CALL TO ORDER
President Dennis Ahlburg called the meeting to order and offered some brief remarks on the following topics:

- In an effort to address declining enrollments, Trinity has moved the Office of Admissions and Financial Aid from lower to upper campus.
- The responsibilities of Vice President Charles White have been expanded to include communications and marketing. The University is in the process of revamping its website and expanding its advertising presence in key markets.
- Trinity is prepared to face the future with a new strategic plan – which emphasizes, among other things, experiential learning and the integration of curricular and co-curricular activities – and a newly proposed curriculum.
- In response to aggressive price competition, the University will need to discount tuition more heavily than it has done in the past.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR FACULTY AND STUDENT AFFAIRS MICHAEL FISCHER
Vice President for Faculty and Student Affairs Michael Fischer continued the meeting as chair. Vice President Fischer offered some brief remarks on the following topics:

- The *Trinity Tomorrow* strategic plan was approved by the Board of Trustees in May, along with an estimated budget and sample metrics. The next step is to conceptualize implementation of specific action steps.
- After constituting the School of Business over the summer, the University will undertake a holistic review of its administrative structure in the coming months.
- If the proposed curriculum receives final approval, Trinity will submit a $1.2 million grant proposal to the Mellon Foundation in order to support the implementation of the new curriculum.
- During the 2013-14 academic year, the Collaborative for Learning and Teaching will sponsor a High Noon luncheon series, a discussion group focusing on “flipped” classrooms, and early career faculty luncheons.

ELECTION OF SECRETARY OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY ASSEMBLY
Associate Vice President Duane Coltharp was elected by acclamation as Secretary of the Academic Faculty Assembly.

ELECTION OF PARLIAMENTARIAN OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY ASSEMBLY
Professor Benjamin Harris was elected by acclamation as Parliamentarian of the Academic Faculty Assembly.
APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF MAY 7, 2013
It was moved and seconded to approve the Minutes of the Academic Faculty Assembly of May 7, 2013. The motion carried.

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE
Professor Jennifer Mathews, Chair of the Faculty Senate, reviewed the Faculty Senate’s achievements from the 2012-13 academic year. Professor Mathews noted that the Senate in 2013-14 plans to address a number of issues including junior faculty leaves, faculty-run assemblies, and faculty morale.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COUNCIL
Professor Kimberlyn Montford, Chair of the University Curriculum Council, reported that the UCC has constituted a number of working groups and charged these groups with the task of developing implementation guidelines for the proposed curriculum. The UCC hopes to bring the final curricular proposal for a vote at the December 12 meeting of the Academic Faculty Assembly.

Professor Montford also noted that the UCC has been asked to review the credit hour policy that was approved at the May 3 meeting of the Academic Faculty Assembly.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW FACULTY AND CONTRACT STAFF

Student Affairs
Kate Polivka, Assistant Director of Campus & Community Involvement
Rachel Boaz, Residential Life Coordinator
Becka Bovio, Coordinator for Student Programs
Margaret Frindell, Student Nurse
Catherine Morell-Nickle, Coordinator of Disability Services for Students

Alumni Relations and Development
Amy New, Assistant Vice President for Alumni Relations and Development
Sarah Kate Strickland, Associate Director of Targeted Marketing
Hector Luna, Associate Director of Reunion Giving

Finance and Administration
Lori Logan, Controller
David Peña-Alfaro, Senior Financial Analyst
Jeff Bledsoe, Associate Controller

Conferences and Special Programs
Justin Michaelson, Conference and Sports Camp Coordinator

Information Technology Services
Art de los Santos, Assistant Director of Information Technology Services
Sandy Givens, Systems Programmer, Senior Level
External Relations
Josh Moczygemba, Sports Information Coordinator
Jeanna Goodrich, Web Producer

Collaborative for Learning and Teaching
Emily Gravett, Assistant Director of Programs

Coates Library
Lanette Garza, E-Content Analysis and Assessment Librarian

Admissions
Gail Roberson, Director of Houston Recruitment
Keith Stanford, Director of California Recruitment
Jeremy Boyce, Coordinator for Athletic Recruitment
Morgan Jackson, Admissions Counselor
Catherine Lepie, Admissions Counselor

Center for the Sciences and Innovation
Les Bleamaster, Science Facilities Manager

Biology
Alex Martinez, Visiting Assistant Professor

Classical Studies
Jared Hudson, Visiting Assistant Professor
Lisa Whitlatch, Visiting Assistant Professor

Communication
J. J. Lopez, Station Manager, KRTU
Matt Stieb, Operations Manager, KRTU
Josie Liu, Assistant Professor

Computer Science
Lisa Bender, Visiting Assistant Professor

Entrepreneurship
Luis Martinez, Director of Entrepreneurship

History
Jason Johnson, Assistant Professor

Human Communication and Theatre
Amanda Zuckman, Coordinator of Theatre Arts
Sarah Martin, Assistant Professor
Rachel Joseph, Assistant Professor
Philosophy
Rachel Johnson, Assistant Professor

Physics and Astronomy
Niescja Turner, Charles A. Zilker Professor of Physics and Astronomy

Political Science
Rosa Aloisi, Assistant Professor
Keesha Middlemass, Assistant Professor

Psychology
Lisa Kilpela, Postdoctoral Assistant
Nishad Jabeen, Visiting Assistant Professor

Sociology and Anthropology
Sarah Beth Kaufman, Assistant Professor

ADJOURNMENT
Vice President Fischer invited faculty and staff members to attend the President’s reception immediately following the meeting of the Academic Faculty Assembly in the foyer of the Dicke/Smith Art and Music Building.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:58 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Duane Coltharp
Secretary of the Academic Faculty Assembly
CALL TO ORDER
President Dennis Ahlburg called the meeting to order and offered some brief remarks on the following topics:

