MEETING OF THE FACULTY SENATE

AGENDA
January 31, 2024
3:00 PM – Student Center Ballroom, 3rd Floor

I. Approval of the Agenda for the January 31, 2024 Meeting
   Anup Kumar

II. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting
   A. December 6, 2023
   Anup Kumar

III. Report of the Senate President
    Anup Kumar

IV. Report of the President of CSU
    Laura Bloomberg

V. University Curriculum Committee
   Michele Heath and Shelley Rose
   Approval Items
   A. Consent Agenda (see attached)
   B. Core Curriculum Proposal (see attached)

VI. Admissions and Standards
    Michael Wiitala
    D. Admissions and Standards approved the attached update to the 3344-21-02 Policy on Academic Misconduct. The updates on pp. 3 and 5-6 address the use of AI. The update on p. 1 is a simple improvement to the previous language. Updates are marked using the track-changes function. (See attached)

    • Admissions and Standards decided not to create a syllabus statement about AI, because the committee thought that individual faculty need to figure out what sorts of AI use they will prohibit or allow on a given assignment or in a given course. Anyone interested in template AI syllabus statements can view a plethora of them here or cut and paste the address into your browser.

    https://docs.google.com/document/d/1RMVwzjc1o0M18Blw-7JUTeXv0z2b2WHRH86vw7mi16W3U/edit?usp=sharing

    E. Admissions and Standards approved the Social Work - CSU & Tri-C Associate of Applied Science (AAS) in Curriculog. That proposal now moves to Steering and then Senate.

VII. Budget and Finance Committee Report
     Deborah Smith

VIII. SEI Committee
      Thijs Heus
      F. SEI Spring Pilots (See attached)
IX. SGA Report

- Dining hall hours.
- Minimum number of students required to run a class.
- Ride escort service on campus.

X. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

XI. Question Time

XII. New Business

XIII. Adjournment

---

Academic Steering Committee

Judy Ausherman  Carole Heyward  Janterria Matthews  Albert F. Smith
Laura Bloomberg  Dana Hubbard  Bruce McClain  Deborah Smith
Brooke Conti  Chandra Kothapalli  Kevin Mueller  Nigamanth Sridhar
Gary Dyer  Anup Kumar, Chair  Anne Price  Michael Wiitala
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FACULTY SENATE—MEETING MINUTES
December 6, 2023
3:00 PM – Student Center Ballroom, 3rd Floor


OTHERS
PRESENT: Zoom indicated a peak of 65 participants.

Senate President Kumar called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. He noted the passing of former colleagues Jerry Mundell (Chemistry) and Alexander Dennison (Political Science) and called for a moment of silence in their memory.

I. Approval of the Agenda for the December 6, 2023

Senate President Kumar noted that a quorum was present. Senator Pearson moved that the agenda be changed to move an item (Labor Relations and Human Resources graduate program change) from the University Curriculum Committee consent agenda to the discussion agenda; Senator F. Smith seconded the motion. The agenda was approved as amended by voice vote.

II. Approval of the Minutes of the November 8 Meeting

The minutes of the November 8, 2023, Faculty Senate meeting were approved by a voice vote.

III. Report of the Senate President

Senate President Kumar provided updates on three issues. First, he noted that a substitute S.B. 83 (the “Ohio Higher Education Enhancement Act”) had been passed by the Higher Education Committee of the Ohio House of Representatives. President Kumar noted that this bill was still highly problematic for higher education.

Second, President Kumar noted that the University’s advertising campaign was at least reaching him. He stated that CSU was popping up on every website that he visits, and he commented on the billboards on highway approaches to Cleveland.
Third, President Kumar commented on the activities of the Planning and Finance Advisory Committee. He noted that combined with the work of the outside consultant, thinking about university finances was proceeding on two tracks that had to go in tandem—short-term actions to address the current budget deficit, and long-term thinking about the shape of the institution. President Kumar stated that the long-term picture has to be clear as short-term issues are being discussed.

IV. Report of the President of CSU (Report No. 13, 2023-2024)

University President Bloomberg began her report by expressing sadness about the frequency with which she had made condolence calls to families of members of the CSU community who had passed. She noted the deaths of two students—Dutch Pope and Madison Hampton—and of Edgar Jackson, a former director of the CSU-NEOMED Partnership. President Bloomberg said that communities grieve and remember together.

President Bloomberg next reported about government relations issues. As had been stated by President Kumar, President Bloomberg reported that Substitute S.B. 83 had passed out of the House Higher Education Committee by a vote of 8-7. President Bloomberg noted that John Plecnik, a faculty senator from the College of Law, had testified in opposition to the proposed legislation in an impressive way. President Bloomberg invited Professor Plecnik to comment on the bill.

Professor Plecnik stated that he was grateful for the Administration’s support as he opposed the bill. Professor Plecnik reported that it appears that the House speaker was not going to bring the bill to the floor of the House for a vote unless substantial changes were made to it, and that we should thank the speaker. Professor Plecnik stated that the bill remains terrible, noting particularly its retrenchment provisions that would make Ohio the least attractive state in which to be a university faculty member and that would be a handicap for Ohioans. Professor Plecnik stated that not a single currently employed Ohio professor has spoken in favor of this bill, and that it was important to communicate opposition to representatives.

President Bloomberg turned to Ohio Senate Bill 117, which mandates that a center for civics be established at CSU and that the Board of Trustees appoint an academic council by December 31, after which the next step would be to hire a director. President Bloomberg said that the actions of the trustees would be communicated to Senate.

President Bloomberg next discussed organizational resilience and financial stability, referring to a detailed email that she had sent to the university community earlier in the day (“Next Steps for Organizational Resilience and Financial Stability”). President Bloomberg said that the University had retained the consulting services of EY-Parthenon, a higher education consulting group with extensive experience. She characterized this consulting group as knowing the values that are important to universities, but also as being soberly analytic, and described an analysis of the sort that would be conducted as a good thing to do. President Bloomberg said that she was seeking external funding for the work of EY-Parthenon, but that she would use discretionary funds available to her to pay for this work if sufficient external funding was not secured.
President Bloomberg said that EY-Parthenon would look at strategies for both cost containment and revenue generation, and that its interface with the campus community would be through a nine-member steering committee composed of administrators and trustees. President Bloomberg said that she anticipates a report from EY-Parthenon before the end of the academic year, and committed to being as transparent as possible concerning organizational resilience and financial stability.

In responding to questions about the EY-Parthenon contract and paying for it, President Bloomberg said the cost of the consultation was $800,000 plus travel expenses, and that concerning strategies, everything is on the table including streamlining of administration.

President Bloomberg concluded her remarks by noting that education and civil rights go hand in hand, and that 2024 would be the 60th anniversary of both the establishment of CSU and of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. She anticipates events celebrating both during 2024.

V. University Curriculum Committee

The chair of the University Curriculum Committee, Michele Heath, noted that the Writing Across the Curriculum form had been updated. (The updated form was included with the meeting materials.) (Report No. 14, 2023-2024)

Professor Heath brought a consent agenda from the committee. (One item—Labor Relations and Human Resources graduate program change—had been separated from the consent agenda when the meeting agenda was amended at the beginning of the meeting. No additional items were separated for individual discussion.) The consent agenda (Report No. 15, 2023-2024) was approved by voice vote with no dissenting votes, and included the following:

- ART - 354 - Medieval Art - Course Modification - Restore WAC course
- CIS - 265 - Data Structures & Algorithms - Modification/Deactivation – Course description and prerequisite
- Exercise Science Minor - 1090 - Spring 24 - UGRD New Minor or Certificate - Addition of minor in exercise science
- SWK - 495 - Social Work Licensure Exam: Strategies and Stress Reduction Techniques – Course modification
- CMG - 490 - Senior Construction Management Capstone - New GenEd Course
- Computer Science Education Endorsement Program for P-12 - 1090 - Spring 24 - 23-24 UGRD New Minor or Certificate
- General Business Major, B.B.A. - 1110 - Fall 24 - UGRD Program Change
- Historic Preservation Certificate - 1110 - Fall 24 - UGRD Program Dormancy/Deactivation
- Sport and Entertainment Management, MSEM - 1110 - Fall 24 - GRAD Program Change
- UST - 205 - Public Service Careers - 24-25 UGRD New Course GenEd
- UST - 309 - Urban Planning - 24-25 UGRD New GenEd Course
- Upper Division Requirements - College of Arts and Sciences - Ad hoc proposal
- Integrated Degrees
  - Sociology + Journalism - approved
Senator Pearson posed a question about the Labor Relations and Human Resources graduate program proposal, which included the requirement that students take an examination for which there is a fee. The question concerned who would pay the exam fee. Senator T. Porter stated that the College would pay the exam fee. Senate approved the proposal.

- Labor Relations and Human Resources, MLRHR - 1110 - Fall 24 - GRAD Program Change

At the invitation of the committee, Vice Provost Holcomb spoke about integrated degrees, four of which had just been approved by Senate as part of the UCC’s consent agenda (Report No. 16, 2023-2024). He explained the idea and purpose of these integrated majors and noted that this was an opportunity to lead in Ohio with this innovation. He stated that there would be a total of 20 proposals in the first set of integrated-degree proposals; that in developing these proposals, proposers were trying as much as possible to use existing resources; and that these proposals were going through the regular curriculum review process. Dr. Holcomb characterized this project as a “whole university” effort.

