

---

**SDSU Senate**  
**April 9, 2013**  
**AL 101**  
**2:00pm - 4:30pm**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Agenda</b> (Bordelon)	
<b>2.</b>	<b>Minutes</b> (Bordelon)	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Announcements</b> (Eadie)	
<b>4.</b>	<b>Academic Affairs</b> (Marlin)	
<b>5.</b>	<b>SEC Report</b> (Valdes)	
5.1	Referral Chart	2
<b>6.</b>	<b>New Business: Action Items</b>	
6.1	Committees and Elections (Ulloa)	3
6.2	Environment and Safety (Quintana)	6-11
6.3	Faculty Affairs (Anderson)	12
<b>7.</b>	<b>New Business: Consent Calendar (Committee Reports)</b>	
7.1	Academic Policy and Planning (Schellenberg)	13-21
7.2	Academic Resources and Planning (LaMaster)	22
7.3	ASCSU (Ornatowski)	23-25
7.4	Diversity, Equity and Outreach (Butler-Byrd)	26-29
7.5	Graduate Council (Balsdon)	30-35
7.6	Undergraduate Curriculum (Barbone)	36
7.8	University Relations and Development (Carleton)	37
<b>8.</b>	<b>Other Information Items</b>	
<b>9.</b>	<b>Adjournment</b>	

Date: April 9, 2013  
To: SEN  
From: Julio Valdes, Vice Chair, SDSU Senate  
Subject: Referral Chart (Information)

---

Committee	Date	Item	Referred by
Environment and Safety	<i>Nov 29, 2011</i>	Review the Memo from Peter Andersen, re: "Air Pollution from Leaf Blowers" (page 44-46 of SEC agenda) and provide a recommended action for the Senate.	Officers
Academic Policy and Planning	<i>Mar 15, 2012</i>	Develop a review process for Distance Education Modality courses that addresses compensation, TA support, final testing schedules, and course quality.	Officers

**To: SEN**

**From: Emilio C. Ulloa, Chair, Committee on Committees and Elections**

**Date: March 19 2013**

**Re: Action**

---

The following official nominations have been received from the College of Business Administration and hereby submitted for appointment via senate.

**General Education Curriculum Committee**

Xudong An will be on sabbatical for the AY 13-14 and is to be replaced by Marie-Eve Lachance

**Library Committee**

Xudong An will be on sabbatical for the AY 13-14 and is to be replaced by Ning Tang

Report to: San Diego State University Senate  
From: Penelope J. E. (Jenny) Quintana, Chair, Environment & Safety Committee  
Date: March 25, 2013  
Title: Proposed changes to Senate smoking policy for the SDSU campus

---

Environment and Safety Committee proposes several changes to the SDSU Senate Policy on Smoking (see policy at the end of this document for exact proposed changes to Senate policy file). In addition, this draft document includes changes suggested by the Senate Executive Committee at its meeting held March 19, 2013.

The proposed changes can be summarized as follows:

1. The new policy would state that the SDSU will have an entirely tobacco-free campus. The committee envisions that this would occur within one year. During this phase-in year, two designated smoking areas would remain on campus, one near Viejas Arena and one near the south end of campus (Physical Plant).
2. The new policy would state that no tobacco-related advertising, sampling, or sponsorship shall be permitted on SDSU property, at college-sponsored events, or in publications produced by the college.
3. The new policy would state that enforcement, complaint, and disciplinary procedures be specified and that these will be communicated widely through electronic and print media and signs at strategic locations on campus. Fines could be collected from repeat violators according to recently passed State legislation dealing with enforcement of smoking policies on California university campuses.
4. The new policy defines what is meant by the term 'smoking'.
5. The new policy states that the smoking policy shall be widely disseminated to the campus community, for example in student and new employee handbooks, websites, and news center notifications.

These changes in part follow the model code of the American College Health Association regarding tobacco policies on campuses. The changes are also based on examples from other CSU campuses, the California Youth Advocacy Network (funded by the California Tobacco Control Program of the Department of Health Services) and the American Lung Association.

The proposed policy changes are based on the following rationales:

- A. The tobacco-free policy would significantly improve SDSU's approach to tobacco use regarding second-hand smoke exposure, changing the social norm about tobacco use among students, and protection of the campus physical environment for the benefit of all employees, faculty, and students. The current policy calls for designated smoking areas, and this policy is confusing, has generated significant numbers of complaints, and fails to protect the campus community from second-hand smoke exposure and toxic tobacco waste products.
- B. The new policy has the following significant improvements: It would be made clear to students, campus visitors, staff and faculty that there is no smoking allowed anywhere on campus, and they would be informed of this tobacco-free policy at all principal entrances to the campus. The procedures and responsibilities are detailed in the new policy, and

prohibitions on tobacco company sponsorship and advertising are explicitly stated. There would be no area of campus that would expose students, faculty, and employees to second-hand smoke. Over time, there would also be economic benefits in that fewer signs would be necessary, and clean-up costs across campus would be reduced (over the last three years, about 24,000 butts have been collected each year during one-hour cleanups of the campus by 50 volunteers).

- C. A completely tobacco-free policy also positions SDSU as a leader, not a follower, in a national trend to implement tobacco free university campuses, supported by the US Department of Health and Human Services. The Environment and Safety Committee surveyed the CSU campuses and found that as of March 2013, one CSU campus has passed a completely smoke-free policy (CSU Fullerton), and about half have designated smoking areas. The rest rely on a 20-30 foot rule prohibiting smoking near entrances to buildings, windows, and walkways (see Appendix for details about other CSU campuses).
- D. The Academic Senate of the CSU has requested the Chancellor to modify the CSU System policy to create a smoke-free University system in January, 2013 (<http://www.calstate.edu/acadsen/Records/Resolutions/2012-2013/documents/3102.shtml>)
- E. The US Surgeon General has asserted that tobacco use in any form and exposure to secondhand smoke presents a significant health hazard; the the US Environmental Protection Agency and the California Environmental Protection Agency have determined that there is no safe level for exposure to secondhand smoke; and secondhand smoke (environmental tobacco smoke, ETS) has been declared a toxic air contaminant by the State of California Air Resources Board, therefore implementing a ban smoking on campus would reduce exposure of its students, faculty and staff to a known health hazard.
- F. Cigarette butts have been recently been shown to be a toxic environmental contaminant (Tobacco Control. 2011 May;20 Suppl 1:i25-9. PMID: 21504921). When deposited into aquatic environments, they may be are toxic to fish, microorganisms, and other animals at low concentrations. Banning tobacco use on campus will reduce the burden of toxic tobacco waste products that flow into storm drains, streams, and San Diego waterways.
- G. Removing cigarette waste will support a more pleasant and attractive campus image and learning environment. It will also reduce janitorial costs by reducing litter and need for cleaning cigarette urns.
- H. Banning smoking on campus would reduce the incidence of trash receptacle fires and associated Public Safety and first responder costs due to cigarette caused fires.
- I. Tobacco bans are known to lower smoking rates (Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine, 2008; 162: 477-483; CDC, 2007, 56(24);604-608), and therefore this action would likely increase healthy behaviors and reduce smoking rates among our students, faculty, and staff. The SDSU campus offers smoking cessation assistance through Student Health Services and Employee Assistance Programs.
- J. Other CSU Campuses, other San Diego area campuses and all UC campuses have passed 'smoke-free' resolutions in recognition of the advantages of this policy.
- K. The American College Health Association supports a 100% smoke-free campus ([http://www.acha.org/Publications/docs/Position\\_Statement\\_on\\_Tobacco\\_Nov2011.pdf](http://www.acha.org/Publications/docs/Position_Statement_on_Tobacco_Nov2011.pdf))
- L. Legal scholars have found that there is no constitutional 'right to smoke' (e.g. Samantha K. Graff, Tobacco Control Legal Consortium, There is No Constitutional Right to Smoke: 2008 (2d edition, 2008) [www.tobaccolawcenter.org](http://www.tobaccolawcenter.org))
- M. The American Lung Association recommends a campus-wide ban on smoking as an important step to protect the health of our students, faculty and staff.