- The Office of Admissions has been relocated to Northrup Hall in an attempt to make the office more accessible to prospective students and their families. The completion of the Center for the Sciences and Innovation should also enhance the University’s efforts to recruit prospective students.
- The redesigned University website is scheduled to go “live” on November 8, 2013. Other marketing efforts, including the purchase of a billboard on U.S. Highway 281, are in progress.
- The Board of Trustees has chosen to delay the Capital Campaign so that the University can concentrate its efforts on recruiting the next entering class.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR FACULTY AND STUDENT AFFAIRS MICHAEL FISCHER
Vice President for Faculty and Student Affairs Michael Fischer continued the meeting as Chair.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE ACADEMIC FACULTY ASSEMBLY OF AUGUST 22, 2013
A motion was made and seconded to approve the Minutes of the Academic Faculty Assembly of August 22, 2013. The motion carried.

REPORT FROM THE FACULTY SENATE
Professor Jennifer Mathews, Chair of the Faculty Senate, reported that the leadership of the Faculty Senate continues to share various faculty concerns in meetings with the leadership of the Board of Trustees. Professor Mathews also noted Professor Adam Urbach will assume the role of Chair of the Faculty Senate in January 2014.

Professor Mathews then presented a motion to revise the Academic Honor Code (*Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook*, Chapter 6K). The motion carried.

REPORT FROM THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COUNCIL
Professor Kimberlyn Montford, Chair of the University Curriculum Council, reported on the progress of curricular revision. Professor Montford noted that various curricular working groups have drafted guidelines that are intended to assist the UCC and the faculty at large in implementing the proposed curriculum. The UCC, in consultation with the membership of the Coordinating Committee for Curricular Review, will continue to edit the curricular guidelines in preparation for a final vote on the proposed curriculum.
Professor Montford then presented a motion to revise the credit hour policy (Courses of Study Bulletin, “Academic Regulations”; Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook, Chapter 2B, Article IV).

A motion was made and seconded to amend the motion to revise the credit hour policy, as follows (additions highlighted, deletions struck through):

**Credit Hour**

One credit hour represents a minimum of three hours of student academic work per week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester, or an equivalent amount of student academic work distributed over a different time period. Student academic work may include lectures, seminars, tutorials, applied and studio instruction, laboratories, supervised fieldwork, as well as reading, writing, homework, research, community-engaged experiences, practica, rehearsals, and performances. Typically, the three hours of student academic work must include a minimum of 50-minutes of faculty contact time. Faculty contact time consists of lectures, seminars, tutorials, applied and studio instruction, laboratories, fieldwork, research, community engaged experiences, practica, rehearsals, or writing labs. Student academic work will consist of some combination of faculty contact time, independent reading, writing, homework, research, community-engaged experiences, practica, rehearsals, or performances.

It is understood that academic credit is often given for activities that do not conform to typical course offerings. Examples include independent study, private music lessons, faculty directed research activities, internships, and honors theses. For these activities the amount of student academic work may be greater than three hours per one credit hour and the amount of faculty time may be less than the typical 50 minute expectation per credit hour.

The nature of the three hours of expected academic work and the way in which that work will be evaluated by faculty will be documented in proposals to the University Curriculum Council for new or revised courses, and will be included in all course syllabi.

A motion was made and seconded to specify that voting on the amendment would be carried out by paper ballots. The motion carried.

A motion was made and seconded to call the previous question. The motion carried.

The motion to amend the motion concerning credit hours was defeated, with 43 votes for the motion and 92 against.

A motion was made and seconded to postpone consideration of the main motion until the December 12 meeting of the Academic Faculty Assembly. The motion was defeated.

A motion was made and seconded to call the previous question. The motion carried.
A motion was made and seconded to specify that voting on the credit hour motion would be carried out by paper ballots. The motion carried.

The motion to revise the credit hour policy was adopted, with 79 votes in favor of the motion and 39 votes against.

**ADJOURNMENT**
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Duane Coltharp
Secretary of the Academic Faculty Assembly
APPENDIX

Here follow the motions that were presented at the meeting of the Academic Faculty Assembly on October 25, 2013.
ELECTION OF HONOR COUNCIL CHAIRS PROPOSAL

This proposal concerns the eligibility of graduating members of the Honor Council to vote in the election of the two Honor Council chairs, the external chair and the internal chair. This proposal would require a revision of the Honor Code section III. B. 2. b. (“Composition and responsibilities”), sub-section 1). The proposal involves one minor editorial change and one substantive change.

[Changes to the current Honor Code text below are in blue font.]

b. Composition and responsibilities

1) The Academic Honor Council includes two officer positions: the external chair and the internal chair. Both chairs require at least one year of Academic Honor Council experience and are elected from within and by the Council members. They will be elected late in the spring semester by the returning and graduating members of the Academic Honor Council.

[Rationale: The first change is merely editorial, for the sake of clarity. The second, substantive change, inserting the phrase, “and graduating,” will allow graduating as well as returning members of the Honor Council to vote in elections. Graduating members, one or two of whom often are themselves chairs, usually have the greatest experience and know the most both about the workings of the Council and the capabilities of individual members. Past graduates and current members have all desired that graduating members be allowed to participate in elections.]
APPEALS PROCESS PROPOSAL

This proposal is aimed primarily at streamlining the current and often cumbersome appeals process. This proposal would require a revision of the Honor Code section III. F., subsections 2, 3, and 4. The whole of section III. F. (without the bylaws as they appear in the integrated Honor Code document available on the Academic Affairs website) is given below for context and ease of understanding the proposed changes. (The relevant bylaws affected by this proposal will be revised if and when the proposal is approved.) The proposal involves some minor editorial changes and several substantive changes.