Dr. Holcomb stated that although integrated degrees that were entirely within the Washkiewicz College of Engineering might seek ABET (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) accreditation, generally accreditation for these integrated degree programs would not be sought at this time and that students would have to be made aware that these programs were not accredited. Dr. Holcomb was asked who would get credit for these degrees; he replied that for any course as part of an integrated degree program, the offering department would get the credit.

VI. University Faculty Affairs Committee (UFAC)

UFAC Chair Gary Dyer reported that the committee had collected input from standing committees concerning their responsibilities as described in the University personnel policies and said that UFAC would work on appropriate revisions in the Spring semester.

VII. Undergraduate Student Success Committee

Using a set of slides distributed in advance of the meeting (Report No. 17, 2023-2024), Laura Northrop, Director of Research and Assessment, provided information about and student feedback from a course, UNI 102, offered in Spring 2023 to students who had been placed on academic warning after their first semester.

Students were asked about whether they had felt supported in courses in which they had earned Ds, Fs, or Ws; how they might have been better supported; and about factors that impeded success in these courses. Among the factors reported by students as impeding success were teaching quality, course expectations, issues with instructors, and personal issues and behaviors. Student responses concerning how CSU or CSU faculty can better support success included instructors checking in on students; flexible policies on deadlines for assignments and on attendance; and support with time management and study skills.
VIII. Budget and Finance Committee

Committee Chair Deborah Smith began her report from the Budget and Finance Committee by responding to an earlier question about library personnel compared to peer institutions. She showed a slide indicating that CSU has 12 full-time library employees compared with 11 at Kent, 13 at Youngstown, and 28 at Akron.

Professor Smith added some detail to previous descriptions of the work of the EY consultants, stating that recommendations concerning both the short-term budget plan and a long-range plan would be provided intermittently through the project period.

She provided information to respond to questions that had been asked previously. She stated that debt service on the assets of the Euclid Avenue Development Corporation (EADC), which include Fenn Tower, Euclid Commons, and the East 21st Street parking garage, is covered by lease payments. She said that EADC would apply for a grant to remove asbestos from Rhodes Tower.

Professor Smith reported that David Jewell, Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, is assessing how to preserve institutional knowledge in the face of substantial numbers of resignations and retirements.

Concerning health care costs, Professor Smith reported that the finance team is working on improving healthcare contracts, which are increasing at an annual rate of about 15%, and that according to Mr. Jewell, fighting these increases is a priority. She reported that increasing on-campus health services is a priority; that we could look forward to a substantial relaunch of VikeHealth in 2024; and that having health savings accounts as an option is under consideration. (Report No. 20, 2023-2024)

IX. Electronic Learning Committee

Using a set of slides distributed in advance of the meeting (Report No. 18, 2023-2024), Carole Heyward provided an update on the state of e-learning at CSU. She reported about new and relaunched online programs, noting in particular the growth of the JD online program, and identified new programs that would begin next year.

Professor Heyward identified two partners that CSU has engaged for its e-learning efforts—Keypath and Collegis—and described their roles and the services they provide. She then addressed a number of questions that faculty have had concerning e-learning and these partnerships, including compliance with FERPA, intellectual property issues, the purpose and role of success coaches, and communications between and among faculty, students, and success coaches.

Professor Heyward presented a draft communication to faculty explaining the role of success coaches in online courses; this includes a draft syllabus statement that explains to students the role of success coaches.
X.  Ad Hoc Committee on the Core Curriculum

Committee member Jeffrey Bolt reported on progress on development of the proposal for a new core curriculum. He thanked faculty for attending the November 20 town hall and stated that the committee was creating a document that would include responses to questions that had been asked at that meeting. Dr. Bolt stated that the committee intended to finalize its proposal within the next two weeks, that the committee would propose removing the capstone requirement, and that the committee would propose that students complete two writing across the curriculum courses.

XI.  Ad Hoc Committee on the Student Evaluation Instrument

Committee chair Thijs Heus updated Senate on the progress of the Ad Hoc Committee on the Student Evaluation of Instruction questionnaire. He reported that 62 people had attended (by zoom) the presentation given by Professor Regan Gurung of Oregon State University on November 28, and that the Committee would have further discussions with Professor Gurung on Friday, December 8. Professor Heus noted that Professor Gurung had said that Oregon State University went through a four-year process of evaluating its system of evaluation of instruction.

Professor Heus noted that the Committee had conducted surveys of instructors and students concerning the SEI; said that the Committee’s fact-finding report would be forthcoming; and stated that the Committee’s attention would next turn to how to increase response rates.

XII. Student Government Association Report

SGA President Kayland Morris reported that the SGA has passed resolutions concerning the need to address problematic WiFi issues on campus; supporting Cleveland State University's student population affected by the ongoing events in the Middle East; and maintaining non-partisanship and free speech standards in SGA. These resolutions were included in the meeting materials (Report No. 19, 2023-2024)

XIII. GPSA Report

GPSA President Tatiana Nikitina spoke about the availability, or lack thereof, of health and wellness services on campus, noting that there are students who are unclear of their options and concerned about the costs for them.

XIV. Report of the Provost and Chief Academic Officer

Provost Sridhar began by expressing gratitude for the care and diligence that faculty had invested in innovative development of a new core curriculum and integrated degrees.

The provost acknowledged the contributions of Dr. Roland Anglin, outgoing dean of the Levin College of Public Affairs and Education, and said that he looked forward to welcoming new dean Dr. Jill Gordon in January.

Provost Sridhar reported that an audit of WiFi services on campus was being undertaken.
Provost Sridhar noted that he had been studying the dossiers of faculty applying for promotion and tenure and that his heart was filled with pride as he read about the accomplishments of these faculty members. The provost said that he was grateful to have these faculty members as colleagues.

The provost stated that the University was launching a phased retirement program that would permit faculty over a period of several years to reduce their level of effort while receiving full health care benefits.

The provost noted that Cleveland would experience a total solar eclipse on April 8.

In response to a question about the sweeping of course fees and lab fees, the Provost stated that there was no intention of taking this money away from departments and using it for anything other than its intended purpose (i.e., to fund needs for the courses for which the fees were collected), but that the Provost’s Office was attempting to understand why large amounts of money of this type accumulate. The provost said that the implementation of improved financial reporting should facilitate this.

XV. New Business

There was no new business.

XVII. Adjournment

There being no further business, and following a motion, the meeting was adjourned at 5:19 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert F. Smith
Faculty Senate Secretary
UCC Consent Agenda 1/31/2024 (Amended on 1/31/2024)

Africana Studies Minor - 1110 - Fall 24
Africana Studies, B.A. - 1110 - Fall 24
Bachelor of Science Degree - Information Systems - 1110 - Fall 24
Bachelors of Science in Construction Management - 1110 - Fall 24
Civil Engineering, with Specializations, Accelerated Master's BCE/MSCE - 1110 - Fall 24
Classical Studies Minor - 1110 - Fall 24
Community Planning, B.A. - 1110 - Fall 24
Computer Science, Accelerated Master's BSCS/MCS - 1110 - Fall 24
Dance Minor - 1110 - Fall 24
Electrical Engineering, Accelerated Master's BEE or BCE/MSEE - 1090 - Spring 24
Health Sciences, Accelerated Master's BS/M.Ed in Exercise Science - 1110 - Fall 24
Health Sciences, MSHS - 1110 - Fall 24
Medieval Studies Minor - 1110 - Fall 24
Memorandum from Clinical Psychology M.A. specialization
Nonprofit Administration, B.A. - 1110 - Fall 24
PHY - 520 - Computational Physics
PHY - 565 - Image Processing
Public Policy and Management, B.A. - 1110 - Fall 24
Religious Studies, B.A. - 1110 - Fall 24
School Requirements - School of Urban Affairs
Social Studies, B.A. proposal
Social Work, MSW - 1110 - Fall 24
Theatre and Dance, B.A. - 1110 - Fall 24
UST - 207 - Ohio Government

Added Proposals
Governance, Risk Management, and Compliance (GRC), Graduate Certificate
IST - 360 - Data Analysis with Python and R
Dance, B.A
Theatre and Dance, B.A.
EET - 460 - Senior Design A
MET - 470 - Senior Design A
Social Work - CSU & Tri-C AAS
Introduction to Africana Studies since the 1880s
The History of the African Diaspora Certificate
Environmental Engineering Certificate Program
Religious Studies, B.A. - 1110 - Fall 24

Updated Integrated Degrees (added on 1/8/2024)
Computer Science + Electrical Engineering - Integrated Degree – Approval
The Inquiry Core Curriculum

Developing Inquiring Minds | Sparking Curiosity | Building Professional Presence

Overview

Built around the development of nine Core Competencies, students will complete 36-credit hours of coursework across a variety of disciplines. Each course will engage students in exploring important questions and problems, introducing them to the methods and standards of the discipline along the way and assessing their experience with signature assignments. Inquiry Pathways provide a further opportunity for students to deepen their understanding of an important issue and strengthen a sense of community with their peers by completing three core courses around a shared theme.

