com/articles/the-jury-is-still-out-when-it-comes-to-classrooms_13391.aspx#.UtlpQOlo6Uk

Graetz, K.A. The psychology of learning environments. In D.G. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning Spaces* (pp. 6.1-6.14). Boulder, CO: EDUCASE.

Harley, D., Winn, S., Pemberton, S. P., & Wilcox, P. (2007). Using texting to support students' transition to university. *Innovations in Education and Teaching International*, 44(3), 229-241. 6

Horrey, W. J., Lesch, M. F., & Garabet, A. (2008). Assessing the awareness of performance decrements in distracted drivers. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 40(2), 675-682.

Katz, J.E. (2005). Mobile phones in educational settings. In K. Nyiri (Ed.), *A Sense of Place: The Global and the Local in Mobile Communication*, 305-317. Vienna: Passagen.

Katz, J. E. & Sugiyama, S. (2006). Mobile phones as fashion statements: Evidence from student surveys in the US and Japan. *New Media and Society*, 8(2), 321-337.

Lin, I. & Peper, E. (2009). Psychophysiological patterns during cell phone text messaging: A preliminary study. *Applied Psychophysiology and Biofeedback*, 34(1), 53-57.

Lomas, C. & Oblinger D.G. (2006). Student practices and their impact on learning spaces. In D.G. Oblinger (Ed.), *Learning Spaces* (pp. 5.1-5.11). Boulder, CO: EDUCASE.

Madell, D. E. & Muncer, S. J. (2007). Control over social interactions: An important reason for young people's use of the internet and mobile phones for communication? *CyberPsychology and Behavior*, 10(1), 137-140.

McCoy, B. (2013). Digital distractions in the classroom: student classroom use of digital devices for non-class related purposes. *Faculty Publications, College of Journalism and Mass Communication, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Paper 71*.

Miners, Z. (2009). One Third of Teens Use Cellphones to Cheat in School. *US News and World Report* 23 June. Downloaded at <http://www.usnews.com/blogs/on-education/2009/06/23/one-third-of-teens-use-cellphones-to-cheat-in-school.html>.

Nihalani, P. & Mayrath, M. (2010). Mobile learning: evidence of increased learning and motivation from using an iPhone app. *GetYa Learn on*. Retrieved from http://gylo.com/WhitePaper_03302010_Stats1.pdf

Nordstrom, C. R., Bartels, L. K., & Bucy, J. (2009). Predicting and curbing classroom incivility in higher education. *College Student Journal*, 43(1), 74-85.

Read, B. (2004). Wired for Cheating. *Chronicle of Higher Education* 16 July. Downloaded at

<http://www.wku.edu/testing/Cheating%20Article.htm>.

Tindell, D.R. & Bohlander, R.W. (2012). The use and abuse of cell phones and text messaging in the classroom: a survey of college students. *College Teaching*, 60, 1-9.

Wei, R. & Leung, L. (1999). Blurring public and private behaviors in public space: Policy challenges in the use and improper use of the cell phone. *Telematics and Informatics*, 16, 11-26.

Wylie, J. (n.d.). Mobile learning technologies for 21st century classrooms. *Scholastic.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.scholastic.com/browse/article.jsp?id=3754742>

Institutional Policy Models

“Cellphone Use in Classrooms.” Office of the Provost, Missouri State University.
<https://www.missouristate.edu/provost/celluse.htm>

“Cellular Telephone/Ready-Link Services.” Policies and Procedures, College of Charleston.
<http://policy.cofc.edu/documents/10.10.pdf>

“Classroom Code of Conduct.” Lander University. www.lander.edu/library/advising/files/Code_of_Conduct.pdf

“Classroom Policies.” College of Health and Human Performance, Brigham Young University.
http://hhp.byu.edu/students/classroom_policies.php.

“Guide for Content of Course Policies” Handout. Learning Technologies Department, Northwest Florida State College. http://ltech.nwfsc.edu/resources-faculty/DL_CourseQuality/Course%20Policies%20Handout%20Statements.pdf.