- N. An SDSU student survey carried out by Associated Students found that a majority of students at SDSU support a smoke-free campus.
- O. The committee supports the analysis and information about the benefits of going tobacco-free presented in the white paper presented to the University of California that led to the declaration of all UC campuses going smoke free (found at <http://risk.ucsc.edu/all-pdf/homepage-smoke-free%20policy-proposal.pdf>). This document provides extensive support for the proposed measure.

(Attachment: Proposed changes to Smoking Policy, has changes marked. See below for final proposed policy).

To: San Diego State University Senate

From: Penelope J. E. (Jenny) Quintana, Chair, Environment & Safety Committee

Date: March, 2013

Re: Proposed changes to Senate Policy on Smoking

---

## Smoking

1.0 Smoking shall be prohibited by San Diego State University as follows:

- a. In buildings owned and occupied by or leased and occupied by SDSU and in SDSU vehicles,
- b. In SDSU outdoor areas including parking lots,
- c. In outdoor SDSU owned or leased constructed seating areas where people are likely to congregate.
- d. Appropriately worded “no smoking” signs shall be placed in locations where the smoking rule is consistently violated and all public ash receptacles shall be placed in compliance with this policy.

2.0 The distribution of free samples of tobacco products is prohibited. No tobacco-related advertising or sponsorship shall be permitted on SDSU property, at college-sponsored events or in publications produced by the college, with the exception of advertising in a newspaper or magazine that is not produced by SDSU and which is lawfully sold, bought or distributed on campus property. For the purposes of this policy, "tobacco-related" applies to the use of a tobacco brand or corporate name, trademark, logo, symbol or motto, selling message, recognizable pattern of colors or any other indicia of product identification identical to or similar to, or identifiable with, those used for any brand of tobacco products or company which manufactures tobacco products.

3.0 The designated officials in charge of receiving complaints about employees shall be Human Resources, and for complaints about students shall be Student Affairs. Other violations shall be referred to Public Safety, unless other designated officials are named by the President to receive complaints concerning violations of this policy. This official, policy, procedures for complaints, and consequences of violations will be posted online. If needed, AB 795 allows for fines to be assessed for repeat violators, and this avenue will be explored if needed, though social enforcement shall be the primary means of enforcement.

4.0 All members of the campus community will be informed of the smoking policy by widely distributing the campus tobacco policy on an annual basis. The tobacco policy will be clearly posted in employee and student handbooks, on the college/university website, and in other relevant publications. Key components of the policy will be also shared with parents, alumni/ae, and visitors. The general policy will be both printed and electronic formats.

5.0 The university shall offer smoking-cessation assistance for students through Student Health Services and for faculty and staff through the Employee Assistance Program. Interested employees should contact the Center for Human Resources.

6.0 San Diego State University auxiliary organizations shall comply with this policy.

7.0 Smoking shall be permitted in university-sponsored theatre and dance productions and other representations where smoking is part of the script.

8.0 Notice of this policy shall be posted at or near principal entrances to the campus and on [www.sdsu.edu](http://www.sdsu.edu).

9.0 This policy shall implement Cal. Code Regs. Title 5 section 42356 and CSU Memorandum 200-26 and 2003-19 in accordance with the Education Code 89030 and 89031 and Cal. Govt Code sections 7596-7598, and CSU Executive Order 599.

10.0 Smoking is defined as inhaling, exhaling, burning, or carrying a lighted or vapor-producing tobacco product. Tobacco is defined as all tobacco-derived or containing products, including, but not limited to, cigarettes (clove, bidis, kreteks), electronic cigarettes, cigars and cigarillos, hookah smoked products, and oral tobacco (spit and spitless, smokeless, chew, snuff).

#### Attachments

- a. SmokingPoliciesatCSUmarch2013.xls
- b. Senate smoking policy proposed changes

To: San Diego State University Senate

From: Penelope J. E. (Jenny) Quintana, Chair, Environment & Safety Committee

Date: March, 2013

Re: Proposed changes to Senate Policy on Smoking

**(changes are noted in track changes)**

Smoking

1.0 Smoking shall be prohibited by San Diego State University as follows:

- a. In buildings owned and occupied by or leased and occupied by SDSU and in SDSU vehicles,
- b. In SDSU outdoor areas including parking lots ~~unless designated as smoking areas consistent with the goals of this policy,~~
- c. In outdoor SDSU owned or leased constructed seating areas where people are likely to congregate, ~~unless designated as smoking areas.~~
- d. Appropriately worded "no smoking" signs shall be placed in locations where the smoking rule is consistently violated and all public ash receptacles shall be placed in compliance with this policy.

2.0 The distribution of free samples of tobacco products is prohibited. ~~and the advertisement of such products anywhere on the SDSU campus is strongly discouraged.~~ No tobacco-related advertising or sponsorship shall be permitted on SDSU property, at college-sponsored events or in publications produced by the college, with the exception of advertising in a newspaper or magazine that is not produced by SDSU and which is lawfully sold, bought or distributed on campus property. For the purposes of this policy, "tobacco-related" applies to the use of a tobacco brand or corporate name, trademark, logo, symbol or motto, selling message, recognizable pattern of colors or any other indicia of product identification identical to or similar to, or identifiable with, those used for any brand of tobacco products or company which manufactures tobacco products.

3.0 ~~The President shall~~ designated an ~~officials in charge of receiving complaints about employees shall be Human Resources, and for complaints about students shall be Student Affairs. Other violations shall be referred to Public Safety, unless other designated officials are named by the President to receive complaints concerning violations of this policy. T, and this official, policy, procedures for complaints, and consequences of violations will be posted online. If needed, AB 795 allows for fines to be assessed for repeat violators, and this avenue will be explored if needed, though social enforcement shall be the primary means of enforcement.~~

4.0 ~~All members of the campus community will be informed of the smoking policy by widely distributing the campus tobacco policy on an annual basis. The tobacco policy will be clearly posted in employee and student handbooks, on the college/university website, and in other relevant publications. Key components of the policy will be also shared with parents, alumni/ae, and visitors. The general policy will be both printed and electronic formats.~~

54.0 The university shall offer smoking-cessation ~~programs~~ assistance for students through Student Health Services and for faculty and staff through the Employee Assistance Program. Interested employees should contact the Center for Human Resources.

65.0 San Diego State University auxiliary organizations shall ~~be encouraged to~~ comply with this policy, ~~except that smoking may be permitted only in the private living areas in auxiliary-owned residential buildings.~~

76.0 Smoking shall be permitted in university-sponsored theatre and dance productions and other representations where smoking is part of the script.



~~87.0 In determining the number and location of smoking areas on campus, the President or designee shall consider the views of students and employees, as per CSU Board of Trustee Resolution RCOW 09-02-02.~~

~~8.0~~ Notice of this policy shall be posted at or near principal entrances to the campus and on [www.sdsu.edu](http://www.sdsu.edu).

~~989.0~~ This policy shall implement Cal. Code Regs. Title 5 section 42356 and CSU Memorandum 200-26 and 2003-19 in accordance with the Education Code 89030 and 89031 and Cal. Govt Code sections 7596-7598, and CSU Executive Order 599.

