

The Faculty Development Program

The Faculty Development Program supports faculty at Santa Clara University as teaching scholars. Programs and services promote two general goals:

- To enhance the professional development of Santa Clara University faculty.
- To explore how students learn and to support faculty in cultivating student learning.

Diane Jonte-Pace
Associate Vice Provost
for Faculty Development

Phone: 408-554-4751
Email: djontepace@scu.edu
Office: Bannan Hall 338

Dorothea French
Interim Associate Vice Provost for
Faculty Development, Fall 2004

Phone: 408-554-4529
Email: dfrench@scu.edu
Office: St. Joseph's Hall 324

Laurene Skinner
Assistant

Phone: 408-554-2746
Email: lskinner@scu.edu

Advisory Council

June Carbone Law
Diane Dreher English
Dale Larson Counseling Psychology
Dennis Moberg Management
Tim Urdan Psychology
Aleksandar Zecevic Electrical Engineering

In This Issue

- **Scholarship at SCU**
- **Encouraging Integrity**
- **Quick and Easy Rubrics**
- **SCU's Course Evaluation Forms**

Scholarship at SCU

In the Spring 2004 issue of *The Teaching Scholar*, in an article entitled "Why Foster Faculty Scholarship," Shelby McIntyre defined "top journal publication" as the essence of the scholarly career and defended the wisdom of the "publish or perish" policy. In this issue, Nancy Unger, chair of the Research Committee, responds to Shelby's remarks.

Support or Commitment? Resources for Faculty Scholarship Nancy Unger, History, Environmental Studies, and the Program for the Study of Women and Gender

In answering the question "Why Foster Faculty Scholarship?" Shelby McIntyre concludes that Santa Clara University faculty must "Publish or Perish." Few would disagree. The real challenge facing our faculty is not whether to publish, but where to find the time, energy, and resources to meet rapidly escalating research expectations.

Our prolific colleagues at major research universities, whom Shelby urges us to emulate, are not necessarily more ambitious or better scholars. Their scholarship, however, is aggressively fostered. They receive greater funding, more generous leave policies, and, especially, substantially reduced teaching loads. They also reap the benefits of grading and research assistance from graduate students, fewer advising demands, and reduced expectations that they will be available to undergraduate students.

Producing high quality scholarship alongside high quality teaching, advising, and service, requires more than institutional *support*. If support is defined as sincere verbal delight about faculty productiveness, as one of my colleagues recently suggested, the faculty of Santa Clara University will need not only support but also *commitment*. Commitment can be defined, especially but not exclusively, in terms of two of our most meaningful resources: time

and money.

If faculty scholarship is genuinely to be fostered, the university's *commitment* to excellence in scholarship, as well as excellence in teaching, advising, and service, must keep pace with the demands it makes in these areas. Certainly SCU is making strides in committing more resources to support research. Important improvements and innovations include the faculty development program, an enhanced sabbatical policy, junior faculty development leaves, flexible course scheduling, internal research grants, and assistance in seeking external funding. However, additional material resources and creative flexibility are required if we are to meet escalating research demands.

The question of *why* faculty scholarship must be fostered has been answered. Shelby's article represents an articulate answer to that question. Answering the greater, and far more pressing question of *how* to foster that scholarship in a climate of increasing demands and decreasing resources is more difficult. It is a challenge for the entire university community, one that requires cooperation, innovation, and the recognition that lofty goals are achieved through practical solutions. The Research Committee invites your thoughts on this important question.

Services and Programs

Teaching Support

- Confidential Classroom Visits
- Open Classrooms with the "Faculty Development Professor"

Research Support: Grants

- Internal University Grants
- Faculty Student Research Assistant Program

Groups and Teams

- Mentoring teams or partnerships for tenure track faculty
- Grant writing groups and research writing groups

Resources

- Website: www.scu.edu/facultydevelopment
- Small resource library of books, videotapes, and articles

Programs

- Pedagogy in Perspective brown bag discussions
- Teaching Scholar Symposia
- Research Colloquia
- New Faculty Orientation, Workshops, and Retreat (with the Directors of New Faculty Orientation and the Bannan Center)

Encouraging Integrity: Strategies and Practices for Discouraging Academic Dishonesty

Rich Barber, Phyllis Brown, Laurie Millar, and Lisa Millora, 2003-2004 Academic Integrity Task Force

In a 1997 survey of 300 Santa Clara University students enrolled in core curriculum classes, 83% admitted to some form of cheating (*Making the Grade: Cheating at Santa Clara University*, Senior Thesis of Dana Brutoco and Maurissa Genereux). Only 2 had been caught. The three most common forms of cheating were "copying work outside of class, engaging peers to complete assignments, and plagiarizing material." Typical reasons for cheating included "insufficient study, high grades needed for jobs or graduate schools, and family pressure." A 1980 Academic Integrity Committee Report found an even higher percentage (88%). Perhaps even more disturbing: the 1980 study found that most faculty (91%) estimated the number of cheating students at ten percent.