[Changes, deletions, and additions to the current Honor Code text below are indicated in blue font. Rationales are not provided for simple editorial changes.]

F. Procedures for Appealing a Decision

1. Philosophical Premises for the Appeals Process
   a. An appeal must have merit and must be sufficiently justified.
   b. The appeals process shall be operated by students in keeping with every other aspect of administration of the Academic Honor Code. An Academic Honor Council faculty advisor shall again be present in order to ensure due process.

2. Basis for Appeal of an Academic Honor Council Decision
   a. After the judgment of the Academic Honor Council has been rendered, the accused student or the professor of the course in which the violation occurred may appeal on the following grounds:
      1) The Academic Honor Council procedure was improperly followed during the adjudication process, warranting an appeal for a rehearing.
      2) New evidence relevant to the case comes to light, warranting an appeal for a rehearing.
      3) The faculty member responsible for the course at issue appeals on the grounds that the sanction is inappropriate, warranting an appeal to amend the sanction.
      [Rationale: The above changes are added for clarity.]
   b. The letter of appeal shall include the basis for appeal, substantiation of such assertions, and the names of any pertinent witnesses.

3. Composition
   a. The Appeals Board shall be made up of seven (7) members of the Academic Honor Council selected by the internal chair.
   b. Among these seven (7) members, there shall be one of the three (3) original hearing members (one who voted with the majority) in order to offer insight into the rationale for the original decision without having sufficient power to uphold that decision should the majority of the Appeals Board disagree with it.

4. Procedures for Appeal Process
   a. Professors, other complainants, or accused students who wish to appeal the Academic Honor Council’s decision shall submit their request in writing to the external chair within five (5) class days following receipt of the Academic Honor Council's opinion or the discovery of new information.
   b. Any sanctions imposed by the Academic Honor Council shall be delayed during the appeals process.
   c. In cases of appeals for a rehearing to reconsider a finding of “Responsible” or “Not Responsible,” a majority of four (4) members of the Appeals Board must concur on the viability of the basis for appeal in order for the Council to rehear a case. In this event, the case shall be reheard as soon as possible.
Rationale: This subsection of the current Honor Code mandates that an Appeal for Rehearing occurs in two steps: an initial review of the grounds for appeal followed by a rehearing. Eliminating the first step and proceeding directly to a rehearing will increase expediency and help to eliminate confusion on the part of those making an appeal. Such confusion happens in the majority of cases, since often appellants do not realize they have to make a fully convincing case during the initial review, thinking that detailed evidence or arguments can wait until the actual rehearing. Furthermore, in the past, as the Appeals Board reviewed a petition for a rehearing, the Board discussed the conditions of the case in great depth, rendering the later rehearing redundant. There is in practice no need to prolong the sometimes already lengthy process of an appeal by having both an initial review of an appeal and a later rehearing of the case.

d. c. In the case of appeals to amend a sanction appeals for a change of sanction, the Appeals Board may accept or deny the appeal by majority vote of four, without further action.

e. d. In the case of appeals to reconsider a finding of “Responsible” or “Not Responsible,” the Appeals Board will accept or deny the appeal by majority vote of four. The rehearing shall follow the same procedures as the original hearing. The members of the Appeals Board for the appeal of the case will serve as the rehearing panel.

f. In the rehearing, a majority of the Appeals Board members may reverse the original decision.

5. Procedure for Appealing Suspension or Expulsion

If a student is suspended or expelled by the Academic Honor Council, an automatic appeal will be registered with the President of Trinity University for a final decision. The dispositive authority of the Council shall not prejudice the executive powers of the President of the University including executive privilege of granting pardon or clemency.

SANCTIONING GUIDELINES PROPOSAL

This proposal is quite complex and thus merits considerable detailed explanation. As part of the explanation, a comprehensive introduction to the proposal is provided. Since this proposal involves the replacement of the current Honor Code text regarding sanctioning guidelines, the changes to the current text simply involve complete deletion of the old and insertion of the new.

I. Introduction.

Last December (2012) the Faculty and the Association of Student Representatives both voted to approve a variety of revisions to the Honor Code, and these revisions were also approved by the Administration. Those revisions related largely to clearing up inconsistencies in the older Honor Code, and to streamlining procedures. What was purposefully not addressed in those revisions was any consideration of the sanctions, as these raise a number of complex issues that needed careful study. The Honor Council presents below, after such careful study, a proposal to revise the current sanctions.

The section of the Honor Code dealing with sanctions, and especially the subsection on “Sanctioning Guidelines” (III.E.3), is in need of major revisions. The sanctions section was written when the Honor Code first came into existence at Trinity back in 2004 and has not been revised since then. However, the Honor Council as well as the Trinity community at large has gained considerable experience with the actual working of the current Honor Code sanctions in the intervening years. Faculty and students over the past several semesters have raised various issues concerning the functioning of the current sanctioning system, and the Honor Council especially has seen what works well and what does not. Many of these issues arose because the Honor Council was bound by the stipulations of the Honor Code itself. The Council often had little flexibility, and thus repeatedly felt a bit helpless, being prevented from exercising its own best judgment. These issues and problems are addressed in the proposal below.

A comparison of the current “Philosophical Premises of Sanctions for Academic Honor Code Violations” (section III. E. 1) with the current Sanctioning Guidelines” reveals two areas of tension, if not outright conflict, between the subsections. These tensions were hard to foresee back in 2004, but have become increasingly apparent. The Honor Council is fully supportive of the ideals expressed in the Philosophical Premises, and the proposal below is designed
to bring the sanctioning guidelines, as actually implemented on a day-by-day, case-by-case basis, more in line with
the premises. The two areas of tension concern: 1) the philosophical premise that sanctions should be “relevant and
proportional” to specific violations (III. E. 1. a), and 2) the guidelines should allow Honor Council hearing panels
“flexibility to consider circumstances unique to a particular incident” (III. E. 1. b).