Guiding Principles

In 2022 CSU’s Faculty Senate initiated a review and update of the general education system. Members of the initial Spring 2023 committee created the following guiding principles for the revision process.

Provide a unique CSU core curriculum experience
Provide a foundational education for the 21st century
Emphasize building relationships
Be a holistic, integrated learning experience
Ensure the core curriculum works for our diverse student population

The Core Competencies

A Core Curricular education should prepare all students for success in life and whatever career(s) they pursue after graduation. The Inquiry Core is designed around nine core competencies that reflect the demands of modern life and the skills most in demand among employers. With the Inquiry Core, CSU is promising that all students who complete the program will be…

1. Effective written communicators
2. Effective oral communication
3. Critical quantitative reasoners fluent in interpreting and using data
4. Efficient and ethical consumers and creators of information
5. Sophisticated users of digital technologies
6. Professional and constructive collaborators
7. Ethically conscious and responsible decision-makers

For a complete list of ad hoc committee members and an overview of the curricular review process see Appendix D.
8. Culturally aware and civically minded members of local and global communities
9. Critical and creative thinkers

Each of these core competencies describes, at a high level, the learning outcomes of the Core Curriculum. Each is also further specified with sub-outcomes, derived from state guidance, AAC&U rubrics, and current research.

These Core Competencies update the existing GenEd 08 skill areas and unify them with the broader statement of the purpose of general education at CSU.

Core Curriculum courses will feature a signature assignment that assesses one or more of the core competencies outlined in the new curriculum.
The CSU Core Curriculum Framework

The CSU Core Curriculum is a reimagining and updating of the general education system at Cleveland State University. It aims to provide a foundational education for all CSU students, organized around a minimum of 36 credit hours, divided into two categories: Foundations of Inquiry and Methods of Inquiry. Each category 2 course will include critical thinking as a core competency.

With the various ways of embedding or replacing requirements in the Core, the minimum credit hours of courses outside of major requirements would be 15.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>OT36 Alignment</th>
<th>Core Competencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 1: Foundations of Inquiry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inquiry Launch</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>First Year Seminar, Collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Your Voice</td>
<td>First Writing</td>
<td>Written Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research &amp; Professional Writing</td>
<td>Second Writing</td>
<td>Written Communication, Information Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative &amp; Formal Reasoning</td>
<td>Mathematics, Statistics, and Logic</td>
<td>Collaboration, Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American History &amp; Culture</td>
<td>Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Arts &amp; Humanities or Social and Behavioral Science</td>
<td>Intercultural Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category 2: Methods of Inquiry</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Culture &amp; Creativity</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Collaboration, Written or Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Human Perspectives</td>
<td>Arts &amp; Humanities</td>
<td>Intercultural Knowledge, Written or Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Investigations</td>
<td>Natural Science + lab</td>
<td>Collaboration, Quantitative Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature &amp; Technology</td>
<td>Natural Science</td>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning, Information Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society &amp; Human Behavior</td>
<td>Social and Behavioral Science</td>
<td>Collaboration, Information Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity in Society</td>
<td>Diversity, Equity, Inclusion</td>
<td>Intercultural Knowledge, Written or Oral Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data &amp; Digital Literacy</td>
<td>Mathematics, Statistics, &amp; Logic or Social and Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Digital Literacy and/or Quantitative Reasoning, Collaboration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inquiry Pathways
A central goal of the Core Curriculum is to help students develop the ability to assess and solve problems using diverse methods. Any student completing their core curriculum at CSU should be able to do this, but we are also introducing the option for students to complete part of their core through a series of courses investigating a similar topic or theme.

Core Curriculum courses may be included in one or more Inquiry Pathways. These pathways are organized around important themes and provide students an opportunity to explore that theme from multiple disciplinary perspectives.

Students completing at least three of their core courses in a single Inquiry Pathway will have that success indicated on their transcript, somewhat equivalent to a certificate. Students will not be required to complete courses within a pathway.

An initial set of pathways will be constructed by the Core Curriculum Director based on input from faculty. Over time, faculty are encouraged to suggest pathways, composed either of existing core curricular courses or that would require the creation of new courses, and the Core Curriculum Director should regularly review existing core curricular offerings to identify where pathways may already exist.

Having a course included in a pathway will simply require a statement of the course’s connection to the pathway. Programs are encouraged to consider potential pathways that would be of particular interest to their students.

Writing Across the Curriculum
Writing Across the Curriculum courses will remain a key component of the CSU curricular experience. CSU students will be required to take two WAC courses at any level. At least one WAC course should be part of the major program of study, but not be a capstone course. WAC courses are outside of the 36 credit core curriculum requirements. The directors of Writing Across the Curriculum, First Year Writing and Core Curriculum will work closely to create unified vision of writing instruction throughout the core curriculum and WAC courses.

Looking Ahead: Course Design
Inquiry pathways and professional skills should focus on core competencies.

All core curriculum courses must be designed with an inquiry orientation and include at least one signature assignment. Additionally, faculty are encouraged to incorporate additional high impact practices to promote student learning.

Inquiry Orientation
The Inquiry Orientation is inspired by Inquiry-Based Learning, a high impact instructional strategy. For the purposes of the core curriculum, an Inquiry Orientation means two main things:

---

2 https://www.csuohio.edu/writing-center/wac-requirements
1. The course should be organized around big questions and/or problems that would be engaging to the students. The content and methods included in the course should be included to help students investigate those questions and/or problems.

2. The course should include ample opportunity for students to engage in some of the stages of inquiry. In practice, this means providing time in class for students to do the investigating and/or problem solving.

The overarching goal of the Inquiry Orientation is to spark student curiosity with the questions/problems and develop their inquiring minds by directing them to engage in inquiry rather than be passive recipients of information.

More information about the Inquiry Orientation and Designing for Inquiry is provided in Appendix E.

**Signature Assignments**

Every course in the core curriculum will be required to include at least one signature assignment which emphasizes the designated learning outcomes.

Signature assignments are authentic assignments that most represent our aspirations for student learning in the course by engaging students in real-world application of knowledge. They also always include a reflection element that prompts students to draw connections between what they did in the assignment (and the course more broadly) and the specific core competencies. In this way, signature assignments function both as artifacts students may use elsewhere in their lives and as a way of “making thinking visible” by drawing explicit links between the work and what it demonstrates.

The precise contours of a signature assignment are left to the instructor. They may take the form of an essay, lab report, website, presentation, artwork, creative writing, the product of a group project, or anything else that fits the bill as a meaningful, real-world application of knowledge. This does mean that exams and other similar assignment types are not signature assignments.

The reflection component of the signature assignment is aimed at promoting student metacognition and making their thinking visible to them. This approach has been shown to greatly enhance learning and make it stick. Once again, there will be no precise requirement for what the reflection should look like. However, resources and potential prompts will be made available for use.

There is no requirement that signature assignments be the “most weighted” assignment in the course. Although it should be part of the student’s overall course grade, it is left to the instructor to determine how it fits into that grade.

Instructors will be required to submit signature assignments to the Core Curriculum Director for the purposes of assessment.

**Assessment**
A Core Curriculum assessment program will be established by the Directors of Core Curriculum and Research & Assessment. Assessment, in this context, refers to a set of activities that measure, analyze, and evaluate student learning to gauge achievement of stated student learning outcomes. Meaningful assessment is the catalyst for the continuous improvement of the underpinnings of students’ educational experiences.

Assessment in the Core Curriculum will be aimed at improving the core curricular educational experience for students. Since no single course or instructor is responsible for achievement of learning across the core curriculum, the use of assessment data as evidence of instructor performance is strictly prohibited.

Core curriculum assessment should be focused on the Core Competencies and should make use of the Signature Assignment completed in each core curricular course as the basis for that assessment.

Given the complexity and time commitment required for the assurance of learning of the nine core competencies, a rotating and staggered assurance of learning plan should be used. The assessment plan should include three main components:

(M): Measurement of student learning, via the collection, evaluation, and reporting of outcomes

(R): Reporting of assessment data and recommendations for continuous improvement

(CI): The development, implementation, and reporting of continuous improvements

The table below provides a suggestive plan for assessment, beginning AY2026:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>F26</th>
<th>S27</th>
<th>F27</th>
<th>S28</th>
<th>F28</th>
<th>S29</th>
<th>F30</th>
<th>S31</th>
<th>F31</th>
<th>S32</th>
<th>F32</th>
<th>S33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Written Comm</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Reasoning</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Literacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Literacy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Reasoning</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Thinking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>M1</td>
<td>R1</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M2</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The exact order of the core competencies is arbitrary, but the key is that 3 will be assessed at a time. The “measurement” semesters denote when the measurement will occur, but it will be measuring the previous academic year’s work (F26 will focus on evidence from AY25-26, etc.). The 2nd measurement
and reporting will be largely the same as the first, but with an emphasis on reporting the results of any prior continuous improvements.