A better understanding of the realities of cheating may be essential as we work toward SCU's mission of educating tomorrow's leaders. Some faculty may believe that cheating is not a problem, or that covering more course material is more important than taking time to emphasize academic honesty. But the high incidence of cheating suggests that many students are not actually learning. What can we do? The Academic Integrity Task force offers the following suggestions:

Familiarize yourself with the Academic Integrity Protocols. A university protocol and flowchart, written by the Academic Integrity Task force and approved by the Provost in 2004, specify appropriate faculty responses to aca-

demically dishonesty. They can be accessed through the Provost's website and the Office of Student Life website. See insert for flowchart.

Communicate Expectations. Students may arrive at the university without an understanding of why academic integrity is important or what academic dishonesty is. Teach them! Include a statement on academic integrity on your syllabus and specify the consequences for violations. Define academic integrity in general terms and explain what it looks like in your course. Be specific: is it misrepresenting or fabricating data? borrowing words or ideas without appropriate citation? turning in someone else's work? Draw attention to complexities: when is it acceptable to work with a partner, and when is it not? When should work be shared? What are the guidelines for working in groups? Explain to students why it's important that they take an active role in dissuading others from academic dishonesty. Mention academic integrity more than once. Be sure to let students know you care. Silence can be misunderstood as acceptance or even consent.

Open Your Door. During Summer Orientation, incoming freshmen spend a session talking about academic integrity and are encouraged, when in doubt, to ask professors for clarification (and, in some cases, to request extensions). Let your students know that you are open to their questions and concerns.

Support an Integrated Approach to

Academic Dishonesty. If you suspect cheating, talk to the student. Follow up by notifying the department chair and the Office of Student Life. This reinforces the value of academic integrity and makes possible the identification and education of students who repeatedly engage in acts of academic dishonesty.

Provide Opportunities for Students to Communicate Concerns. Despite your best efforts to educate for academic integrity, students face another challenge when they become aware that their peers are cheating. Some students are hesitant to confront their peers. Inviting students to discuss suspicions or concerns with you privately may allow students to better respond to difficult situations.

Take Advantage of Resources. A plagiarism-prevention web-tool, Turnitin.com, is available through the Office of Student Life. Google.com can be used to check for undocumented borrowing from the internet. The Undergraduate Bulletin contains a succinct statement on academic honesty, and the Community Handbook contains the Statement of Community Values and the Student Conduct Code. A copy of the Academic Integrity Binder provided by the Office of Student Life is in every department.

Prevent Plagiarism by Developing Meaningful Assignments. The Faculty Development website contains an article

Schedule of Events 2004-2005

	Fall Quarter	Winter Quarter	Spring Quarter
Pedagogy In Perspective Lunchtime discussions of teaching and learning 12:00-1:00	Grading More Efficiently: Using Rubrics to Clarify Expectations and Save Time Leilani Miller, Linda Garber, Tim Healy Thursday, October 14 Transamerica Room St. Joseph's Hall	Using Faculty Evaluations to Improve Teaching Wednesday, January 19 Wiegand Room	The Brain, the Mind, and How Learning Happens Tuesday, April 19 Wiegand Room
Teaching Scholar Symposia A series of symposia on professional development 3:45-5:00	Planning Ahead for Productive Sabbaticals Tuesday, October 26 Wiegand Room	Publishing Your Book with a University Press: Advice from SCU Scholars Tuesday, February 1 Wiegand Room	On-line, Hybrid, and Traditional Pedagogies: Does Technology Help Students Learn? Tuesday, April 26 Wiegand Room
Research Colloquia Conversations with SCU faculty about their current research 12:00-1:00	Data, Theory, and Text: Research Methods, Obstacles, and Successes Wednesday, November 10 Wiegand Room	Data, Theory, and Text: Research Methods, Obstacles, and Successes Tuesday, February 15 Wiegand Room	Data, Theory, and Text: Research Methods, Obstacles, and Successes Wednesday, May 11 Transamerica Room St. Joseph's Hall

Quick and Easy Rubrics *Leilani Miller, Biology Department*

I never thought I would look forward to grading oral presentations, but this Spring I discovered a free web tool, RubiStar (www.rubistar.4teachers.org). With RubiStar I created a rubric that made the grading process easier, more consistent, and almost fun! A grading rubric is an individualized scoring tool that specifies criteria and levels of performance. Here's a portion of a rubric evaluating "organization" in oral presentations:

Level 4--presentation is extremely well-organized, ideas are always presented clearly, and a clear "story" is always apparent.

Level 3--presentation is fairly well-

organized, ideas are usually presented clearly, and a clear "story" is usually apparent.