In developing the proposal below, the Honor Council quickly became aware of the need to balance the ideal of
flexibility and using good judgment, on the one hand, with the ideal of a reasonable degree of consistency on the
other. A relatively rigid system of sanctioning may provide a mechanical sort of consistency, but can actually result
in wide disparities of penalties for quite similar offenses. The philosophical premises state that “Violations vary in
severity, so a range of sanctions is available” (III. E. 1. b). The set of mitigating and aggravating factors in the
current Honor Code was apparently intended to provide such flexibility, but they have often proved to be quite
difficult to implement in practice (often much more time is spent in hearings on debating the mitigating factors than
on determining the “responsibility” or “non-responsibility” of the accused student). One of the major factors
resulting in disparities, a factor that largely ignores the severity of the violation, is the weight of the assignment.
Often a major violation, if on a little-weighted assignment, results in a very light penalty, while a much less severe
violation bordering on “sloppy scholarship,” in a heavily weighted assignment, can result in an F for the course.
While some faculty feel that any cheating is a violation, “period” (contrary to the current philosophical premises that
assume there is variation in severity), other faculty, realizing the possible major consequence to the course grade for
a rather minimal lapse, simply do not report “minor” violations. In this regard, some faculty members have said at
the close of a hearing in which the penalty of a zero on the assignment plus a two or three letter course grade
reduction has resulted in an F for the course, that if they had known the severe sanction that the Honor Council was
going to apply, then they would never have brought the case to the Honor Council. And often the Council
completely sympathized with such sentiments, but could see no way around the sanction given, in order to conform
to the current guidelines.

Another general concern was balancing significant consequences with the educational ideals expressed in the
philosophical premises. It struck many members of the Honor Council that the harshness of penalties at times
resulted only in resentment and fear on the part of the student. It is especially important to educate first-years and
international students regarding academic integrity norms in American universities.

The Honor Council began the study of these sanctioning issues about three years ago, in the fall of 2010. At several
Honor Council meetings over the last four semesters, council members shared their experiences on hearing panels
and discussed the potential and actual problems with the way the sanctions had to be assigned. It was clearly
recognized that the sanctioning guidelines allowed for minimal flexibility to hearing panel members and that the
guidelines did not always result in the fairest and most consistent penalties for students found responsible for
violating the Honor Code. The Honor Council set up an ad hoc committee in the spring of 2013 to work exclusively
on reforming the sanctioning guidelines.

This committee, consisting of three council members and working with an ASR representative, met
every Wednesday to work on the sanctions. Early in the semester the committee devised a campus-wide survey,
with feedback regarding specific questions to be included in the survey from other council members and the Honor
Council faculty advisors. The survey was conducted in February. It was sent to all faculty and all students—the
two surveys being identical except for one question. Once the ad hoc committee had obtained the results, the
committee set to work drawing up a tentative proposal, based on a “class model” that categorized violations
according to their severity, in accord with the philosophical premise mentioned above that “Violations vary in
severity, so a range of sanctions is available” (III. E. 1. b). The proposal below attempts to address the concerns of
the Trinity faculty and students as expressed in the February survey of faculty and student attitudes towards the
Honor Code and Honor Council.

During the spring the ad hoc committee also looked at a number of honor codes at other institutions and found that
Trinity’s existing sanctions fall midway between the most severe and the most lenient. Looking at the honor codes
of other institutions as well as the results of the February survey here at Trinity, the committee saw that there is no
consensus among faculty and institutions regarding sanctioning, either here at Trinity or across the nation.

The tentative class model drawn up by the spring ad hoc committee came to form the basic structure of the current
proposal. As the semester came to an end and considerable more work was still required to finalize a proposal, a
new ad hoc, summer committee was established. The summer committee met for two intensive weeks in late May
and early June. This committee consisted of Nupur Agrawal, next year’s external chair of the Honor Council and
member of the ad hoc committee in the spring; Erin Frisch, also a member of the ad hoc committee and last year’s
internal chair, who graduated in May; McKenzie Quinn, a continuing member of the Honor Council; and the two
Honor Council Faculty Advisors. A few other members of last year’s and this year’s Honor Council served as
consultants who were provided with email attachments of working documents and who gave their helpful feedback.
The current proposal is the work of the summer committee.

Rationales for the various parts of the proposal are provided below in their appropriate places.

II. The Proposal

[Note: The text below will replace the Honor Code sections III. E. 3. a-d]

Class system based largely on seriousness of violation

[Rationale: The proposal for revised sanctioning guidelines utilizes a "class model" based on seriousness of violation. The different classes allow for flexibility, particularly in the case of minor violations. The system will better allow the Council to give sanctions that are proportional to the violation. In addition to more flexibility, the proposed revision streamlines sanctioning deliberations by giving each class clear definitions—as clear as can be reasonably expected without becoming merely mechanical—and a corresponding sanction.

The proposed class model eliminates the mitigating factors that previously determined the severity of sanctioning. The “amount of the assignment” in violation, while no longer a mitigating factor, will now help the panel determine the seriousness of a violation (i.e. its class). The proposal entirely removes “extreme extenuating circumstances” because it was exceedingly difficult to define in practice and was open to abuse. Finally, “cooperation” was eliminated because it was routinely granted (in every case found “responsible” last year), rendering it unnecessary. Aggravating factors, such as misleading of the hearing panel, have also been removed, but they are now replaced with the new “Egregious conduct” category (c. 2. Below) that addresses violations of confidentiality, harassment, and the like.