**Conclusion**

The Inquiry Core Curriculum is a reimagining of the Core Curriculum experience at CSU. Key features include the development of inquiry pathways, the inclusion of a 3-credit First Year Experience Course, and the addition of Signature Assignments built around nine Core Competencies. Students will complete 36-credit hours of coursework across a variety of disciplines. We look forward to collaborating with instructors and programs to create a distinctive core curriculum experience for all students at CSU.
Appendix A. Why Reform our General Education System?

The above presents the proposed changes to our general education system and gives some indication of the justification. But the justification runs much deeper and is grounded in social changes, demographic changes, new findings in the science of learning, and new evidence of what works in general education.

The aim of reform is to better promote student success through (1) promoting student belonging early in their CSU careers; (2) developing the foundational skills necessary for success at the university; and (3) beginning the development of broad transferable skills essential to success in any career or profession.

To further support the changes discussed above, below outlines some of the lines of evidence and justification considered by the committee(s), organized by the goals and features of the system.

1. Promoting integration

The new core aims to provide students with various mechanisms for integrating their learning across courses and drawing connections. This includes the optional Inquiry Pathways, the signature assignments in each course, and the inquiry-based structuring of courses. Why should we want a general education system that promotes integration in these ways?³

- The world is ever more complex and integrated. This includes the workplaces our students are likely to find themselves in. They will need to perform a variety of different tasks throughout the day, engaging with a variety of different perspectives and methods. Moreover, as recent work has suggested, we have moved from a “knowledge economy” to an “insight economy”.⁴ No longer is it sufficient to have knowledge of content; what is vital is the ability to generate insights. Insight partly comes from being able to pull together disparate ideas and form connections.
- Our students’ lives are ever busier, meaning they have less time outside of class to reflect on their learning and form connections themselves. To the extent forming connections is important at all, they need to be given more explicit opportunity to do so in their curriculum.
- Forming connections between disparate ideas supercharges learning.⁵ When students can integrate new knowledge with existing knowledge, or integrate knowledge across disciplines, their understanding is strengthened. Additionally, they develop the broad ability to integrate new knowledge, helping them become life-long learners.

• Global reality demands an ever greater ability to sort through mountains of information from all sorts of different fields. And this information is often overlapping. To understand a single social or political issue will likely require understanding natural scientific facts but also how those facts overlap with social or political considerations and the broader social and historical context of the issue.

2. Inviting & Accessible Course Design
Courses in the core curriculum are required to be designed in a way that makes them inviting and accessible to first-year, non-major students. This is both a reflection of OT-36 requirements and grounded in an understanding of the role of a core curriculum/general education program in a student’s overall university career. In practice, this means that core courses should not be designed as a major course, or with the expectation that the students in the course have or will in the future take additional courses in the same program. Research on teaching and course design has suggested the following reasons for regarding core courses as distinct from major courses:

• Student belonging and success. When non-majors enter a “general education” course that is designed predominantly for majors, they can easily feel out of their depth or like they do not belong in the course. This can result in poor performance, poor learning, and thus poor grades. Especially for students new to college, and especially first-generation college students, this sort of experience can result in a broader feeling that they do not belong in college at all. Clarifying the audience and catering courses appropriately can thus promote belonging and bring about both short-term and long-term success.

• Student interest and class culture. Designing core courses for their intended audience – first year, non-major students – can lead to course design decisions that better promote the interest of the relevant student population. This can generate a better class culture, as more students feel more invested given the course is designed for them. The result is a better learning community, better learning experience for students, and a better experience for the instructor as well.

• Improved learning. Educational theory emphasizes the idea of “desirable difficulties” – learning tasks that require a considerable amount of effort, but within the range of potential for the learner. When the audience of a course is more similar, it is easier to ensure that assigned tasks are desirable difficulties for all or most students. Thus, learning is enhanced. On the other hand, in a course designed for majors, any non-majors may be left behind.

---


3. Applied learning over content coverage

Sitting behind both integration and distinguishing the purpose of core courses is the idea that the core curriculum should be fundamentally about developing key competencies rather than learning a bunch of content. Of course, this does not mean content is not important. Rather, it simply suggests where the emphasis should lie. While a student majoring in your field will likely need to know a lot of specific content to succeed in later courses, graduate school, or specific industries, a student taking a core curricular course in your field has different needs. In particular, with the inquiry-based focus of the core curricular reform, we are suggesting they need to learn how to think in the ways your discipline privileges so they can use the tools of your discipline in their everyday lives. Doing this requires organizing a course less around covering specific content and more around ensuring students can work with whatever content they do learn. Why should that be the emphasis of a core curriculum?

- Transferability is key.8 The students taking a core course may never take another course in that same discipline. As a result, for the learning to matter to them at all, it will need to be capable of being transferred to other things they are doing. The best way to promote transferability is to practice transferring, and that comes from applying ideas to real-life or extra-disciplinary situations.

- Covering content does not mean students are learning content.9 Instead, knowledge must be “acted on” to be encoded in a way that constitutes long-term learning.10 Decreasing the breadth of content (where possible) to emphasize depth and application thus enhances student learning. While this is not always possible for major courses due to externally-imposed requirements, it is possible in the core curriculum.

- Promoting intrinsic motivation. Helping students see why learning what they are learning is important, and how it can help them with other things they care about can enhance their intrinsic motivation to participate in the course and learn the material.

As should be clear from these justifications, the updating and redesign of the core curriculum is fundamentally aimed at enhancing student success. This helps with student retention, improves classroom culture, produces more successful graduates, and all of that can lead to making CSU a more attractive proposition to students.

---

8 Hanstedt (2012).
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Appendix B. Core Curriculum Framework Categories of Inquiry

Foundational Inquiries

**Inquiry Launch** is a First-Year Seminar course focused on introducing incoming students to the college experience. Courses will have a topical, inquiry focus designed by the faculty and meeting any of the OT-36 distribution categories. Additionally, all Inquiry Launch courses will be required to incorporate specific First-Year Experience components and develop the core competency of collaboration.

**Finding Your Voice** aims to introduce students to college writing conventions and help them develop their ability to express themselves through writing. ENG101: College Writing, which meets OT-36 “First Writing” learning outcomes, will satisfy this requirement and focus on developing written communication.

**Research & Professional Writing** is focused on continuing the writing development of **Finding your Voice** with a significant focus on research and/or professional writing. This requirement may be satisfied by ENG102: College Writing II or alternative courses created in other programs. In either case, the course must meet the OT-36 learning outcomes for “Second Writing” and emphasize the core competencies of written communication and information literacy.

**Quantitative & Formal Reasoning** emphasizes quantitative, statistical, and logical reasoning. Courses in this category must meet outcomes for one of the OT-36 mathematics, statistics, and logic courses and emphasize the core competency of collaboration.

**African-American History & Culture** emphasizes CSU’s unique position in Cleveland, a majority minority city. Courses in this category must meet OT-36 learning outcomes for “Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion” as well as outcomes for either “Arts & Humanities” or “Social and Behavioral Sciences”. Additionally, these courses will emphasize the core competency of intercultural knowledge and competence.

Methods of Inquiry

**Human Culture & Creativity** is designed to meet OT-36 arts & humanities learning outcomes and speak to the core competencies of written or oral communication and collaboration.

**Global Human Perspectives** is designed to meet OT-36 arts & humanities learning outcomes. Additionally, the primary topical focus must be on societies and/or cultures from Asia, Latin America, Africa, or the Middle East. Courses in this category must be designed to develop and assess the core competencies of intercultural knowledge & competence and written or oral communication.

**Scientific Investigations** courses will be designed to meet OT-36 learning outcomes for the natural sciences and include a minimum 1-credit hour laboratory component, which meets OT-36
requirements for lab components. Courses in this category must be designed to develop and assess the core competencies of quantitative reasoning and collaboration.

**Nature & Technology** courses will be designed to meet OT-36 learning outcomes for the natural sciences. They do not include a laboratory component. Courses in this category must be designed to develop and assess the core competencies of quantitative reasoning and information literacy.

**Society & Human Behavior** courses will be designed to meet OT-36 learning outcomes for the social and behavioral sciences. They must be designed to develop and assess the core competencies of collaboration and information literacy.

**Diversity in Society** courses aim to investigate aspects of social and cultural diversity in the United States or the world. Courses in this category must be designed to meet the OT-36 learning outcomes for “Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion. These courses should focus on the core competencies of intercultural knowledge and competence and written or oral communication.