~~109.0~~ Smoking is defined as inhaling, exhaling, burning, or carrying a lighted or vapor-producing tobacco product. Tobacco is defined as all tobacco-derived or containing products, including, but not limited to, cigarettes (clove, bidis, kreteks), electronic cigarettes, cigars and cigarillos, hookah smoked products, and oral tobacco (spit and spitless, smokeless, chew, snuff).

To: SEN

From: Matt Anderson, Chair of Faculty Affairs Committee

Date: March 28, 2013

Re: Action item – emeritus status

**Action:**

The faculty affairs committee recommends emeritus status upon the following faculty members:

Joseph W. Ball, Professor of Anthropology, May 21, 2013, 38 years

Earnest Dale Sevier, SSPAR III in the College of Sciences, August 18, 2013, 13 years

C. Anne Turhollow, Librarian, July 1, 2013, 31 years

To: SEN

From: Stephen Schellenberg, Chair, Academic Policies and Planning

Date: 28 March 2013

Regarding: Information Item – Response on Online Education Referral

On 15 March 2012, APP received the following referral: *“Review current policy on the oversight of courses that are either proposed to be offered in a Distant Education modality or are moving to Distance Education Modality. Issue: Up until 2008 courses offered in a Distant Education modality were required to be reviewed by a special distance education curriculum review committee, which was abandoned because it hampered the ability to transition courses to DE in an efficient manner. With more and more courses transitioning to DE modalities new questions have come up with respect to compensation, adequate TA support, final testing schedules and course quality. The review should provide suggestions on developing an efficient DE review process to address these concerns.”*

On 18 September 2012, this referral was revised by senate officers to read: *“Develop a review process for Distance Education Modality courses that addresses compensation, TA support, final testing schedules, and course quality.”*

**Overview:** Online education is a “disruptive innovation” that (1) challenges the traditional brick-and-mortar-based structure and operation of higher-education and (2) introduces new potentials and pitfalls for student learning and success. This issue is particularly complex given that an individual’s schema regarding online education is strongly influenced by their broader educational philosophy, general familiarity and comfort with technology, and level of experience in online course design, operation, and assessment.

During the 2012-13 AY, APP explored the components and spirit of this referral, along with its broader context and implications, with informal input from various stakeholders including students, faculty, staff, and administrators. This information item, together with the attached action item, summarizes our findings and recommendations.

**Compensation:** APP interprets this term to refer to instructor assigned-time with respect to (1) “one-time” efforts to transform course modality from face-to-face or hybrid modes to a fully online mode and (2) the “semester-to-semester” potential for large enrollment (i.e., 100s to potentially 1,000s) within a single online section. Assigned-time policy regarding both issues exists at the CSU level, and is administered/reported through *Faculty Assignment by Department* reports. APP recommends that interested parties refer to this policy (see attached), particularly assigned-time codes for Excess Enrollment (Code 11), New Preparations (Code 12), Non-Traditional Instruction (Code 15), and Instructional Experimentation, Innovation, or Instructionally-Related Research (Code 22). APP notes that these assigned-time codes were last amended in 1991, and may be overdue for review and potential revision.

Given the significant effort involved in transforming courses into a quality online learning experience and the potential challenges of large section enrollments, APP recommends the following:

- (1) Instructors should discuss their interest in developing online courses and/or large enrollment sections with their department chair to establish a clear agreement and documentation regarding assigned time.
- (2) Department chairs and equivalents should consult with the involved instructor prior to setting section enrollments, whether face-to-face, hybrid, or online.
- (3) Instructors and department chairs should seek assistance in the development, operation, and assessment of online courses through ITS, whose mission is to provide support and leadership in the effective use of technologies for enhancing learning as well as facilitating research and strategic

initiatives. This support can range from informal consultation with ITS course designers to participation in the annual Curriculum Design Institute, for which selected instructors currently receive three units of release time. APP anticipates that the Strategic Plan will include additional investment in such resources.

**Teaching Assistant Support:** This issue relates to compensation in that TAs can provide important value and assistance in maintaining course quality within large-enrollment sections that may or may not be fully online. As with the above compensation issue, APP refers interested parties to the existing CSU-wide policy regarding assigned-time, specifically Excess Enrollments (Code 11).

**Final Testing Schedule:** This issue relates to the current lack of articulation of online courses within the SDSU final exam matrix, and thereby the potential for clumping of online final exams on certain days (e.g., first day of finals, which provides instructors with the maximum amount of grading time). In addition, APP recognized the need for clear and consistent coding of both hybrid and online courses within the schedule of classes with respect to their synchronous versus asynchronous formats, any required activities involving student presence on campus or elsewhere at specific places, dates, and times, etc. APP believes that both issues are important for enrollment management as well as student success, but does not view either issue as rising to the level of formal Policy File additions. Instead, APP requests that the administration develop timely and effective operational solutions to these logistical issues.

**Course Quality:** The term “quality” denotes a desired degree of excellence with respect to some broader distribution. Thus, the term can be relativistic among individuals and is, by definition, relativistic with respect to the selected distribution. APP interpreted this referral to reflect concerns about specific low-quality online courses with respect to all courses regardless of modality. We reject the dichotomous view that online learning and courses are, *by definition*, innately inferior to face-to-face learning and courses. However, we also appreciate that some courses may, based on their content and learning outcomes, be more suited to one modality than another. In other words, APP notes that the mission of SDSU is agnostic to course modality. Thus, APP believes that concerns regarding low course quality are healthy, but should be broadened to *all* modalities *including* the face-to-face modality. That said, the potential for online learning to expand student learning and improve student success does come paired with pitfalls that, once recognized and addressed, are readily avoidable.

*What is the way forward with respect to course quality?* APP believes that this complex issue transcends our committee’s specific role within shared-governance, and merits a broader discussion with various senate- and senate-appointed committees (e.g., Instructional and Information Technology, Library, Student Affairs, Student Learning Outcomes, Undergraduate Council, Undergraduate Curriculum) that is informed by the outstanding efforts of Instructional Technology Services and the Center for Teaching and Learning. APP recommends that these stake-holders collaborate to identify mechanisms and policy that will promote course quality across *all* modalities. In the meantime, APP encourages those individuals currently involved in the college-level approval of new and existing courses for operation in an online mode, as in all modes, to (1) seek input from individuals experienced in course design and (2) consider the CSU Quality Online Teaching rubric (QOLT, attached) as a potential means to assess the quality of courses across *all* modalities.

### **APP Recommendations and Comments beyond Specific Scope of Referral**

**Nomenclature:** Throughout SDSU, APP recommends that (1) courses without a significant online component be formally defined, and consistently referred to, as “face-to-face” (versus “normal” or “regular”) and (2) courses in which greater than 50% of the instruction is online be formally defined, and consistently referred to, as “online” (versus “distance education”). These recommendations reflect more than low-level semantics: For the first recommendation, use of terms such as “normal” or “regular” are arguably pejorative with respect to online education. For the second recommendation, the term “distance”

has a geographic denotation, yet many, if not most, students are participating in online courses while proximal to, or actually on, the SDSU campus. In addition, the term “distance” can have a negative connotation by implying that this modality produces an inherent gap in meaningful instructor-student interaction, which need not be the case given technological advances that allow timely and dynamic interactions (e.g., live and interactive synchronous sessions, timely feedback via discussion boards, etc.). In addition, the adoption and consistent use of the terms “face-to-face” and “online” are more consistent with the current use of the term “hybrid,” which describes sections with periodic “face-to-face” meetings within physical classrooms as well as a significant “online” component.