Another major change in the sanctioning guidelines occurs in Class 1 (Negligent and Careless Scholarship) and Class 2 (Minor Violation). The proposed guidelines give instructors the responsibility of giving an appropriate grade, including a zero, to assignments that have minimal portions in violation of the Honor Code, taking into account the careless scholarship or offending material.

Violations on work assigned in a course in which the student is currently enrolled are divided into four classes of increasing seriousness. The person reporting a violation, if an instructor, is encouraged to include a statement, with brief rationale, about which class of violation he or she believes should be considered. Such statements would not bind the Honor Council but would often provide context that is sometimes difficult for the Honor Council to determine on its own.

Second and third violations carry more severe sanctions than first violations. In addition to sanctions for violations on work for a course, sanctions are specified for violations occurring outside the classroom. Provision is also made for a warning letter to accompany some findings of not responsible.

The primary factor in determining the class of violation is the significance of the violation. Significance will be determined in large part by the amount of material in an assignment that is involved in the violation, as well as the degree to which the offending material is critical to accomplishing the goals of the assignment. Determination of the class to which a given violation is assigned will be made on a case-by-case basis, once a finding of responsible is reached during deliberation. To assist in assessing the significance of a violation, the hearing panel, in cases where the amount and critical nature of the offending material is not clear and the instructor has not provided any indication of the class of violation, may solicit the instructor’s views on the matter during deliberations. The hearing panel will take such solicited views into consideration, but will ultimately arrive at its own independent conclusion regarding classification of the offense.

[Note: the following paragraph is a proposed bylaw, and is not part of the Honor Code itself. The bylaw is included here as it addresses the issue of consistency.]

Consistency in findings, classifications, and sanctions will be established by the continual review of precedents as provided in written summaries of debriefings of cases that present problematic issues. These cases will be presented in regular meetings of the Honor Council. To protect the confidentiality of the accused student and the accusing person, the debriefings and summaries will exclude names of all involved in the case, except for the panel hearing members. The written summaries of these problematic cases will be kept on the HC confidential T-Learn website. Such summaries will include the basic findings of the case, the rationale for the finding including where relevant the
rationale for the assignment of the case to a particular class, and finally an account or explanation of the problematic issues raised in the case. Honor Council members will be required to review all written summaries of these problematic cases of the current and preceding semester before being allowed to serve on a hearing panel.

a. Finding of non-responsibility that nevertheless merits a warning

Guidelines: This classification is merited when one of two conditions applies: 1) the evidence in the final analysis was not clear and convincing but was indicative of a likely violation of the Honor Code; or 2) the student's failure to satisfy requirements was due to a reasonable misunderstanding of the instructor's guidelines. However, students have a responsibility to clarify any instructions that they are not certain they have fully heard or correctly understood.

Sanction: In the case of lack of clear and convincing evidence, a letter will be issued warning the accused student that the behavior or actions described in the allegation are not tolerated, and that all future academically related behavior and actions should avoid even the appearance of violating the Academic Honor Code. In the case of unclear or verbal only instructor guidelines, a letter will be issued directing the student to be more aware of the need to be clear about what is and is not allowed, and to seek clarification from the instructor if there is any doubt. In addition, the student will complete a CD-Rom focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity, or similar assignment.

[Rationale: In some cases an accused student may be found not responsible for reasons that make a letter of warning appropriate. Although the evidence falls short of “clear and convincing,” the panel may think that it is more likely than not that a violation occurred; or the student may have engaged in behavior that, while not in itself a violation of the Honor Code, is nevertheless academically unacceptable. In these cases, the new section a. permits the panel to include, with the finding of “not responsible,” an explanation of the panel’s suspicions or concerns and a warning not to engage in similar behavior in the future. (Nothing in the current Honor Code prohibits doing this, but in the interest of clarity and transparency it seems desirable to include this option explicitly.)]

b. Violations in a class in which the student is currently enrolled

[Rationale: The new sanctions for violations in a class in which the student is currently enrolled explicitly distinguish four different classes of violations. The previous system tried to achieve a certain degree of flexibility by starting from a “baseline” sanction of an F in the course, and then adjusting the sanction based on a system of “mitigating factors” and “exacerbating factors.” There are two main problems with this system. First, in practice panels have believed that the resulting sanctions are in many cases too harsh. The sanction almost always results in the student receiving a D or an F in the class, and yet in many cases the violations involve small portions of the assignment and often appear to represent carelessness or misunderstanding rather than deliberate, intentional cheating. This has seemed to many panels to be too damaging a penalty for such cases. In almost all cases the minimum sanction panels can impose is a zero on the assignment in question followed by a one-letter grade reduction in the course grade. For an assignment worth 10% of the final grade, this amounts to a two-letter grade reduction; for an assignment worth 20% of the final grade, it amounts to a three-letter-grade reduction in the course grade. Unless the student was an A student prior to the violation, this means that the student will receive a D or an F in the class.

The second problem is that in the absence of clear guidelines about how to apply the mitigating and exacerbating factors, there has been a certain lack of consistency from case to case, since each case is heard by a different panel.

The new system attempts to solve both problems. The problem of harsh penalties is dealt with by allowing less extreme penalties in Class 1 and Class 2 cases, while in the more serious Class 3 and Class 4 cases the penalties will be comparable to current penalties, usually resulting in a D or an F in the class. The problem of consistency is dealt with by providing clear and explicit guidelines about which cases fall into which categories. Of course, no set of general guidelines can anticipate the complexities of all possible cases, but even in cases with unanticipated features, it should be easier for a panel to classify the case into one of the four categories based on its degree of severity than it currently is to determine which mitigating or exacerbating factors to apply.