**Data & Digital Literacy** courses provide students with two distinct options. Students may either complete a second quantitative & formal reasoning course, meeting OT-36 outcomes for a course in the “mathematics, statistics, and logic” OT-36 category, or complete a course satisfying OT-36 outcomes for “Social and Behavioral Sciences” and emphasizing the core competency of digital literacy. This may include, for instance, courses that emphasize the use of Microsoft Excel, Adobe Creative Cloud, or other digital technologies. The digital technology component of these courses must be significant.
## Navigating the Inquiry Core Curriculum:

Potential Student Experiences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inquiry Pathways</th>
<th>Student-Centered Route</th>
<th>Professional Route</th>
<th>Transfer Route</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty-designed inquiry pathway through the curriculum focused on a common theme or issue</td>
<td>• Students design their own path through the core course offerings</td>
<td>• Allows students in certain major programs to complete core competencies in approved &quot;replacement&quot; major courses.</td>
<td>• Supports students who transfer in credits that apply to their core curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fosters connections between students and deep engagement in a specific issue</td>
<td>• This route is created according to individual student needs &amp; interests</td>
<td>• Program curriculum designers will ensure all competencies in the CC are met</td>
<td>• Recognizes that some students will complete only part of the core curriculum at CSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential for development of core curriculum credentials or badges</td>
<td>• Accommodates students who change majors once they start the core curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Related to the Student-Centered Route in that the student designs the experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C. Methodological Outcomes: OT36

CSU’s methodological outcomes reflect OT-36-approved areas of distribution for general education curriculum and includes English composition, mathematics, statistics, and logic, arts and humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and natural sciences.

General Requirements
All courses approved for a “Methodological Inquiry” category must:

- Be offered at the 100- or 200-level;
- Be inviting and accessible to non-majors; and
- Engage students in inquiry using the techniques and methods of the discipline, rather than focus exclusively on content coverage

Courses must additionally incorporate all the learning outcomes associated with the relevant category as listed below.

Arts & Humanities
Courses designated as fulfilling the OT36 Arts & Humanities requirements must provide opportunities for learners to achieve all the following learning outcomes:

1. Students will be able to employ principles, terminology, and methods from disciplines in the arts and humanities.
2. Students will be able to analyze, interpret, and/or evaluate primary works that are products of the human imagination and critical thought.
3. Students will be able to reflect on the creative process of products of the human imagination and critical thought.
4. Students will be able to explain relationships among cultural and/or historical contexts.
5. Students will be able to convey concepts and evidence related to humanistic endeavors clearly and effectively.

Social or Behavioral Sciences
Courses designated as social or behavioral sciences will provide opportunities for learners to achieve all the following learning outcomes:

1. Students will be able to explain the primary terminology, concepts, and findings of the specific social and behavioral science discipline.
2. Students will be able to explain the primary theoretical approaches used in the specific social and behavioral science discipline.
3. Students will be able to explain the primary quantitative and qualitative research methods used in the specific social and behavioral science discipline.
4. Students will be able to explain the primary ethical issues raised by the practice and findings of the specific social and behavioral science discipline.
5. Students will be able to explain the range of relevant information sources in the specific social and behavioral science discipline.

**Natural Sciences**
Courses designated as natural sciences will provide opportunities for learners to achieve all the following learning outcomes:

1. Students will be able to explain basic terminology, concepts, and methods of modern science.
2. Students will be able to outline how scientific principles are formulated, tested, and either modified or validated.
3. Students will be able to describe or predict natural phenomena using current scientific models and theories.
4. Students will be able to apply scientific methods of inquiry appropriate to a discipline to gather and analyze data and draw evidence-based conclusions.
5. Students will be able to describe how scientific data are reproducible while also having intrinsic variation and possible limitations.
6. Students will be able to solve problems or address issues using foundational knowledge and discipline-specific concepts.
7. Students will be able to communicate how scientific findings contribute to the modern world.
8. Students will be able to evaluate evidence-based scientific arguments in a logical fashion and distinguish between scientific and non-scientific evidence and explanations.

**Natural Science Laboratory Requirement**
Each student must complete at least one natural science course that includes a laboratory component. This component must carry at least one credit hour and involve at least 1,500 minutes of laboratory activities (an average of no less than two hours per week for a traditional 15-week semester). During the course, students will demonstrate the application of the methods and tools of scientific inquiry appropriate to the discipline, by actively and directly collecting, analyzing, and interpreting data, presenting findings, and using information to answer questions.

A natural science course with a laboratory component must meet outcomes 1-8 above and achieve all the following objectives for laboratory activities:

- Involve realistic measurements of physical quantities;
- Involve data analysis, using data that are unique and/or physically authentic and that include random and/or systematic (natural) variability;
- Include realistic interactions with experimental apparatus, and realistic manipulation of tools/instruments and/or observed objects in space and time;
• Involve synchronous feedback on safety (and consequences of unsafe actions), correctness of procedure, and progress toward experimental goals; and
• Involve effective interaction with the instructor at several points during each lab activity

Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI)
Courses designated as Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) will provide opportunities for learners to achieve all the following learning outcomes:

1. Students will be able to describe identity as multifaceted and constituting multiple categories of difference such as race, color, language, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, socio-economic status, and intersectionality as operating by individual and group.
2. Students will be able to describe how cultures (including their own) are shaped by the intersections of a variety of factors such as race, gender, sexuality, class, disability, ethnicity, nationality, and/or other socially constructed categories of difference.
3. Students will be able to recognize the complex elements of cultural biases on a global scale by identifying historic, economic, political, and/or social factors, such as ethnocentrism, colonialism, slavery, democracy, and imperialism.
4. Students will be able to recognize how sociocultural status and access to (or distribution of) resources are informed by cultural practices within historical, social, cultural, and economic systems.

Additionally, courses must meet at least one of the following outcomes:

5. Students will be able to articulate the meaning of empathy and its role in strengthening civic responsibilities and reducing the negative impact of societal stereotypes.
6. Demonstrate empathy by successfully interpreting intercultural experiences from one’s own and others’ worldview.
Appendix D. Core Competencies

CSU’s Core Competencies reflect a university commitment to ensuring all graduates have the essential skills and abilities foundational to a productive and successful life.

Written Communication
Consistent with AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics, Cleveland State University defines written communication as “the development and expression of ideas in writing.” Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

Consistent with the Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) requirements, courses designated as developing written communication abilities will provide opportunities for learners to develop written communication abilities through the following course-embedded learning experiences.

- Learners will develop their understanding of the rhetorical situation as they read and write in several genres.
- Learners will develop their critical thinking skills as they analyze model texts and secondary sources.
- Learners will study all phases of the writing process, thus becoming better revisers and editors of their own work and learning to help peers improve their texts.
- Learners will study genre conventions and apply appropriate conventions to their own work.
- Learners will compose a substantial amount and variety of work in order to demonstrate that they have met the first four outcomes.

Consistent with the ODHE requirements, courses designated as written communication should include the following:

- Written assignments spanning a variety of texts, including at least one researched essay;
- Frequent “low-stakes” assignments, such as journals, reading responses, and in-class efforts;
- A minimum of 5,000 total words of formal, edited text;
- Opportunities for students to revise written work; and
- Frequent, individual feedback from instructors and, as appropriate, peers.

Learning Outcomes
Courses, programs, or learning experiences designated as teaching written communication will provide opportunities for learners to achieve the following six learning outcomes:
1. **Context and purpose.** Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the context and purpose for writing such that the text has the writer’s intended effect on an audience.

2. **Content development.** Students will be able to use appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer’s understanding, and shaping the whole work.

3. **Genre and disciplinary conventions.** Students will be able to use formal and informal rules for particular kinds of texts and/or media that guide formatting, organization, and stylistic choices appropriate for a specific academic field.

4. **Sources and evidence.** Students will be able to use and source texts (written, oral, behavioral, visual, or other) to extend, argue with, develop, define, or shape the writer’s ideas.

5. **Control of syntax and mechanics.** Students will be able to use syntax and mechanics effectively to communicate ideas.

### Oral Communication

Consistent with AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics, CSU defines oral communication as “a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners’ attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors.”

Consistent with the ODHE requirements, students will be provided opportunities to:

- Present speeches that are consistent and appropriate for the purpose, context, and audience.
- Present speeches using effective verbal and nonverbal delivery techniques and appropriate presentational aids.
- Critically and constructively evaluate their own and others’ speeches.

### Learning Outcomes

Courses, programs, or learning experiences designated as teaching oral communication will provide opportunities for learners to achieve the following five learning outcomes.

1. **Organization.** Students will be able to group and sequence ideas and supporting material such that the organization reflects the purpose of the presentation, is cohesive, and accomplishes the goal(s).

2. **Language.** Students will be able to use unbiased vocabulary, terminology, and sentence structure appropriate to the topic and audience.

3. **Delivery.** Students will be able to use posture, gestures, eye contact, and voice to enhance the effectiveness of a presentation and to make the speaker appear polished/confident.

4. **Supporting material.** Students will be able to provide credible, relevant, and convincing information (e.g., explanations, analogies, quotations, statistics, examples, contexts) that supports the principal ideas of the presentation or establishes the presenter’s credibility on the topic.

5. **Central message.** Students will be able to articulate a precise, compelling, and memorable purpose or main point of a presentation.
Quantitative Reasoning
Consistent with AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics, CSU defines quantitative reasoning as “a habit of mind, competency, and comfort in working with numerical data.”

Individuals with strong quantitative reasoning skills possess the ability to reason and solve quantitative problems from a wide array of authentic contexts and everyday life situations. They understand and can create sophisticated arguments supported by quantitative evidence, and they can clearly communicate those arguments in a variety of formats (using words, tables, graphics, mathematical equations, etc., as appropriate).

Courses, programs, or learning experiences designated as teaching quantitative reasoning will provide opportunities for learners to develop quantitative reasoning skills through the following course-embedded learning experiences.