**Intellectual property:** Instructors have expressed concern regarding the intellectual property of the content that they have developed for online learning, particularly comprehensive course materials and architecture housed in Blackboard courses. APP refers concerned parties to the Policy File, specifically Item 2.4 of the *Classes and Courses, Hybrid, and Distance Education* section and to the broader *Copyrights, Trademarks, and Trade Secrets* section. Given the complexity of the later section, APP suggests that Faculty Affairs collaborates with the Center for Teaching and Learning as well as the California Faculty Association to develop opportunities to clarify these issues for all parties.

**Requests that a face-to-face section is offered whenever an online section is offered:** Such requests beg the question that online courses are inherently inferior compared to face-to-face courses in terms of quality, accessibility, and student success. While some peer-reviewed studies support such views, others do not. While APP endorses diversity in course modality, the requirement of such pairing is often not feasible given staffing and programmatic constraints.

**Requirements that an instructor teaches online:** While APP believes that no instructor should be forced to teach hybrid or online sections, we also appreciate that certain logistical circumstances and programmatic designs may favor an online modality for a given course. APP encourages involved parties to engage in good faith discussion on this issue in order to avoid the difficult situation of a forced means that works against the desired ends.

**CSU INSTRUCTION RELATED ASSIGNED TIME CODES**  
**Activities for which Weighted Teaching Units may be assigned:**

Code\*

11. Excess Enrollments

- a. For classes with census date enrollment of between 75 and 120 and exceptional workload, a graduate assistant or student assistant may be allocated.
- b. For classes with census date enrollment of over 120, a graduate assistant, a student assistant, or an additional 3 WTU may be assigned.

Assignment of graduate assistants is a preferable way of handling such large class loads, but it is recognized that qualified graduate assistants are not always available.

In no case shall a faculty member be granted assigned WTU for more than one class with excess enrollments.

12. New Preparations

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for preparation of courses never before taught by that particular faculty member, if courses actually taught include two or more such new preparations.

14. Course or Supervision Overload

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU equal to course or supervision overload earned in a prior fiscal year provided that calendar considerations so necessitate and the faculty member has not been present for the full preceding academic year.

15. Non-Traditional Instruction

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for activities involving instruction and evaluation, which include such activities as modularized instruction, self-paced instruction, team teaching/cluster courses, thematic projects, open laboratory, sponsored experimental learning or other community activities, writing adjunct, mediated instruction (involving computers, television, and/or other media devices), and peer instruction. These activities typically do not involve a single instructor regularly meeting a group of students in an assigned classroom or laboratory setting.

16. In-Service Training for K-12 School Personnel

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for activities involving in-service training for K-12 school personnel. Typically, the activities are provided on the school site using a variety of instructional modes and do not necessarily involve an instructor regularly meeting a group of students in an assigned classroom or laboratory setting on a campus.

17. Credit by Examination/Evaluation

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for activities that give primary emphasis to the evaluation of a student's knowledge and skills rather than upon the instructional process by which the knowledge and skills are acquired. Such activities include:

- a. Credit by evaluation of prior experiential learning (e.g., based upon evaluation of a portfolio of materials).
- b. Credit by examination (where the examination is generated and evaluated in whole or in part by the campus), including comprehensive and challenge examinations.

The characteristics of evaluation activities that should be treated as part of the regular instructional program involve 1) regularly enrolled students, and 2) a substantial effort on the part of the faculty member to perform any of the following tasks:

- a. Interview and make a preliminary assessment of the student's background.
- b. Counsel the student regarding preparation for the evaluation.
- c. Selection or preparation of the examination or assistance in preparation of a student portfolio.
- d. Evaluation of the portfolio or evaluation of the student response to the examination.

18. Instructional Support for Graduate Students

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for special graduate student testing duties, in particular for conducting comprehensive examinations for master's degree candidates and examinations in fulfillment of foreign language requirements.

21. Special Instructional Programs

- a. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for participation in a team teaching effort. The total assigned and earned WTU associated with a team-taught course may not exceed the WTU generated by the course multiplied by the number of faculty members teaching the course. In addition, no individual faculty member may be given more WTU, both earned and assigned, than the course generates.
- b. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for program and tape production for instructional television.
- c. A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for liaison duties among multiple sections of the same course.

22. Instructional Experimentation, Innovation, or Instructionally Related Research

- a. A faculty member may be given assigned time for development and implementation of experimental programs involving:
  1. Instructional television
  2. Computer assisted instruction
  3. Other innovations in instruction
- b. A faculty member may be given assigned time for documented research evaluations which are demonstrably related to the instructional functions and programs of the college.

23. Instruction-Related Services

A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for his services related to college clinics, study skill centers, farms, art galleries, and other campus institutions and facilities which are ancillary to the instruction program.

31. Advising Responsibilities
- A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for carrying an excessive advising load due to a relatively high proportion of part-time faculty in his department.
  - A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for carrying a greater than normal share of departmental or school advising responsibilities.
  - A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for services as departmental graduate adviser.
32. Instruction- Related Committee Assignments
- A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for participation over and above normal levels in such areas as curriculum, personnel, budget, library, audio-visual, and selection committees at the department, school or college level.
  - A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for membership in or liaison to special committees whose activities have significant bearing on the instructional programs of the college, or the CSU system at large.
  - Includes all-university assigned time.
33. Curricular Planning or Studies
- A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for special individual or committee-related curriculum planning, development and redevelopment activities.
  - A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for development of special tests for credit by examination.
34. Accreditation Responsibilities
- A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for accreditation responsibilities.
35. Instruction-Related Facilities Planning
- A faculty member may be given assigned WTU for duties related to planning of instructional facilities.
41. California Faculty Association Activities
- Each CFA campus Chapter President and each of four CFA statewide officers (President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer) shall be granted a reduction in workload, without loss of compensation, of up to three (3) WTU on a semester campus, or four (4) WTU on a Quarter campus, per academic term.

\*This is the code used for reporting assigned WTU in the Academic Planning Data Base

Document last amended November 1991



# Quality Online Learning and Teaching (QOLT) Rubric Summary

The QOLT program is a pilot effort to establish a system for informing and evaluating online teaching and learning using Moodle in the CSU.

The following scale of effectiveness is applied to each QOLT objective:

Exceeds/Always (3 points)	Criterion evidence is clear, appropriate for this course, and demonstrates best practices in a manner that models its use.
Meets/Frequent (2 points)	Evidence of this criterion is clear and is appropriate for this course. Minor room for enhancement.
Developing/Rarely (1 point)	Some evidence of this criterion, but it needs to be presented more clearly and/or further developed.
Nonexistent /Never (0 points)	Not present, but should be, based on course design and content. Or, is present, but not appropriate for this course.
Non-applicable (no score given)	Objective does not apply to the course (e.g., course does not have group-work assignments and rater would enter "NA"). Objective(s) rated NA will not factor into overall points and resulting Mean scores.

## Section 1. Course Overview and Introduction

Instructor gives a thorough description of the course, as well as inducting students to the course protocol and expectations.

- 1.1 Students are provided clear instructions to get started and access all course components.
- 1.2 Course description is provided in a manner that goes beyond the very brief description that is typically provided in the course catalog.
- 1.3 Instructor information is available to students and includes contact, biographical, and availability information, as well as picture.
- 1.4 Etiquette expectations for online discussions, email, and other forms of course communication are clearly stated.
- 1.5 Academic integrity is defined and expectations provided.
- 1.6 Prerequisite knowledge and competencies (if applicable) clearly stated.
- 1.7 A list of technical competencies necessary for course completion is provided, identifying and delineating role/extent the online environment plays in the total course.
- 1.8 Calendar of due dates and other relevant events is provided.

## Section 2. Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning

Student Evaluation and Assessment refers to the process your institution uses to determine student achievement and quality of work, including the assigning of grades.