Moreover, the proposed system is more flexible than the current system with regard to second and third offenses. Currently, a second violation almost always results in suspension, and a third violation is expected to lead to expulsion (although third violations have been extremely rare). Under the present proposal, sanctions for second or third violations will continue to be more severe than for a first violation, and when the violations have been in Class
3 or Class 4, the sanctions will continue to be suspension and expulsion, but the proposal makes it possible to assign slightly less severe sanctions in cases when the violations are all in Class 1 or Class 2.

1) First Violation

**Class 1: Negligent and careless scholarship**

Guidelines: there is no clear evidence of intent to cheat, and the vast majority of assignment is done appropriately (e.g., on a paper, most quotations and sources are correctly indicated and cited, and any missing citations do not involve major sources used in the paper but not cited anywhere).

Sanctions:
- Completion of a CD-Rom focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity, or similar assignment.
- The instructor gives an appropriate grade to the assignment, including a zero, taking into account the negligent and careless scholarship.
- A 1/3 letter course grade reduction (e.g., an A- to a B+, or a C to a C-), calculated after the grade on the assignment is recorded.

**Class 2: Minor violation**

Guidelines: the offending material in question is a minimal part of the assignment, and if deleted would not significantly impact the rest of the assignment.

Sanctions:
- Completion of a CD-Rom focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity, or similar assignment.
- The instructor gives an appropriate grade to the assignment, including a zero, taking into account the offending material.
- A 2/3 letter course grade reduction (e.g., an A- to a B, or a C+ to a C-), calculated after the grade on the assignment is recorded.

**Class 3: Substantial violation**

Guidelines: the offending material in the assignment is either extensive or critical to the assignment as a whole, but the student has also contributed significant original material of his or her own.

Sanctions:
- Completion of a CD-Rom focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity, or similar assignment.
- A zero on the assignment.
- A 1 letter course grade reduction, calculated after the zero on the assignment is recorded for the assignment.

**Class 4: Major violation**

Guidelines: the offending material in the assignment is either extensive or critical to the assignment as a whole, and the student made a minimal original contribution, if any, to the assignment.

Sanctions:
- Completion of a CD-Rom focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity, or similar assignment.
- A zero on the assignment.
- A 2 letter course grade reduction, calculated after the zero on the assignment is recorded for the assignment.

2) Second Violation

(Note: the four classes of violations described above also apply to second and third violations.)

Sanctions:
• If the first violation was either class 1 (negligent and careless scholarship) or class 2 (minor violation), and the second violation is either class 1 or 2: a 2 letter grade reduction in the course. The instructor may give an appropriate grade to the assignment, including a zero, taking into account the negligent and careless scholarship or offending material.
• In all other cases: F in the course and suspension beginning in the next semester.

3) Third Violation
Sanctions:
• If all previous violations were either class 1 or 2: F in the course and suspension beginning in the next semester.
• In all other cases: expulsion.
  o Options include immediate expulsion with an F in the course, or expulsion beginning in the next semester with an F in the course.

c. Other violations
1) Violations pertaining to a course or courses in which the accused student is not, or is no longer, enrolled
[Rationale: The Honor Code currently includes some classes of violations that do not involve a course in which the student is currently enrolled. However, the sanctioning section of the current Honor Code does not include appropriate sanctions for such violations unless they are very severe, since most of the sanctions involve grade reductions. The present proposal attempts to rectify this by adding as a new sanction an annotated bibliography or research paper related to academic integrity.]
Guidelines: such violations usually involve activity that takes place beyond the classroom. Examples include but are not limited to: possessing a prohibited test bank, knowingly giving unauthorized help to another student on an assignment or examination, altering or falsifying academic forms or records, and misrepresenting one’s academic achievements at Trinity on the web or to future employers.
Sanctions:
• Completion of a CD-Rom focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity, or similar assignment.
• Completion of an annotated bibliography, consisting of 200-250 words per entry, of ten peer-reviewed articles and books dealing with academic integrity, or completion of a 2500 word essay report on a recent book dealing with academic integrity.
• In addition to the above, depending on the nature and seriousness of the violation: suspension, expulsion, and revocation of a degree. In the case of expulsion or revocation of degree, the first two sanctions above become irrelevant.

2) Egregious conduct
[Rationale: There have been Honor Council cases in the past in which there has been inappropriate conduct by the accusing or the accused party towards members of the University community. As stated in the Honor Code, the Academic Honor Council helps foster academic integrity on campus, and thus the Council believes that every member of the University should be supported in initiating or participating in Honor Council proceedings. The current sanctioning guidelines do not address the problem of egregious conduct.]
Guidelines: such violations include, but are not limited to, threatening, harassing or assaulting another student, professor or staff member involved in an Academic Honor Council proceeding, unruly behavior during a hearing, and violating the confidentiality of an Honor Council case.
Procedures:
• Submission of the case to the Student or University Conduct Board (hereafter both referred to as Conduct Board) by the Academic Honor Council external chair.
• Participate in Conduct Board hearings as needed.
Outcomes and sanctions:
• Findings and sanctions to be determined through regular Conduct Board procedures.
• In cases of egregious conduct, the Honor Council recommends either suspension or expulsion, to be in line with the sanctions for repeated substantial and major violations of the Honor Code.

MISCELLANEOUS PROPOSALS

There are three miscellaneous proposals to be considered.

First Miscellaneous proposal:

This proposal adds an additional sanction for students who have been found “Responsible” for a violation in a course from which they withdrew before being notified of an alleged violation. This proposal would require a revision of the Honor Code section III. C. 2. (“Procedure for Complaint to the Academic Honor Council”), sub-section g.