“Use of Electronic Devices in the Classroom.” The College at Brockport, State University of New York at Brockport. http://www.brockport.edu/policies/docs/use_of_electronic_devices_in_the_classroom.pdf.

Appendix 4

CAS Common Response Questions

Closed Response Questions

- A. The course was what I expected based on the goals, objectives, and description provided early in the semester. *Student Response Choices: strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree*
- B. The course requirements (assignments, activities, explorations, readings, etc.) contributed to my understanding of course content. *Student Response Choices: strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree*
- C. The course required me to use critical thinking. Critical thinking goes beyond the learning of facts and is often demonstrated through activities that require synthesis of ideas, argument, logical reasoning, analysis, questioning, exploration, and/or problem solving. *Student Response Choices: strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree*
- D. As a result of my work in the course, I gained new knowledge, skills, information, and/or insights. *Student Response Choices: strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree*
- E. The instructor clearly stated the expectations for graded assignments and/or tests and followed them consistently. *Student Response Choices: strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree*
- F. The instructor provided useful feedback on my work. When evaluating the usefulness of feedback, consider the timeliness of response in relation to the type of assignment, the relationship to providing constructive comments that enabled you to develop further understanding, and the connection to assignment and/or course expectations. *Student Response Choices: strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree*
- G. The instructor created a classroom and/or online environment that was conducive to learning. The instructor welcomed questions and invited interaction. *Student Response Choices: strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree*
- H. The instructor was available outside the classroom and/or designated online class meetings (in selecting your rating, consider the instructor's availability via established office hours, appointments, and electronic communications). *Student Response Choices: strongly agree; agree; neither agree nor disagree; disagree; strongly disagree; did not attempt to contact*

Open Ended

- I. What experiences in this course positively influenced your academic and/or professional development? Experiences to consider include (but are not limited to) assignments, discussions, internship placements, projects, labs, explorations, virtual activities, lectures, etc.
- J. What, if anything, could the instructor do to improve this course?

A to D – Course design

D to E – Instruction

Appendix 5

FACULTY ANNUAL REVIEW PROCESS AND TIMELINE College of Arts and Sciences

Because of the size and diversity of the College, the College of Arts and Sciences takes a holistic approach to faculty evaluation and commentary. The College considers annual reports, pre-tenure/third year reviews, tenure and promotion reviews, and post-tenure reviews to be critical points for feedback.

As a result, the Department Chair is the principal source of formative and summative evaluation for faculty members in the College. Chairs are expected to comment on each faculty member's annual report each year. Faculty members expect to receive annual report comments in a timely manner, and Chairs expect faculty members to address these suggestions for improvement at their first opportunity.

The purpose of this document is to detail the responsibilities of faculty members, department chairs, and the dean's office in the annual review process.

Full Time Faculty Members

All full-time faculty in the College of Arts and Sciences should use the college annual report form – or its electronic equivalent -- which is organized to facilitate preparation for pre-tenure, tenure, post-tenure, and promotion reviews. The annual report serves as the primary basis for personnel decisions made in the College. It may also serve other purposes, such as support for special awards or recognition for individual faculty excellence. Attachment of appropriate documentary evidence to the annual report will facilitate the gathering and submission of materials required in these later reviews.

The faculty member is responsible for providing the information necessary for the Department Chair to write a complete evaluation of the faculty member's work. Faculty are encouraged to be reflective yet concise, so that the annual report process allows for meaningful reflection and reporting of faculty involvement. Probationary faculty and those planning to apply for promotion should be thorough and reflective throughout this report. Tenured faculty not seeking promotion in the next three years may choose solely to highlight activities in Academic Responsibility, Student Intellectual Development, Scholarly Activity, and Professional Stewardship. All faculty members are required to sign the form containing the Department Chair's written evaluation of her/his work as evidence of receipt; this signature does not indicate agreement.

In her/his comments, the Department Chair's evaluation of a faculty member should:

- a) Address all areas of faculty roles and responsibilities;
- b) Indicate strengths and identify areas for development; and
- c) Help the faculty member meet the expectations of her/his rank.