- 2.1 All Student Learning Outcomes (SLO) are specific, well-defined, and measureable.
- 2.2 Instructions for students to meet the SLO are adequate and stated clearly.
- 2.3 SLO are not just in bulleted list, but also integrated within respective assignments/assessments.
- 2.4 The course grading policy is clearly stated, along with scale and weights of respective assignments.
- 2.5 Demonstrates an understanding of the relationships between and among the assignments, assessments and standards-based learning goals.
- 2.6 The assessment instruments selected are sequenced, varied, and appropriate to the student work being assessed.
- 2.7 Students have multiple opportunities to measure their own learning progress.

## Section 3. Instructional Materials and Resources Utilized

The instructor has carefully selected a variety of materials and material formats to represent course content and enable students to meet relevant learning outcomes.

- 3.1 Students are given adequate notice to acquire course materials.
- 3.2 Syllabus lists whether textbooks are required or recommended.
- 3.3 For each required and recommended text, there is a brief statement as to its value/purpose in meeting student learning outcome(s).
- 3.4 When possible, students are given options in terms of how they acquire course materials, including Open Educational Resources (e.g., MERLOT).
- 3.5 There is a variety of instructional material types, helping to engage students in the content, while not overly relying on one content type.
- 3.6 Audio and visual files used are clear in purpose and do not distract from outcomes.

- 3.7 The instructional materials present a variety of perspectives related to course content and topics within.
- 3.8 All resources and materials used in the course are appropriately cited.

#### **Section 4. Instructional Design and Delivery**

Addresses how the course design, assignments, and technology effectively encourage exchanges amongst the instructor, students, and content.

- 4.1 At the beginning of the course, students are provided with an opportunity to introduce themselves to each other as a way of encouraging community.
- 4.2 A variety of instructional delivery methods, accommodating multiple learning styles, is available throughout course.
- 4.3 The selected tool for each activity is appropriate for effective delivery of teacher or student content.
- 4.4 Establishes and maintains ongoing and frequent teacher-student interaction, as well as student-student interaction.
- 4.5 Discussions are organized in clearly defined forums, threads, or communities.
- 4.6 The learning activities promote the achievement of the stated learning outcomes.
- 4.7 Learning activities provide opportunities for interaction that support active learning.
- 4.8 When requiring group work, a statement of the task is provided, with clear and concise outcomes that are appropriate and reasonable.
- 4.9 Rules for forming groups and assigning roles are clearly stated.
- 4.10 Benchmarks and expectations of group participation are clearly stated.
- 4.11 The modes and requirements for student interaction are clearly articulated.
- 4.12 Instructor's plan for response time and feedback on assignments is clearly stated.
- 4.13 Course abides by copyright and fair use laws.

#### **Section 5. Technology for Teaching and Learning**

Instructor utilizes technology to effectively deliver course content, engage students in learning activities (individual, student-to-student, instructor-to-student) and for students to express themselves or demonstrate learning.

- 5.1 The tools and media support the course learning objectives.
- 5.2 Course tools and media support student engagement and guide the student to become an active learner.
- 5.3 Navigation throughout the online components of the course is logical, consistent, and efficient.
- 5.4 Students can readily access the technologies required in the course.
- 5.5 Acceptable formats for assignment completion and submission have been articulated.
- 5.6 The course technologies are current.

#### **Section 6. Learner Support and Resources**

Learner Support and Resources refers to program, academic, and/or technical resources available to learners.

- 6.1 Instructor states her/his role in the support process and how students obtain support.
- 6.2 The course instructions articulate, or link to, a clear description of the technical support offered and how to access it.
- 6.3 Syllabus articulates how students access and fully utilize campus library resources and support.
- 6.4 Course instructions articulate, or link to, an explanation of how the institution's academic support services and resources can help students succeed in the course and how students can access related services (e.g., Disability Support Services, Writing Center, Tutoring Center, IT Help Desk).
- 6.5 Course and institutional policies with which students are expected to comply are clearly stated and/or links to current policies provided (e.g., cheating and plagiarism, copyright).

#### **Section 7. Accessibility and Universal Design**

The course utilizes principles of accessibility and universal design that are critical to some learners, as well as offering benefits to all learners.

- 7.1 Course instructions articulate and/or link to the institution's accessibility policies and services.
- 7.2 The syllabus makes clear how the instructor will follow university policy and work with students who have an officially registered disability.
- 7.3 The course employs accessible technologies: course environment, communications, engagement, instructional materials, and assessments.
- 7.4 The course design facilitates readability and minimizes distractions.
- 7.5 The course design and materials accommodate, rather than inhibit, the use of assistive technologies.
- 7.6 Instructor adapts and adjusts instruction to create multiple paths to learning objectives.

Adapted 4/2012 for Teaching and Technology Day, Faculty Development Center, California State University Fullerton, April 2012. See accompanying presentation at <http://portal.sliderocket.com/BFNWS/QOTL-FDC>. For information, contact Vikki Costa, Department of Secondary Education [vcosta@fullerton.edu](mailto:vcosta@fullerton.edu).



**March 28, 2013**

**TO: Senate**

**FROM: Kathy LaMaster, Chair  
Academic Resources and Planning Committee**

**SUBJECT: Information**

---

### **1. Referral Item - American Colleges and Universities President's Climate Commitment**

The Senate officers issued a referral to the Academic Resources and Planning Committee, asking the committee to consider the proposal of the sustainability committee on signing the American Colleges and Universities President's Climate Commitment and report on the resource implications for SDSU should the president agree to take such an action. The officers ask AR&P to provide its best estimate of the effects of signing onto the commitment for campus budgeting processes (for example, could anticipated costs be absorbed by careful budgeting or by spreading out payments over a number of years, or would the cost have to be put ahead of other spending priorities that SDSU might have). If possible, the officers ask AR&P to advise the Senate on the advantages and disadvantages of agreeing to the commitment so that senators will have an adequate background for making a decision on this matter.

AR&P invited Dean Geoff Chase and Robert Schulz, Associate Vice President for Operations, to the March 12, 2013 meeting to provide input on the components of the report and associated costs. We were informed that the initial costs (year 1 & 2) would be minimal and would include \$4000 to join the organization, staff support and small internal costs. However, full implementation for our campus would be at least \$250 Million over 20 or so years. With such a wide range of numbers and variables, AR&P does not believe actual costs can be determined with the available information.

Our committee identified the advantage to signing the document as a public statement for the campus acknowledging the importance of climate change and the need for a campus plan. The disadvantage was identified as a commitment to an organization that would involve an unknown fiscal commitment by the campus. In summary, AR&P would recommend that the campus develop a preliminary plan that has specific goals and associated costs prior to committing to this initiative.

### **2. PBAC Voting Items**

AR&P discussed one-time funding proposals from Student Affairs, Business & Financial Affairs, University Relations and Development and Academic Affairs. Each proposal was discussed and the corresponding merits identified. The wisdom of the committee was to support as many of the requests as possible with campus safety, ADA issues and academic affairs as top priorities. Given the fact we were reviewing this agenda item without a budget we did not allocate funds to each division proposal.

TO: SEN

FROM: Cezar Ornatowski  
Academic Senate, CSU

DATE: March 28, 2013

SUBJECT: Information

#### Mandated Child Abuse Reporting

The Executive Order on Mandated Child Abuse reporting is being rewritten. At this point, faculty do not have to sign the Mandated Child Abuse Reporter form and there will be no consequences for not signing it. At some point in the future, we will get a "reminder" and at that point we will have to take on-line "training," which is allegedly being reduced from 4 hours to about 45 minutes (under pressure from CFA) and sign the form. At that point, being a mandated child abuse reporter will become a "condition of employment." At this point, Community Colleges have not yet been made "mandated reporters," neither have UC faculty. However, the law covers all segments of higher education, therefore, the CCs will have to comply. UC is late to the table and has turned the matter over to their HR. Stanford has already developed 44 designations of mandated reporters but we (CSU) have yet to sort it all out. We are officially on hold as more issues are examined.