[Changes to the current Honor Code text below are in blue font.]

1. Students accused of violating the Honor Code may not change their registration in a course in which the accusation is pending or in which a responsible finding has been made. If a student drops or withdraws from a course after an alleged violation occurs but before being notified, then the student will still be subject to a hearing. In such cases, if the student is found responsible, then he or she will be subject to the standard sanctions with the exception that there will be no grade penalty in the course, as the student is no longer enrolled in the course, but with the additional sanction of the completion of an annotated bibliography, consisting of 200-250 words per entry, of ten peer-reviewed articles and books dealing with academic integrity, or completion of a 2500 word essay report on a recent book dealing with academic integrity.

[Rationale: Some faculty members have expressed concern that the current sanction seems like an invitation to withdraw from a course after cheating. Even without a grade penalty, however, the fact that the student is on record for a violation, along with the requirement of completing the CD ROM on Academic Integrity, is not without a certain deterrent force. Nonetheless, these cases are instances of “Violations pertaining to a course or courses in which the accused student is not, or is no longer, enrolled,” which include the sanction of the annotated bibliography or essay. One could refer here to that section (“Violations pertaining to a course or courses in which the accused student is not, or is no longer, enrolled,”), but for the sake of clarity and to minimize the need to go back and forth in the Honor Code, the sanctions for that section are stated here as well.]}

Second Miscellaneous proposal:

This proposal concerns the conduct of students once notified of an allegation of violating the Academic Honor Code. This proposal would require an addition to the Honor Code following section III. C. 3. (“Notification Procedure of the Academic Honor Council”), sub-section d.

[The addition to the current Honor Code text below is in blue font.]

1. The accused student will be notified by the external chair as soon as feasible that an allegation of violating the Academic Honor Code has been made against him or her. In the case of an allegation filed by an instructor, the accused student will be notified of the allegation, with relevant details as submitted by the instructor, at the same time that the instructor is notified of receipt of the complaint. The external chair will also provide the accused student with an electronic statement of the student’s rights. In addition, the external chair will provide the accused student with the name of the internal chair, to whom the accused student should direct any inquiries at this time about the case. At this same time the external chair will notify the internal chair, the Associate Vice President of
Academic Affairs charged with oversight of the Honor Council (henceforth “the AVPAA”), and the faculty advisors, providing all of these with a copy of the allegation.

d. In the case of an allegation filed by a student or staff member, the accused student will be notified once the accusing student or staff member has met with the external chair, agreed to forego anonymity, and has submitted solid evidence. The accused student in this latter case will also be given the evidence, or summary of it, against him or her. The external chair will also provide the accused student with an electronic statement of the student’s rights. In addition, the external chair will provide the accused student with the name of the internal chair, with whom the accused student should direct any inquiries about the case. At the same time the external chair will notify the internal chair, the AVPAA, and faculty advisors as in the preceding paragraph.

e. Accused students are not to contact instructors or other complainants about the allegation once they have been notified. If they do, this may be considered an instance of “egregious conduct” and would be dealt with accordingly.

[Rationale: The insertion is a modification of a current bylaw (that appears immediately following section d). In effect, the insertion into the Honor Code simply changes the “status” of the bylaw. The modification of the bylaw is to conform to other changes in the Honor Code if the new Sanctioning Guidelines are approved.]

---

**Third Miscellaneous proposal:**

This proposal concerns a) elimination of one paragraph (c. below) that will become partially redundant and partially inconsistent with the Honor Code if the proposal for new Sanctioning Guidelines is approved, and b) slight revisions of one sentence (in paragraph d. below) for the sake of clarification and succinctness. This proposal would require revisions to the Honor Code section III. E. 2. (“Sanctioning Procedures for Academic Honor Code Violations”), sub-sections c. and d.

[The revisions to the current Honor Code text below are in blue font.]

**2. Sanctioning Procedures for Academic Honor Code Violations**

a. All three hearing members assigned to the case shall vote on whether or not the accused student violated the Academic Honor Code based on clear and convincing evidence presented by witnesses and case presenters. A majority of two shall decide a case.

b. The presiding member is responsible for issuing the majority opinion to the internal chair. A dissenting hearing member may also issue an opinion. The presiding member provides all opinions to the accused student, both case-presenters, and the professor(s) involved within five (5) class days of the hearing.

e. If the accused student is not found in violation of the Academic Honor Code because there was not sufficient evidence, the presiding member may still issue a “Letter of Clarification,” stating that although the Academic Honor Council did not find the student in violation of the Academic Honor Code, the Council would like the student to keep in mind specific aspects of the Code. No entry would be made in the student’s file for such a letter.

[Rationale: This paragraph will be superseded by the sub-section “a. Finding of non-responsibility that nevertheless merits a warning,” in the new Sanctioning Guidelines, if approved.]

d. If a student is found in violation of the Academic Honor Code, the hearing members shall assign sanctions. **Sentencing Sanctioning** decisions shall be made by a majority of two out of three hearing members.
HONOR CODE CURRENT SANCTION GUIDELINES AND NORMS

Current Honor Code guidelines for sanctioning
(available at: http://www.trinity.edu/departments/academic_affairs/honor_code/honor_code.htm)