Department chairs are not expected to repeat information already contained in the annual report and are encouraged to be concise when possible. Department Chairs and faculty members are encouraged to discuss the faculty member's work and are expected to collaborate where necessary on the creation and submission of the annual report.

The faculty member and Department Chair should work together to determine appropriate goals and resolve any misunderstandings or disagreements related to the interpretation of materials before the

annual report and Department Chair's evaluation of the faculty member's work are finalized and forwarded to the Dean's office. The Department Chair may change information in the evaluation s/he provided or the faculty member may adjust information in the annual report to represent the resolution. The annual report and evaluation documents will be considered official once they are signed and sent to the college.

If a resolution is not possible, faculty may follow the appeals process detailed below.

Full-time Faculty with Secondary Assignments: The College of Arts and Sciences has many faculty members with secondary teaching and/or administrative assignments in other campus units. The College believes that faculty should receive adequate credit for this work and that all supervisors should provide regular feedback to the faculty on their performance.

Thus, faculty with a secondary assignment in another department, college, or administrative unit should include reflective commentary and analysis of all of their duties in their annual reports. Faculty should submit their annual reports and *curriculum vitae* to both supervisors simultaneously. Secondary supervisors should provide comments to the primary supervisor for inclusion in the faculty member's annual report comments. These comments must be provided before the primary supervisor meets with the faculty member. Primary supervisors are expected to include the secondary supervisor's comments in the annual report comments, and to confer with secondary supervisors on tenure, promotion, and merit pay recommendations.

Adjunct Faculty Members

Adjunct faculty are expected to complete the annual report form for adjunct faculty members. The faculty members should provide reflective, yet concise, commentary and analysis on two areas of faculty evaluation: Academic Responsibility and Student Intellectual Development. Additional commentary related to Scholarly Activity and Professional Stewardship may be included, but is not required.

Adjunct faculty members should complete one annual report – or its electronic equivalent -- per year, to be completed no later than May 15. An adjunct faculty member teaching in summer session and/or fall semester but not in spring semester may be given an earlier deadline at her/his chair's discretion.

The Department Chair evaluation of an adjunct faculty member should:

- a) Address those faculty roles and responsibilities addressed by the adjunct faculty member in her/his annual report, but focus especially on Student Intellectual Development and Academic Responsibility;
- b) Indicate strengths and identify areas for development; and
- c) Help the faculty member meet the expectations for an adjunct faculty member.

Department chairs are not expected to repeat information already contained in the annual report and are encouraged to be concise when possible.

The faculty member and Department Chair should work together to determine appropriate goals and resolve any misunderstandings or disagreements related to the interpretation of materials before the annual report and Department Chair's evaluation of the faculty member's work is finalized and forwarded to the college office. The Department Chair may change information in the evaluation he/she provided or the faculty member may adjust information in the annual report to represent the

resolution. The annual report and evaluation documents will be considered official once they are signed and sent to the college.

If a resolution is not possible, adjunct faculty may follow the appeals process detailed below.

Adjunct Faculty with Secondary Assignments. Adjunct faculty with secondary assignments in another department, college, or administrative unit should include reflective commentary and analysis of all of their duties in their annual reports. Faculty should submit their annual reports and *curriculum vitae* or resumé to all supervisors simultaneously. The primary and secondary supervisors should confer on the deadline for the faculty member's annual report. Secondary supervisors should provide comments to the primary supervisor for inclusion in the faculty member's annual report comments. These comments must be provided before the primary supervisor meets with the faculty member. Primary supervisors are expected to include the secondary supervisor's comments in the annual report comments. Each supervisor will make her/his own determination about rehiring the faculty member independently.

Comments from the Dean's Office

The Dean or a designated Associate/Assistant Dean will read annual reports submitted by faculty, including adjunct faculty, each year. In most cases, the feedback provided will be brief, with a few comments or simply a checkmark and a signature, unless there is a point of disagreement with the chair's evaluation.