#### Resolutions

At the March 13-15 ASCSU plenary, five resolutions were passed

#### **AS-3110-13/FGA California State University (CSU) Action on Environmental Sustainability**

Commends the CSU campuses that have signed the American College & University Presidents' Climate Commitment and the CSU campuses that have signed Talloires Declaration and encourages the Chancellor's Office and the other campuses to consider becoming signatories to these commitments.

#### **AS-3111-13/APEP Support for the Course Identification Numbering (C-ID) System**

Expresses support for the continuation of the C-ID system and requests funding to ensure its viability. The system not only supports the implementation of SB 1440 but also provides a vehicle for systemwide articulation.

#### **AS-3112-13/FGA (Rev) AB 67 (Gorell) and SB 58 (Cannella) Post-Proposition 30 Freeze on Systemwide Student Fees and Tuition Increases**

Expresses concerns about overall CSU funding and encourages the authors of the bills to include exceptions in the case that adequate state funding is unavailable.

**AS-3113-13/AA/FGA Request for a Task Force to Study California State University (CSU) Student Tuition Fees and Financial Aid Support**

Encourages the establishment of a task force to include CSSA, Chancellor's Office staff, and ASCSU.

**AS-3115-13/EX Commemorating the 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Academic Senate CSU**

One resolution was tabled

**AS-3114-13/APEP/AA/FGA SB 520 California Open Education Resources Council**  
Expresses concerns about the potential usurpation of faculty role in approving curriculum and the potential privatization of higher education. However, following a long discussion, the resolution was tabled. Since SB 530 is still evolving, ASCSU leadership will draft a letter articulating faculty concerns and meet with the author and/or his staff in person on March 25; in addition, a delegation of senators will travel to Sacramento on April 9 with a similar purpose.

Nine resolutions received their first reading (they will return as second reading items at the May ASCSU meeting)

**AS-3116-13/EX Academic Senate of the CSU Calendar of 2013-2014 Meetings**

**AS-3117-13/FA Change to the Bylaws of the Academic Senate Section 4d(2) Charge to the Faculty Affairs Committee**

**AS-3118-13/FGA AB 386—Cross-Enrollment in CSU Online Courses**

Opposes the provision requiring the establishment of a numbering system for online courses due to concerns over feasibility and resources to accomplish the bill's goals.

**AS-3119-13/AA Clarifying the Changing Expectations for General Education.**

Requests that a joint task force (between the ASCSU and CSU Chancellor's Office) be established to address the movement towards outcome-focused assessment, greater alignment of co-curricular activities with learning outcomes, and the need for systematic assessment of GE through program review, and requests a preliminary report at the September 2013 ASCSU meeting.

**AS-3120-13/EX Re-instituting the Annual CSU Academic Conference**

Refers to a prior resolution confirming the value of the annual CSU Academic Conference to shared governance within the CSU.

**AS-3121-13/FGA AB 387--Online Education in the CSU**

Opposes AB 387 (Levine) because of the difficulties in developing a workable common course numbering system just for online courses and the imposed mandate dealing with the number of courses to be developed.

**AS-3122-13/AA Reaffirming the Importance of Graduate Programs and Access to Those Programs**

Focuses on the preservation of State University Grants (fee waivers) for graduate students.

**AS-3123-13/AA Support of Student Mental Health and Counseling Services**

**AS-3124-13/AA Recognition of Executive Order 1047, Extended Education and Self-Support Courses and Programs**

Expresses gratitude for the clarification provided by the new EO.

Copies of this and other resolutions can be found at <http://www.calstate.edu/AcadSen/Records/Resolutions/>. Faculty are encouraged to provide feedback on the above resolutions as well as on any other relevant matters to their academic senators (Bill Eadie, Cezar Ornatowski, Mark Wheeler).

To: Senate  
From: Nola Butler-Byrd, Chair of Committee on Diversity, Equity and Outreach  
Date: March 5, 2013  
Re: **Information Item**

---

In January 2013, Dr. Anne Donadey presented this 2006-2011 SDSU Employee Data report to the Diversity, Equity and Outreach Committee. The committee requests that this report be shared with the SDSU Senate to contextualize the on-going challenges that SDSU faces regarding faculty and employee recruitment and retention.

### **2006-2011 SDSU Employee Data**

#### ***I – Four-year loss to the CSU and SDSU***

- A. Between 2007-08 and 2011-12, the CSU was subjected to a 33% reduction in state support by the California Legislature. (Public Institute of California analysis, Nov. 2012)
  
- B. SDSU has lost:
  - **21% of our staff** (362 out of 1,721 between 2006-07 and 2010-11). (Data from SDSU’s Office of Employee Relations and Compliance)
  - **19% of our faculty** (361 out of 1,890—including over **29% of our lecturers**—between fall 2007 and fall 2011). (Data from SDSU’s Office of Faculty Affairs)
  - **14.4% of our students** (5,256 out of 36,559 between fall 2007 and fall 2011). (Data from SDSU website, Office of Analytic Studies & Institutional Research)
  - **4.5% of our administrators** (12 out of 264 between 2006-07 and 2010-11). (Data from SDSU’s Office of Employee Relations and Compliance)

#### ***II – Ethnic and gender diversity data by category***

- A. Staff
  - In 2010-11, white staff employees comprised 53%, Hispanics 22%, Asians 13% and African Americans 8% of all staff employees. Staff members from ethnic minority groups comprised 44.5% of staff, an increase of 2 percentage points from 2006-07.
  - Between 2006-07 and 2010-11, whites went down by four percentage points and Native Hawaiians/Other Pacific Islanders went down by one percentage point, while Hispanics went up by four percentage points.



- In 2010-11, staff employees were 67% female (up from 58% in 2006-07). The only category in which there is a minuscule number of women is skilled crafts.
- Percentages of female employees have increased because we lost large numbers of male employees in the technical and paraprofessional (-177) and service/maintenance (-52) fields. The largest drop in numbers of female employees has been in the clerical and secretarial field (-48). The technical and paraprofessional category is the one that has suffered the most, losing over 38% of its workforce.

(Data from SDSU's Office of Employee Relations and Compliance)

*Conclusions:* The staff is 2/3 female and ethnically diverse. Staff diversity has increased in spite of loss of staff. Some occupational categories have suffered more loss than others, and males have suffered more loss than females.

#### B. Faculty

- Tenured/Tenure-Track (permanent) faculty: ethnic minority 24%, female 42% in fall 2011 (ethnic minority 22%, female 38% in fall 2007). (CSU-wide: 28% ethnic minority faculty and 45% female faculty (2009 data).)
- Lecturers (temporary faculty): ethnic minority 22%, female 56% in fall 2011 (ethnic minority 20%, female 54% in fall 2007).
- Overall, tenured/tenure-track faculty are 73.4% white, 8.3% Hispanic, 3.3% African American, 12.1% Asian
- Overall, lecturers are 75.6% white, 13% Hispanic, 2.4% African American, 5.6% Asian
- The colleges with the lowest percentages of tenured/tenure-track faculty of color are PSFA (Professional Studies and Fine Arts) and Sciences (around 15%)
- The colleges with the highest percentages of tenured/tenure-track faculty of color are the Imperial Valley campus (50%), Engineering (around 42%), Business Administration (around 37%), and Education (around 34%)
- The colleges with the lowest percentages of female tenured/tenure-track faculty are Engineering (around 7%), Sciences (around 27%), and Business Administration (around 35%)
- The colleges with the highest percentages of female tenured/tenure-track faculty are Education (over 70%), Health and Human Services (around 62%), and Arts and Letters (around 47%)

(Data from SDSU's Office of Faculty Affairs)

*Conclusions:*

- Overall, tenured/tenure-track faculty diversity increased slightly for all minority ethnic groups in spite of loss of faculty, due in great part to the fact that retirees are a less diverse group overall than new faculty members.
- For lecturers, there has been little change except for a small percentage increase for Hispanic lecturers and a small percentage decrease for white lecturers.
- Numbers and percentages of African American faculty members have been low and stagnant for 40 years (under 30 tenured/tenure-track), which is cause for concern.
- We have a high ratio of Hispanic lecturers to Hispanic tenured/tenure-track faculty.
- Numbers of American Indian and Pacific Islander faculty are minuscule.
- The embarrassingly low numbers of female faculty in the College of Engineering (fewer than 5) are cause for concern.
- The low percentages of faculty ethnic diversity in the Colleges of PSFA (Professional Studies and Fine Arts) and Sciences are cause for concern.