- Learners will evaluate arguments in a logical fashion and develop competence in analysis and logical argument.
- Learners will develop and use the concepts of numeracy to investigate and explain quantitative relationships and solve problems in a variety of contexts.
- Learners will make decisions by analyzing mathematical models, including situations in which the student must recognize and/or make assumptions.
- Learners will use the language and structure appropriate to the subject matter to investigate, represent, make decisions, and draw conclusions.

Learning Outcomes
Courses, programs, or learning experiences designated as teaching quantitative reasoning will provide opportunities for learners to achieve the following six learning outcomes.

1. **Interpretation.** Students will be able to explain information presented in mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words).
2. **Representation.** Students will be able to convert relevant information into various mathematical forms (e.g., equations, graphs, diagrams, tables, words).
3. **Calculation.** Students will be able to calculate relevant information using various mathematical formulas.
4. **Application/Analysis.** Students will be able to make judgments and draw appropriate conclusions based on the quantitative analysis of data while recognizing the limits of this analysis.
5. **Assumptions.** Students will be able to make and evaluate important assumptions in estimation, modeling, and data analysis.
Information Literacy

Consistent with AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics and the ACRL’s Framework for Information Literacy in Higher Education, CSU defines information literacy as the set of integrated abilities and mindsets enabling students to answer questions and solve problems by identifying information needs, discovering information strategically, understanding how information is created and valued, evaluating information critically, participating in conversations as knowledge creators, and using information ethically.

Courses, programs, or learning experiences designated as teaching information literacy will provide opportunities for learners to achieve the following five learning outcomes.

1. Effectively defines the scope of the research question, determining key concepts and perspectives.
2. Selects and utilizes appropriate tools to search for different types of information with a spirit of inquiry and discovery.
3. Strategically searches for information and assesses results, considering the multiple criteria relevant to evaluating the information in context.
4. Organizes, synthesizes, and articulates information from sources to generate new knowledge and/or achieve a specific purpose with clarity and depth.
5. Uses information ethically, providing complete and accurate citations. Paraphrases, summarizes, and quotes sources with fidelity to the original context. Distinguishes between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution. Demonstrates understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

Digital Literacy

CSU defines digital literacy as a habit of mind, competency, and comfort in working with digital technologies.

Individuals who are digitally literate are able to identify which (if any) digital tools are appropriate to a task, proficiently use the appropriate tools for the task, effectively communicate with digital tools, and engage with digital tools safely and ethically.

Learning Outcomes

Courses, programs, and learning experiences designated as teaching digital literacy will provide opportunities for learners to achieve the following six learning outcomes.

1. **Information gathering.** Students will engage with appropriate digital tools and platforms to gather needed information.
2. *Communication and collaboration.* Students will use digital tools to effectively communicate and collaborate with others.

3. *Presentation of work.* Students will be able to use appropriate digital tools to convey information and present work, respecting both disciplinary conventions and conventions of the digital medium.

4. *Safe and ethical use.* Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of safe online practices and ethical and legal use of digital information and technologies.

5. Self-directed learning. Students will demonstrate use of strategies to seek out resources, problem solving, and trouble shoot when learning new digital technologies.

6. Organization. Students will practice using digital tools to bolster good academic and professional habits, and manage their data on personal devices and online.

**Collaboration & Teamwork**

Consistent with AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics, CSU defines collaboration and teamwork as “the behaviors under the control of individual team members (i.e., effort they put into team tasks, their manner of interacting with others on the team, and the quantity and quality of contributions they make to team discussions.)”

Accordingly, courses, programs, or experiences designated as teaching teamwork should include:

- Learners should be required to complete at least one significant project or multiple assignments spanning multiple weeks that involves collaboration in a team.
- Teams should be comprised of a minimum of three (3) members.
- Projects/assignments should be sufficient duration for team dynamics to be experienced.
- Each student’s performance as a team member must be assessed using the CSU modified version of the AAC&U Teamwork VALUE rubric.
• At least 15% of the course grade should depend on some combination of (a) the student’s evaluated performance as a team member and/or (b) the learner’s evaluated learning about principles of successful teamwork.

• A portion of course instruction should be dedicated to (a) effectively managing a team project/assignment (e.g., establishing roles, responsibilities, milestones, and timelines) and (b) developing interpersonal communication skills and cultural awareness to create a collaborative and inclusive team environment.

Learning Outcomes

Courses, programs, or learning experiences designated as teaching collaboration & teamwork will provide opportunities for learners to achieve the following five learning outcomes.

1. **Contributes to team meetings.** Students will be able to contribute ideas, solutions, and courses of action during team meetings.

2. **Engagement with team members.** Students will be able to engage other team members, constructively and respectfully.

3. **Individual contributions.** Students will be able to provide meaningful contributions to the team that advances the work of the group.

4. **Constructive team climate.** Students will be able to foster a constructive team climate.

5. **Conflict management.** Students will be able to manage team conflict.

Ethical Reasoning

Consistent with AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics, CSU defines ethical reasoning as “reasoning about right and wrong human conduct.” This core competency will be assessed in major programs.

Ethical reasoning requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical questions, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students’ ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

Learning Outcomes

Courses, programs, or learning experiences designated as teaching ethical reasoning will provide opportunities for learners to achieve the following five learning outcomes.

1. **Ethical self-awareness.** Students will be able to recognize one’s own ethical core beliefs and how they shape ethical conduct and thinking.

2. **Perspectives/concepts.** Students will be able to understand ethical perspectives, theories, and/or concepts.
3. Ethical issue(s). Students will be able to recognize, evaluate, and connect ethical issues.

4. Application. Students will be able to apply ethical perspectives, theories, or concepts to a decision-making situation.

5. Evaluation. Students will be able to evaluate alternative ethical perspectives within a decision-making situation.

**Intercultural Knowledge and Competence**

Consistent with AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics, CSU defines intercultural knowledge and competence as “a set of cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills and characteristics that support effective and appropriate interaction in a variety of cultural contexts.”

Consistent with ODHE requirements, students will be provided opportunities to:

1. Examine identity as multifaceted and constituting multiple categories of difference such as race, color, language, religion, national origin, gender, sexual orientation, age, socio-economic status, and intersectionality.

2. Investigate how cultures (including their own) are shaped by the intersection of a variety of factors such as race, gender, sexuality, class, disability, ethnicity, nationality, and/or other socially constructed categories of difference.

3. Recognize the complex elements of cultural biases on a global scale by identifying historic, economic, political, and/or social factors, such as ethnocentrism, colonialism, slavery, democracy, and imperialism.

4. Recognize how sociocultural status and access to (or distribution of) resources are informed by cultural practices within historical, social, cultural, and economic systems.

And at least one of the following:

5. Articulate the meaning of empathy and its role in strengthening civic responsibilities and reducing the negative impact of societal stereotypes.

6. Demonstrate empathy by successfully interpreting intercultural experiences from one’s own and others’ worldview.

**Learning Outcomes**

Courses, programs, or learning experiences designated as teaching intercultural knowledge and competence will provide opportunities for learners to achieve the following six learning outcomes.

1. Cultural self-awareness. Students will be able to articulate insights about one’s own cultural rules and biases.
2. *Cultural worldwide frameworks.* Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of the complexity of elements important to members of another culture in relation to its history, values, politics, communication styles, economy, or beliefs and practices.

3. *Empathy.* Students will be able to interpret intercultural experience from their own and others’ worldview and to act in a supportive manner that recognizes the feelings of another cultural group.

4. *Verbal and non-verbal communications.* Students will be able to demonstrate an understanding of cultural differences in verbal and non-verbal communication and to negotiate a shared understanding based on those differences.

5. *Curiosity.* Students will be able to ask complex questions of other cultures and to articulate answers to these questions that reflect multiple cultural perspectives.

6. *Openness.* Students will be able to initiate and develop interactions with culturally different others while suspending judgment in valuing their interactions with culturally different others.

**Critical Thinking**

Consistent with AAC&U’s VALUE rubrics, CSU defines critical thinking as “a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion.”

Consistent with the National Council for Excellence in Critical Thinking, courses programs, or other learning experiences designated as teaching critical thinking will provide opportunities for students to develop critical thinking skills through the process of actively conceptualizing, applying, analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating information. Information can be gathered from external sources, observation, experience, reflection, reasoning, or communication.

**Learning Outcomes**

Courses, programs, or learning experiences designated as teaching critical thinking will provide opportunities for learners to achieve all of the following five learning outcomes.

1. *Explanation of issues.* Students will be able to critically state, describe, and consider an issue or problem.

2. *Evidence.* Students will be able to use information from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis.

3. *Influence of context and assumptions.* Students will be able to systematically and methodically analyze assumptions and carefully evaluate the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.
4. **Student’s position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis).** Students will be able to state a specific position (i.e., perspective, thesis, or hypothesis) that is thoughtful, recognizes complexities, and acknowledges limitations.