Beginning in the 2013-14 Academic Year, and each year thereafter, the Dean will read and comment on the annual reports/administrative reviews submitted by the following individuals:

- Direct reports on the CAS Dean's office staff (Student Services Director, Assistant to Dean, Administrative Coordinator, Assistant/Associate Deans).
- All Department Chairs.
- Probationary faculty in the year of their third year/pre-tenure review (typically the third year).
- Associate Professors and tenured Assistant Professors every six years, starting three years after last review (tenure or promotion).
- Non-tenure track faculty upon completion of year three and year six and every six years thereafter.
- Faculty on multi-year contracts, upon completion of year three and year six and every six years thereafter.
- Any faculty members, including adjunct faculty members, who appeal their chair's comments.
- Any faculty members, including adjunct faculty members, whose annual reports or chair's comments are flagged by a department chair or the designated Assistant/Associate Dean for any reason.

In addition, the Dean will participate in the following review processes each year as indicated by University policy:

- Pre-tenure/Third year Reviews
- Tenure reviews
- Promotion reviews
- Post-tenure reviews

Chair's Comments Appeals Process

In the event that any misunderstandings or disagreements cannot be resolved, a faculty member has the right to appeal her/his chair's comments.

Once the faculty member receives the Department Chair's written evaluation of her/his faculty work, the faculty member has five business days to initiate a discussion of any misunderstandings or disagreements. In the event that a timely resolution between the faculty member and chair is not possible, the faculty member has an additional five business days to create a written response as an appeal of the Department Chair's evaluation of her/his work to the Dean or the Dean's Designee. Before the annual report packet is forwarded to the college, the faculty member is required to sign the form containing the Department Chair's evaluation of the faculty member's work to indicate review of the statement; this signature does not indicate agreement with the content of the evaluation.

When a formal appeal of the Department Chair's evaluation of the faculty member's work is necessary, the faculty member should use the appeals form located on the College of Arts and Science faculty resources page. This form should be completed and submitted to the Dean's office and copied to the chair, so that it can be included in the faculty member's annual report packet.

In all cases this process should be completed such that the annual report packet can be forwarded to the College Office on or about July 1. When a faculty member formally contests the Department Chair's evaluation of her/his faculty work, the Dean or Dean's designee will work with the Department Chair and faculty member to determine whether a resolution is possible.

If the appeal remains formal, the Dean will provide a statement for the annual report packet that indicates agreement or disagreement with the Department Chair's evaluation of the faculty member with a brief statement of reason. When resolution of the disagreement is not possible, a faculty member should maintain the chain of statements for future use in promotion, tenure, or post-tenure portfolios.

Timeline for Annual Reports and Feedback:

On or before **May 15**: Faculty members' annual reports due to the department chair(s)/supervisors.

On or before **July 1**: Department Chair's annual report comments, including those submitted by secondary supervisors, if appropriate, due back to faculty.

Within five days of signing annual report comments and no later than **July 6**: Faculty appeals of chair's comments (if any) due to Dean.

On or before **August 15**: Dean's office comments returned to candidates for tenure and/or promotion.

On or before **January 10**: Dean's office comments returned to faculty (other than tenure/promotion candidates).

Appendix 6

Appeals Form

To appeal Department Chair comments on Faculty Annual Report

Submit completed form to the Dean's Office, and send a copy to your Department Chair.

Name of Faculty member: _____

Date of written statement: _____

Date of final discussion with Chair*: _____

Brief description of the misunderstanding or disagreement leading to the appeal:

Provide a concise statement explaining your concern with the Department Chair's evaluation of your work. This statement should outline evidence that supports your claims. As appropriate, evidence can be attached to this form.

*The normal process for appealing the Department Chair's evaluation of a faculty member should begin with a discussion between the faculty member and the chair to determine whether a resolution to the matter can be found in advance of the annual report packet being forwarded to the college. If this discussion was not possible, the faculty member must explain the circumstances preventing such a discussion.

Last updated: 14 October, 2013