### C. Students

Between fall 2007 and fall 2011, the student body changed as follows:

- The largest ethnic group remained whites but went down from 44.3% to 38.7%
- The second largest ethnic group remained Mexican Americans but went up from 17.2% to 22.2%. Combined with other Hispanics, this category went up from 21.9% to 27.3%
- African Americans, Filipinos, and Asians maintained similar percentages (3.9%, 6.4%, and 6.8, respectively)
- Percentages are very small for American Indians and Pacific Islanders, but it is notable that their numbers dropped in half for American Indians and by almost two-thirds for Pacific Islanders

(Data from SDSU website, Office of Analytic Studies & Institutional Research)

*Conclusions:* Overall, student diversity increased even though the university had to reduce admissions. During this time period, SDSU-San Diego achieved Hispanic-Serving Institution status. Numbers and percentages of African American students have been low and stagnant for many years, which is cause for concern. Dropping numbers of American Indian and Pacific Islander students are also cause for concern.

### D. Administrators

- Overall, administrators are 73% white, 10% Hispanic, 7.5% African American, 6.7% Asian; and 55.5% women
- Between 2006-07 and 2010-11, there was very little change in the make-up of administrators

- Lower level administrators (Administrator I and II) are primarily female (58%); 28.7% of lower level administrators are members of ethnic minority groups; there is almost gender parity among members of ethnic minority groups; among whites, 64% are women
- Upper level administrators (Administrator III and IV) are overwhelmingly white (80.7%) and primarily male (59%); there is almost gender parity among whites; only 15% are administrators from ethnic minority groups, among whom there are only two women (and there are no African American women)
- Administrator IV level (the highest level) includes a minute number of ethnic minority men and no ethnic minority women

(Data from SDSU's Office of Employee Relations and Compliance)

*Conclusions:* Administrators are diverse in terms of gender, especially for whites; lower level administrators are diverse in terms of ethnic origin. The lack of ethnic diversity (both female and male) in upper level administration is cause for concern.

*General Conclusions:* SDSU has suffered the loss of 1/5<sup>th</sup> of our workforce (except for administrators) in a very short period of time, which is cause for concern in terms of our ability to serve students as well as we have in the past. In spite of these losses, there has been an increase in diversity overall, which is good news. The San Diego SDSU campus achieving Hispanic-Serving Institution status is a particularly significant milestone, as is the spectacular increase in graduation rates for students from underrepresented groups. The only area in which women are underrepresented is faculty in Engineering. In addition, attention needs to be placed on areas where ethnic diversity is lacking, in particular for:

- Faculty (especially in PSFA and Sciences)
- African American, American Indian, and Pacific Islander students and faculty
- Upper-level administrators

Data compiled and analyzed by Professor Anne Donadey  
January 2013

To: SEN

From: The Graduate Council

Date: 3/13/13

Re: 2013-2014 Graduate Bulletin

---

**INFORMATION (5I-03-13)**

**EXERCISE AND NUTRITIONAL SCIENCES**

1. Changes in course title, unit value, and description.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

*CPTS PHYS PATHOPHYS PHARM*

DPT 750. Concepts in Physiology, Pathophysiology, and Pharmacology (4)

Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.

Normal physiology, diseases, disorders, and injuries. Pathological processes, specific organ system pathology, multisystem pathology, and pharmacological concepts.

Change: Revisions reflect additional concepts in normal physiology, exercise physiology, medical terminology, and pharmacology being presented.

2. Delete existing course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

DPT 786. Clinical Communication (2)

Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.

Professional issues affecting physical therapists. Development of engaged professionalism through the American Physical Therapy Association.

Change: Content better presented in DPT 868 and 887.

3. Change in grading.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

DPT 822. Interventions in Musculoskeletal Therapeutics (3)

Two lectures and three hours of laboratory.

Prerequisite: Doctor of Physical Therapy 821.

Analysis of interventions used to treat clients with dysfunctions of the musculoskeletal system.

Change: Letter grade more reflective of learning than Cr/NC.

4. Delete existing course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

DPT 870. Health Care Systems (2)

Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.

Business strategies and skills for private practice setting.

Change: Content better presented in DPT 710 and 872.

5. Change in grading.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

DPT 881. Seminar in Evidence-Based Practice I (2)

Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.

Preparation as a consumer of the professional literature in physical therapy.

Change: Letter grade more reflective of learning than Cr/NC.

6. Change in grading.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

DPT 882. Seminar in Evidence-Based Practice II (2)

Prerequisite: Doctor of Physical Therapy 881.

Use of evidence in current physical therapy practice.

Change: Letter grade more reflective of learning than Cr/NC.

7. Delete existing course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

DPT 883. Seminar in Normal Human Gait (1) Cr/NC

Prerequisite: Doctor of Physical Therapy 725.

Normal gait and skills necessary to evaluate pathological gait.

Change: Content incorporated into new course, DPT 783.

8. Delete existing course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

DPT 884. Seminar in Abnormal Human Gait (2) Cr/NC

Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.

Gait analyses and gait-related physical therapy examination and intervention planning with a variety of patient populations.

Change: Content incorporated into new course, DPT 783.

9. New course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

*FUNCT NEURO-BIOMECH REL (C-3)*

DPT 886. Functional Neuro-Biomechanical Relationships (3)

Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.

Structures of the musculoskeletal system and individual regions. Forces sustained in normal and pathological conditions.

10. New course.

Doctor of Physical Therapy

*DOCTORAL RESEARCH (C-23)*

DPT 897. Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC

Prerequisite: Admission to the DPT program.

Investigation to the general field of the doctoral project.

11. Change in program

**Specific Requirements for the Doctor of Physical Therapy Degree  
(Major Code: 12122) (SIMS Code: 556529)**

The Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) is a professional and not a research degree. Students in the program will be involved in evidence-based practice/translational research projects as part of coursework and clinical internship. Students are expected to complete the program in three years while attending full-time as there is no part-time program. The minimum number of units for the DPT program of study is 116 units and the maximum number of units allowed is 121 units.