Level 2--presentation is not well-organized, ideas are sometimes presented unclearly, and a clear "story" is sometimes apparent.

Level 1--presentation is very poorly organized, ideas are usually presented unclearly, and a clear "story" is rarely apparent.

The RubiStar website generates similar grading levels for the evaluation of content, style, use of media, mechanics, etc. Rubrics can be distributed in advance so that students understand the grading system. Most of the students in

my class appreciated this foreknowledge and said the rubric helped them create and give better presentations.

With its customizable templates RubiStar makes the creation of a rubric simple. Faculty can use the generic rubrics or modify the templates to serve specific course needs. Rubrics can be downloaded to your own computer or saved online for one year. The website offers several categories to choose from: Oral Projects, Multimedia, Math, Research and Writing, Art, Sciences, Music, etc. Each category contains a number of templates, ranging from "Stage Design" in the Art category to "Lab Report" in the Science category. Rubrics are especially useful for evalu-

SCU's Course Evaluation Forms: Do They Help Us Teach Better?

Diane Jonte-Pace, Associate Vice Provost for Faculty Development

Do our course evaluation forms ask the right questions? Do they help us promote student learning? Do they provide useful information for department chairs needing to make personnel decisions and offer timely pedagogical advice? In the Winter quarter of 2004 the Faculty Senate President convened a group of faculty to discuss our current course evaluation forms and to consider possible alternatives.

Santa Clara University currently uses two different course evaluation systems. The Leavey School of Business developed a questionnaire in the nineties. The rest of the university uses a form developed on campus in the mid-seventies. (See www.scu/evaluations/ for examples of both forms.) Last Winter, after careful research into the literature on course evaluations and broad consultation with faculty at other universities, the ad hoc "evaluation re-evaluation" group selected two widely used models for a small pilot project: the IDEA (Individual Development and Educational Assessment) system and the SALG (Student Assessment of Learning Gains) system.*

I volunteered, along with about a dozen others, to participate in the pilot project. I opted to use the IDEA system (along

with the University's standard evaluation form) for my Spring quarter course. I found IDEA superior to the SCU evaluation form: not only did it help me clarify and articulate my goals for the course, but it also gave me specific information at the end of the quarter about what had worked well and what hadn't. According to the IDEA report, strengths to retain in my pedagogy included "finding ways to help students answer their own questions," "introducing stimulating ideas about the subject," and "giving assignments that require original or creative thinking." I should work harder, however, to "relate course material to real life situations" and "give tests that cover the most important points of the course." I haven't had the opportunity yet to try the SALG system, which offers more flexibility and a greater focus on student learning, but I will: the pilot program continues this year.

SCU faculty are invited to participate in these conversations and in the on-going pilot program. If you're interested, please contact John Hawley, Faculty Senate President, or Stephen Carroll, Lecturer in the English Department, who has agreed to supervise the pilot. We hope to have a webpage on the Faculty Senate website shortly. And the Faculty Development

Program will sponsor a lunchtime discussion of these issues during the Winter quarter. We encourage you to join us for a serious conversation about how course evaluations can enhance teaching and learning.

**IDEA was developed at Kansas State University several years ago and is used by more than 200 universities; SALG was developed recently by a branch of the American Association of Colleges and Universities, with support from the NSF.*

Open Classrooms

We are delighted to announce that Phil Kesten, Chair of the Physics Department, will serve as the the Faculty Development Professor for 2004-05. Well known for his skills in lecturing clearly, leading good discussions, and creating environments where deep learning can occur, Phil invites SCU faculty from any department to visit his classes (with advance notice, please). Visitors are welcome to schedule coffee and conversation with Phil afterwards.

Integrity, continued

with suggestions for constructing plagiarism-proof assignments. For other valuable resources, see "Avoiding Plagiarism," <http://sja.ucdavis.edu/avoid.htm>, and "Anti-Plagiarism Strategies for Research Papers" www.virtualsalt.com/antiplag.htm

Don't give up. Be aware of the reality of student cheating documented by the 1997 and 1980 surveys. Talk to colleagues and students about how to cultivate significant changes in the campus climate. Working together we can create a campus culture that truly values academic integrity.

Rubrics, continued

ating project-based learning, which is sometimes difficult to measure, but they can be used for traditional assignments as well. (See insert for a sample from another source.)

We've all been hearing a lot about the "A" word - Assessment - recently. Many of us have had to grapple with how to assess our departments and programs. This is not a trivial process: achievement of learning objectives is difficult to evaluate objectively. We may find that rubrics are valuable in the program review process we've initiated: one feature on RubiStar allows you to create your own rubric *de novo*.

Rubrics are easy to create and easy to use. Using RubiStar this Spring I was able to explain assignments more clearly and grade them more efficiently. And my students produced better work. Go check it out!