5. **Conclusions and related outcomes.** Students will be able to state conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) logically and in a priority order.
Appendix E. Designing for Inquiry

Inquiry & Skills Focus
Part of the aim of this update is to make core curricular courses more interesting to students, and to help them see the value of what they are learning. To do that, all courses in the core curriculum should take an inquiry orientation to course design and instruction. The inquiry orientation is inspired by, not but identical to, inquiry-based learning (IBL), a well-researched high impact approach to education that is used through primary, secondary, and tertiary education. The inquiry orientation of the core curriculum means that courses should be designed around helping students investigate important questions or problems using the content and methods of the discipline, rather than focusing solely on covering content.

Additionally, to ensure students receive ample opportunity to develop their inquiring minds, courses cannot be primarily focused on content coverage.

In practice, this will mean two things: Identifying a ‘course narrative’ that frames why students are learning what they are in terms of some sort of inquiry; and reducing the content of a ‘survey’ or major ‘introductory’ course by about 25% to provide room for the inquiry. Exactly how much (if at all) any given course will need to change along either of these dimensions will vary with the current nature of the course. Many courses are already framed around some sort of inquiry (even if it's implicit) and many already make plenty of room for skill development.

Courses in the CSU Core Curriculum should take an inquiry orientation to their design. This inquiry orientation is inspired by, but not identical to, Inquiry-Based Learning (IBL). More precisely, in line with IBL, the inquiry orientation emphasizes the active involvement of students in exploring and investigating real-world problems and questions.

The inquiry orientation is broadly aimed at promoting student success through sparking student curiosity, engaging them actively in the learning process, and helping them develop higher-order thinking skills. IBL has been shown, at the K-12 and university levels, to provide these and other benefits.

To assist faculty in adopting an inquiry orientation in their core courses, this document outlines the relevant aspects of Inquiry-Based Learning, provides an ‘action plan’ for designing an inquiry-oriented course, and provides a few examples of course design using the action plan.

Aspects of the Inquiry Orientation
At the highest level, Inquiry-based Learning is a form of constructivist learning that aims to spark student curiosity and help them develop higher-order thinking skills and mental architecture needed to be a critical, autonomous thinker. We can see this highest level of IBL in action when we engage students in independent research, for instance in their program capstone. Additionally, we can understand the orientation of IBL by recognizing that it asks faculty to see their students as apprentices and to organize their courses and learning experiences so as to lead the students through the same sort of processes you may take as an expert in the field.
Core courses are not expected to reach this highest level of inquiry, but instead to start students on that pathway through various forms of structured inquiry. This is in line with IBL research that emphasizes the importance of scaffolding inquiry development. To understand the idea of structured inquiry, it is helpful to identify the various steps common to an inquiry process:

1. Identification of a topic of interest
2. Formulation of research question(s)
3. Gathering of resources aimed at investigating and answering the question(s)
4. Analyzing and evaluating the resources
5. Synthesizing information gained to answer, or better understand, the initial question(s)

While the highest level of inquiry, often called open inquiry, would have students engage in all five steps in a largely self-directed manner, structured inquiry involves the instructor in completing, or at least providing significant guidance, in completing some of the steps.

A typical method of scaffolding structured inquiry involves beginning with structure for all five steps, and then removing or reducing the structure for the later steps while maintaining it for the earlier steps. For instance, we may identify an interesting question in our field (steps 1 and 2) that we will help students explore, provide them relevant readings or other materials (step 3), and then provide structured activities that help them complete steps (4) and/or (5). In this form of structured inquiry, students are beginning the process of critical thinking through the active engagement in steps (4) and (5).

Inquiry could then be further scaffolded by, for instance, providing activities that guide students through the gathering of resources for a pre-provided question, followed by additional practice with steps (4) and (5), perhaps with less structure or guidance than previously provided.

To repeat, while we should aim for students to have the ability to engage in open inquiry by the end of their university career, the inquiry orientation of the core curriculum is more modestly aimed at developing their inquiry skills through engaging in structured and semi-structured activities related to steps (4) and (5), and perhaps (3).

**Designing for Inquiry**

Through the Center for Faculty Excellence, resources and workshops will be made available to assist faculty in designing inquiry-oriented courses. Briefly, this consists of the following sorts of steps:

1. Identifying the overarching goal(s) of the course, by answering the question: what should students be able to do by the end of the course. This puts the emphasis on student activity with information, rather than on the presentation on information.
2. Identifying the ancillary skills students will need to be able to achieve the goal(s) of the course. This puts emphasis on the skills that will need to be developed in the course.
3. Choosing the content and topics of the course in the context of the overarching goal(s) and ancillary skills.
4. Identification of the steps of inquiry that will be structured and which will be open to students, keeping in mind that these may be scaffolded throughout the course.
5. Construction of developmental activities and assessments that align with the overarching goal(s) and ancillary skills, and fit with the content and topics chosen

High Impact Practices

Educational research has identified several practices that provide significant educational benefits to the students who participate in them. Additionally, research into High Impact Practices (HIPs) has identified more general features of educational experiences that make the experience high impact.

All core curriculum instructors are encouraged to incorporate high impact practices into their courses, either by making use of the set of identified practices listed below or by designing learning experiences that are in line with the features of high impact practices.

Identified High Impact Practices

The list below is derived from the American Association of Colleges & Universities’ list of High Impact Practices. Those HIPs which apply more at an institutional level (such as common intellectual experiences) have been omitted.11

- Collaborative Assignments and Projects
- ePortfolios
- Writing Intensive
- Undergraduate Research
- Service Learning or Community-based Learning

The Features of High Impact Practices

Research on identified HIPs indicated that they all shared eight key features, which can be used as the basis for designing new high impact practices.12

1. Performance expectations set at appropriately high levels
2. Significant investment of time and effort by students over an extended period of time
3. Interactions with faculty and peers about substantive matters
4. Experiences with diversity, wherein students are exposed to and must contend with people and circumstances that differ from those with which students are familiar
5. Frequent, timely, and constructive feedback
6. Periodic, structured opportunities to reflect and integrate learning
7. Opportunities to discover relevance of learning through real-world applications
8. Public demonstration of competence

11 https://www.aacu.org/trending-topics/high-impact
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Appendix F: Review Process and Core Curriculum Committees

The Core Curricular Review Process
The review and updating of CSU’s general education system was initiated by Faculty Senate in Fall 2022. A committee composed of 11 faculty and 4 ex officio members worked throughout the Spring 2023 semester to review the current system, faculty input, national trends, and other data to produce a set of high-level guiding principles for reform. These principles were accompanied by a variety of potential updates the committee reviewed and considered.

A subset of the committee, composed of seven faculty and four ex officio members, continued the work throughout the summer. This committee participated in a week-long intensive institute on general education reform hosted by the American Association of Colleges & Universities. The committee then leveraged the lessons of that institute, and the action plan they created as part of it, to develop the Inquiry Core Curriculum. Throughout that process, they presented ideas and gained feedback from various stakeholders, including faculty, advisors, students, and employers. The result of the summer work is a robust updating and rebranding of general education at CSU.

An ad-hoc committee of 10 faculty and 6 ex officio members (now including the directors of core curriculum and assessment in the Office of Instructional Excellence) worked through the Fall 2023 semester to bring this revised proposal for the core curriculum to Faculty Senate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ad-Hoc Committee on the Core Curriculum</th>
<th>Summer Sub-Committee</th>
<th>Fall 2023 Ad-Hoc Committee on the Core Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Schultz-Bergin, Arts &amp; Sciences (Arts)</td>
<td>Marcus Schultz-Bergin</td>
<td>Emilie Zickel, Arts &amp; Sciences (Humanities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Chincholkar, Arts &amp; Sciences (Sciences)</td>
<td>Sandra Chincholkar</td>
<td>Anne O'Connor, Arts &amp; Sciences (Sciences)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toni Paoletta, Business</td>
<td>Toni Paoletta</td>
<td>Toni Paoletta, Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karla Hamlen Mansour, Public Affairs &amp; Education</td>
<td>Joanne Belovich</td>
<td>Karla Hamlen Mansour, Public Affairs &amp; Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Belovich, Engineering</td>
<td>Jeffrey Bolt</td>
<td>Joanne Belovich, Engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Stoddard Dare, Health</td>
<td>Dorothy Hamilton</td>
<td>Carol Olszewski, Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Moncrieff, Law</td>
<td>Tatiana Gracyk</td>
<td>Jeffrey Bolt, at large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeffrey Bolt, at large</td>
<td>Ben Richards</td>
<td>Adebimpe Adedipe, at large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Hamilton, at large</td>
<td>Kristy Tokarczyk</td>
<td>Shelley Rose, at large</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Rose, at large</td>
<td>Kevin Neal</td>
<td>Tatiana Gracyk, University Curriculum Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatiana Gracyk, University Curriculum Committee</td>
<td>Debbie Jackson</td>
<td>Ben Richards, Libraries (ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Richards, Libraries (ex officio)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kristy Tokarczyk, Advising (ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristy Tokarczyk, Advising (ex officio)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kevin Neal, Registrar (ex officio)</th>
<th>Debbie Jackson, Vice Provost (ex officio)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Neal, Registrar (ex officio)</td>
<td>Debbie Jackson, Vice Provost (ex officio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Schultz-Bergin,</td>
<td>Director of Core Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Northrop, Director of Assessment (ex officio)</td>
<td>(ex officio)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy on academic misconduct.