**FALL SEMESTER I (17 Units)**

DPT 725 Clinical Anatomy I (4)  
DPT 750 Pathophysiology of Physical Therapy Practice (4)  
DPT 780 Integumentary Therapeutics (4)  
DPT 881 Seminar in Evidence-Based Practice I (2)  
DPT 887 Seminar in Professional Development (3) Cr/NC

**SPRING SEMESTER I (16 Units)**

DPT 710 Foundations of Physical Therapy Evaluation (3)  
DPT 726 Clinical Anatomy II (4)  
DPT 760 Neurosciences (4)  
DPT 880 Differential Diagnosis in Physical Therapy (3)  
DPT 882 Seminar in Evidence-Based Practice II (2)

**SUMMER I (13 Units)**

**Session 1:**

DPT 782 Therapeutic Exercise (4)  
DPT 872 Health Care Economics in Physical Therapy Practice

DPT 886 Functional Neuro-Biomechanical Relationships (3)

**Session 2:**

DPT 801 Clerkship (3) Cr/NC

DPT 897 Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC

**FALL SEMESTER II (18 Units)**

DPT 802 Life Cycle I (2)

DPT 820 Musculoskeletal Therapeutics I (4)

DPT 830 Cardiopulmonary Therapeutics (4)

DPT 835 Neurophysiological Therapeutics I (4)

DPT 885 Seminar in Case Presentations (3)

DPT 897 Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC

**SPRING SEMESTER II (15 Units)**

DPT 803 Life Cycle II (2)

DPT 821 Musculoskeletal Therapeutics II (3)

DPT 836 Neurophysiological Therapeutics II (3)

DPT 857 Prosthetics and Orthotics (2)

DPT 875 Medical Therapeutics in Physical Therapy Practice (2)

DPT 878 Psychosocial Aspects of Rehabilitation (2)

DPT 897 Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC

**SUMMER II (9 Units)**

**Session 1:**

DPT 822 Interventions in Musculoskeletal Therapeutics (3)

DPT 837 Interventions in Neuromuscular Therapeutics (3)

DPT 868 Physical Therapy Organization and Administration (2)

**Session 2:**

DPT 897 Doctoral Research (1) Cr/NC

**FALL SEMESTER III (14 Units)**

DPT 889 Doctoral Project (4) Cr/NC

DPT 895 Clinical Internship (10) Cr/NC

**SPRING SEMESTER III (14 Units)**

DPT 889 Doctoral Project (4) Cr/NC

DPT 895 Clinical Internship (10) Cr/NC

Change: Update of program with new courses and revisions.

GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES

1. New course.

Geological Sciences

*RESEARCH FORUM (S-23)*

GEOL 602. Research Forum (3)

Prerequisite: Consent of department.

Identification of an original research project and collection of preliminary data.  
Oral presentation of a written proposal.

2. Add prerequisite.

Geological Sciences

GEOL 750. Research and Technical Writing (3) Cr/NC

Prerequisites: Geological Sciences 602 and advancement to candidacy.

Research and technical report writing in geological sciences for students in Plan B.

Change: Inclusion of new GEOL 602.

3. Add prerequisite.

Geological Sciences

GEOL 799A. Thesis (3) Cr/NC/RP

Prerequisites: Geological Sciences 602, an officially appointed thesis committee, and advancement to candidacy.

Preparation of a thesis for the master's degree.

Change: Inclusion of new GEOL 602.

4. Change in program

**Geological Sciences**

**Specific Requirements for the Master of Science Degree**

**(Major Code: 19141) (SIMS Code: 775301)**

(no change to first paragraph)

A minimum of 18 units must be selected from 600- and 700-numbered courses in the Department of Geological Sciences. Graduate students are required to complete Geological Sciences 602, up to six units of Geological Sciences 797 Research, and three units of Geological Sciences 799A Thesis (Plan A) or three units of Geological Sciences 750, Research and Technical Writing (Plan B). (no change to balance of paragraph)

Change: Inclusion of new GEOL 602.

## PUBLIC HEALTH

1. New course.

Public Health

*SCI WRITING EPIDEMIOLOGY (C-4)*

P H 725. Scientific Writing for Epidemiology (3) Cr/NC



Prerequisite: Completion of one year of master's level coursework in epidemiology or biometry.

Prepares students to generate a feasible hypothesis, perform, organize and write a literature review, and summarize proposed methodology. Topics include research development and organization, finding data sources, principles of scientific writing and revising, plagiarism, and citation management.

2. Change in program

**Master of Public Health Degree  
Concentration in Environmental Health  
(SIMS Code: 557315)**

Courses required for the concentration:  
*(no change to list of required courses.)*

Prescribed electives: A minimum of nine additional units selected with the approval of the adviser from:

P H 630	Environmental Health Risk Assessment (3)
P H 700D	Seminar in Public Health: Environmental Health (3)
P H 738	Topics in Toxicology (3)
P H 784	Global Environmental Health (3)
P H 798	Special Study (1-3) Cr/NC/RP

Change: Amend prescribed electives to reflect course offerings and germane to field. Increase elective units from 6 to 9. Delete P H 635, 637, 721; add P H 784.

3. Change in program

**Master of Public Health Degree  
Concentration in Epidemiology  
(SIMS Code: 557329)**

Courses required for the concentration:  
*(no change to list of courses)*

Prescribed electives: Six units selected from the following public health courses in epidemiology:

*Addition of following new course to existing list:*

P H 725	Scientific Writing for Epidemiology (3) Cr/NC
---------	---

Change: Addition of new course to prescribed electives.

To: SEN  
From: Steven L. Barbone, Chair  
Undergraduate Curriculum Committee  
Date: March 28, 2013  
Re: 2013-2014 General Catalog

---

**INFORMATION (6I-04-13)**

COMMUNICATION

1. Changes in course prerequisite, unit value, grading, and mode of instruction.

Communication

(C-78)

COMM 490. Internship (1) Cr/NC

Prerequisites: Communication 300 and 350; junior or senior standing. Admission to a major or minor in the School of Communication.

Students work at approved agencies off-campus under the combined supervision of agency personnel and instructors. Internship hours to be arranged. Maximum credit three units.

Change: Update to enable students to obtain internships. One unit appropriate for amount of academic work.

Date: March 28, 2013  
To: SEN  
From: Mary Ruth Carleton, VP University Relations and Development  
Subject: Information

---

**Information:**

SDSU's four living presidents were on campus last month. Brage Golding, Tom Day and Steve Weber were on campus in the KPBS studio and joined President Hirshman for a lively conversation about SDSU's history. That program will air as a special episode of "**SDSU Insider**" on KPBS on **March 30 at 12:30 p.m.**

**Campaign Update:**

The Campaign has raised nearly \$390 million in gifts and pledges through February. \$208 million is dedicated to supporting our faculty through programs, endowments and chairs.

Recent gifts of note:

Carey Mack pledged \$250,000 to the College of Business Administration Building and Classroom Remodel Project.

A gift in kind of software valued at \$307,000 from MSCI for the Wells Fargo Financial Lab.

The ARCS Foundation made a gift of \$46,000 to support graduate students.

Bill Waite made a \$750,000 planned giving commitment for Lavin Center Scholarships.

To find out more about the gifts being made to support our students, faculty and programs, please visit:  
<http://campaign.sdsu.edu>.

**Marketing and Communications:**

On March 12, President Hirshman lead SDSU's delegation to Sacramento for **CSU Legislative Advocacy Day**.

On February 28, the university honored Tony Young with the **President's Service Award**. Young is the former City Council President and current Red Cross CEO. It was a great event attended by several current and former councilmembers, members of the Red Cross Board of Directors and members of the SDSU community. First presented in 2001, the President's Service Award is given to individuals who are dedicated to community service and are promoters of higher education. Past honorees have included Bob White, Mayor Bob Filner, former Mayor Jerry Sanders and former State Senator Christine Kehoe.

The spring issue of **360 Magazine** is out and is now being sent to 45,000 alumni, donors and other friends of the university. This issue features stories on the 50th anniversary of John F. Kennedy's visit to SDSU, a Q&A with Ellen Ochoa, Director of the Lyndon B. Johnson Space Center, and an expanded focus on faculty research (heart research, language research and fetal alcohol spectrum disorders). The cover story highlights the Bunnell Strings – an extraordinary musical quintet of siblings who are all students.