(A) Policy.

(1) Academic honesty is essential to maintain the integrity of the university as an institution and to foster an environment conducive to the pursuit of knowledge. The Cleveland State University community values honesty and integrity and holds its members to high standards of ethical conduct. Academic dishonesty is unacceptable, and students who are found to have engaged in academic dishonesty, or knowingly facilitated academic dishonesty by another student, may be sanctioned as outlined in the Procedures for Charges of Academic Misconduct. Academic misconduct refers to any fraudulent actions or behaviors designed to affect the evaluation of a student’s academic performance or record of academic progress. It includes, but is not limited to:

(a) Cheating: using or attempting to use or possessing any aid, information, resources, or means in the completion of any graded course content such as, but not limited to, an academic assignment, quiz, examination, paper, portfolio, project, thesis, dissertation, or assessment (collectively defined as “assessment”) that are not explicitly permitted by the instructor, or facilitating cheating by another student.

Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to:

(i) Possessing, referring to, or using in any way unauthorized textbooks, notes, study aids, websites, crib/cheat sheets, electronic
transmissions, or other information when completing an academic assessment;

(ii) Possessing, referring to, giving, or using in any way unauthorized electronic devices, transmissions or other materials when completing an academic assessment;

(iii) Looking at, using, or obtaining unauthorized information from another individual’s work when completing an academic assessment;

(iv) Giving or receiving answers, information, or materials from another individual when completing any academic assessment when not explicitly permitted by the instructor;

(v) Utilizing or soliciting another person or entity to complete any portion of an academic assessment in place of the student or submitting the work of another person or entity as the student’s own;

(vi) Submitting the identical or substantially the same assessment or portions of an assessment to fulfill the requirements for two or more courses without approval of both instructors involved, including when repeating a course; or submitting the identical or substantially the same assessment or portions of an assessment from a previously completed course to fulfill the requirements for another course without the approval of the instructor of the latter course; or submitting the identical or substantially the same assessment or portions of the assessment to fulfill the requirements for two or more academic assessments within a course without the approval of the instructor;
(vii) Completing or participating in the completion of any portion of an academic assessment for another student to submit as his or her own work, including taking a quiz or an examination for another student, or writing any portion of an essay, paper, thesis, project, or dissertation for another student for submission in person or submitting to an online learning management system;

(viii) Providing answers, information, or materials to another student in a manner not authorized by the instructor, including providing the student’s own completed coursework.

(b) Plagiarism: presenting as one’s own the work, the ideas, the representations, or the words of another person, or source, or generative artificial intelligence tool, such as ChatGPT or other Large Language Models, without proper attribution. Examples of plagiarism include, but are not limited to:

(i) Submitting material that in part or whole is not entirely one’s own work without accurate and appropriate citations and attribution (including appropriate use of quotation marks);

(ii) Using the words, ideas, or structure/sequence of another person or source without accurate and appropriate citation and attribution (including the appropriate use of quotation marks);

(iii) Too closely paraphrasing by the wholesale reproduction of the structure and ideas of the original text, but merely changing some of the wording.
(iv) Submitting material using translation software/devices without permission from the instructor.

(c) Fabrication: falsification, invention, or manipulation of any information, citation, data, or method. Examples of fabrication include, but are not limited to:

(i) Changing material on a graded academic assessment after it has been returned to the student by the instructor and then requesting the instructor to re-grade that assessment, without specific instruction from the instructor to do that;

(ii) Presenting false or invented information as fact in any academic assessment;

(iii) Presenting false claims or an inaccurate account regarding how information or data was collected or generated;

(iv) Inventing, inaccurately presenting, or manipulating data and/or its outcomes;

(v) Inventing or inaccurately presenting citations or sources.

(vi) Changing or manipulating, or attempting to change or manipulate, the grade for any assessment in any grade recording system. Misrepresenting, or attempting to misrepresent, a grade to any campus person or entity.

(vii) Changing, manipulating or misrepresenting the course grade or course information on an official or unofficial document for review by a university official.

(d) Unauthorized collaboration: working with another individual or individuals in any phase of or in the completion of an individual academic assessment
without explicit permission from the instructor to complete the work in such a manner.

(e) Sharing CSU credentials with another person to login to an online learning management system.

(f) Misrepresentation: falsely representing oneself or one’s efforts or abilities in an academic assessment. Examples of misrepresentation include, but are not limited to:

(i) Utilizing another person to complete any portion of an academic assessment in place of one’s self;

(ii) Having another individual sign-in to indicate attendance for a course or use an electronic device to record one’s presence or participation in a class.

(iii) Signing another student’s name or using an electronic device to record another’s presence or participation in a class or on an academic assessment;

(iv) Having another person or entity sign-in to the electronic learning management system on behalf of a current student.

(vi) Including one’s own name on a group project, allowing one’s name to be included when one did not contribute to the work, or claiming credit for work completed by another group member;

(vii) Including unacknowledged sources or citations in an academic assessment.

(viii) Using generative artificial intelligence (AI), such as ChatGPT or other Large Language Models (LLMs), on assessments without the express permission of the instructor, or in a manner
inconsistent with the directions of your instructor. Further, using work generated by AI platforms such as ChatGPT or other LLMs, and submitting that work as your own without proper attribution is plagiarism.

(g) Gaining an unfair advantage: completing an academic assessment through use of information or means not available to other students or engaging in any activity that interferes with another student’s ability to complete his or her academic work. Examples of gaining an unfair advantage include, but are not limited to:

(i) Retaining, possessing, using, distributing or making public previous or current academic assessment materials when the instructor has indicated that those materials are not to be retained or shared or are to be returned to the instructor at the conclusion of the academic assessment or course (including originals, copies, reproductions, pictures and electronic or hard copy formats, or uploading to websites or providing for sale);

(ii) Taking pictures of, making copies of, or reproducing any academic assignment materials when the instructor has indicated that those materials are not to be copied or reproduced in any form;

(iii) Obstructing or interfering with another student’s academic work or ability to gain access to information to be used in the completion of an academic assessment;

(iv) Taking or using another student’s work without his or her knowledge;
(v) Removing or tampering with academic assessment materials from an instructor’s office, classroom, computer, or any other University space (physical or virtual/electronic);

(vi) Violating the procedures intended to maintain the integrity of an academic assessment, including any procedures associated with online proctoring.

(vii) Using an electronic device in any capacity for any purpose when the assessment instructions strictly prohibit its use.

(h) Bribery: Offering money or any item or service to a faculty member or any other person to gain academic advantage for oneself or another.

(2) Attempts to engage in any of the above actions will be treated the same as completed acts.

(3) Students may be held responsible for committing academic dishonesty while enrolled in a course even if the student has withdrawn from, or subsequently withdraws from the course.

(4) Students may be held responsible for committing academic misconduct at any point evidence of academic misconduct comes to light. This includes after a course is completed and a grade has been received, and/or after a student graduates. If a student no longer meets the degree requirements because of a sanction imposed as a result of academic misconduct, the degree will be rescinded.

(5) For purposes referenced below all of the above shall fall under the heading of “academic misconduct.”

(6) For the purpose of differentiating the degree of seriousness of acts of academic misconduct and the sanctions that should
be imposed, the following definitions apply:

(a) “Minor Infraction” – Minor infractions are instances of academic misconduct on an individual assessment which comprises less than twenty per cent of the overall course grade. Two or more instances of minor infractions within a course or across courses constitute a major infraction.

(b) “Major infraction” - Major are instances of academic misconduct on an individual class assessment which comprises twenty per cent or more of the overall course grade. Two or more instances of minor infractions within a course or across courses constitute a major infraction. The second minor infraction will result in a major infraction in the second course if both minor infractions did not happen in the same course.

(c) “Program infraction” – Program infractions comprise those instances of cheating which affect the integrity of the student’s degree program. Examples include, but are not limited to, committing academic misconduct on capstone projects, theses, dissertations, portfolios, clinical activities, internships, and externships, or committing academic misconduct in more than one course essential to degree program completion. Other examples include falsifying documents or providing doctored transcripts.

(7) Any member of the university community can raise allegations of academic misconduct. Generally, the determination that a student has engaged in academic misconduct, will be made following investigation by the faculty member or instructor,
although, depending on the circumstances, that determination
may be made following investigation by the department
chairperson or college, dean or provost’s designee in
accordance with the circumstances.

(B) The policy on academic misconduct is implemented by the
procedures on academic misconduct, which are promulgated by the
provost, after appropriate notice to the university community.

(C) Any question of interpretation or application of the policy on
academic misconduct shall be referred to the provost for final
determination.

Policy Name: Policy on academic misconduct.
Policy Number: 3344-21-02
Board Approved: 07/21/2020
Effective:
SEI Spring Pilots

Based on the surveys we conducted last semester, response rate is one of the largest concerns with the validity of the SEI. To better understand the impact of different strategies to improve response rate, we propose to conduct three pilots with a limited set of courses:

1. Reminders to the students by text (on top of the email reminders).
2. Reserving in-class time to fill out the survey.
3. Clear messages on Blackboard to ensure students can find the survey.