3. Sanctioning Guidelines
   a. Every student found in violation of the Academic Honor Code shall be given the following three sanctions:
      1) An F (zero credit) on assignment;
      2) Required completion of a CD-ROM program focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity;
      3) Academic Honor Code probation.
      In addition, the student will receive one of the following grade sanctions:
         • Lower course grade by 1, 2, or 3 full letter grades.
         • F in the course.
   b. If a student is repeatedly found in violation of the Academic Honor Code, more severe sanctions shall be imposed. Suspension for a semester shall routinely be applied for second offenses. Any further violation of the Academic Honor Code may result in expulsion from the university.
      1) Suspension -- from classes and all other activities for remainder of semester with an F for the course in which the violation took place and Ws for all other courses in which the student is enrolled.
      2) Expulsion – from the University with no option to re-enroll.
   c. If a student not enrolled in a course knowingly gives significant unauthorized help on an assignment or an examination completed by another student, s/he will be subject to the following sanctions:
      1) Academic Honor Code Probation.
      2) Required completion of a CD-ROM program focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity.
      3) If a student is found in violation of the Academic Honor Code in the above way for a second time, a more severe sanction may be imposed that may include suspension from all classes for the remainder of the semester.
   d. If a student is found in violation of the Academic Honor Code for an activity that is not involved with coursework, s/he will be subject to the following sanctions:
      1) Academic Honor Code probation
      2) Required completion of a CD-ROM program focusing on ethical principles as they apply to academic integrity.
      3) No gain from the action that was found in violation.
      4) Other sanctions that would be appropriate to the violation given the circumstances of the violation.
Current Norms, regarding mitigating factors
(Available at: http://www.trinity.edu/departments/academic_affairs/honor_code/Norms.htm)

II. NORMS FOR SANCTIONING

A. General guidelines

1. The Academic Honor Council will limit sanctions to those outlined in the Honor Code.

Explanation: This maintains consistency in sanctioning. For example, students will not be sanctioned to rewrite plagiarized papers.

2. The Academic Honor Council mandates that all assignments on which a student is found “responsible” for violating the Honor Code will not be graded or counted.

Explanation: A zero on the assignment is a mandatory sanction for all instances where a student is found “responsible.”

B. Summary of specific factors affecting sanctioning

Mitigating factors
1. Amount and degree of plagiarism; extent of use of unauthorized materials, assistance, or collaboration; and extent of data falsification or fabrication of sources.
2. Cooperation of student during all phases of the adjudication process
3. Extraordinary extenuating circumstances

Aggravating factors
4. Purposeful and demonstrated misleading of Hearing Panel

Factors not taken into account
5. Weight of assignment (percent of course grade)
6. Long-term consequences of sanction
7. Emotional Duress

C. Explanation of factors affecting sanctioning

1. The Academic Honor Council will consider the amount of the assignment affected by behavior found to violate the Honor Code.
Explanation: This differentiates cheating on, for example, one math problem versus many math problems. In the instance of plagiarism, sanction mitigation would be warranted if the plagiarized text represented a very small proportion of the complete paper or did not contribute significantly to the overall argument of the paper.

2. The Academic Honor Council will consider the accused student's cooperation during all phases of the adjudication process.

Explanation: Whether or not an accused student pleads "responsible" or "not responsible," a student who in a spirit of cooperation attempts to assist both the Honor Council's Student Case Presenter and the Honor Council's Hearing Panel in understanding exactly what happened. Lying to the Student Case Presenter or to the Hearing Panel is evidence of non-cooperation.

3. The Academic Honor Council will take into account the possibility of extraordinary extenuating circumstances.

Explanation: This norm is intended to take into account truly extraordinary extenuating circumstances that may have contributed to the student's violation of the Honor Code. Such circumstances need to be distinguished from "emotional duress" (see 7 below), in that the extraordinary extenuating circumstances will be found to be largely beyond the student's control and which can reasonably be interpreted as seriously undermining the student's ability to make sound ethical decisions. In such situations, the student must provide compelling evidence of the extraordinary circumstances.

This evidence may include documented mental health cases that led the student to seek counseling and advice prior to the violation of the Honor Code or extraordinary physical health conditions. The evidence is not limited to documented mental and physical health issues; it could also include documented personal trauma issues.

4. The Academic Honor Council will regard the purposeful and demonstrated misleading of the Hearing Panel as an aggravating factor.

Explanation: This norm applies to situations where an accused student attempts to mislead either the Honor Council's Student Case Presenter or the Honor Council's Hearing Panel by misrepresenting or concealing relevant factors, or lies about his or her actions in relation to the accusation. The norm also applies to an accused student who attempts to mislead the Hearing panel through rude and aggressive behavior towards members of the Honor Council or to the person filing the charge.
5. The Academic Honor Council will not consider the weight an assignment has in a course (percent of course grade) when determining sanctions.

Explanation: This norm reduces inconsistency in sanctioning.

6. The Academic Honor Council will not consider the long-term consequences of its assigned sanctions.

Explanation: This is for the sake of consistency only. If the Honor Council considers long term consequences, a senior and a first-year student in the same course could get two different sanctions for the same offense.

7. The Academic Honor Council will not consider emotional duress on the part of the student.

Explanation: Many violations of the Honor Code are due to the emotional duress of falling behind in work, often the result of being overwhelmed with the demands of multiple responsibilities such as social, athletic, and other extracurricular activities, as well as other course assignments. These are part of normal college life and students need to learn how to deal with these in more constructive ways than taking short-cuts that violate the Honor Code.
Proposal:

To revise the credit hour policy that was approved at the May 3, 2013, meeting of the Academic Faculty Assembly.

Rationale:

On May 3, 2013, the Faculty Assembly approved a credit hour definition and policy. Due to the number of amendments offered from the floor, the definition and policy included ambiguous language, internal inconsistencies, and grammatical flaws that needed to be corrected before the definition and policy could be submitted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for approval or implemented by the University Curriculum Council. In addition, many individuals have contacted UCC representatives regarding confusion about the language adopted last May, or expressing a desire to reconsider the credit hour language.

The Executive Committee of the UCC had already begun the revision process when a number of departments, recognizing that they had similar reservations about the current language, submitted their own proposal to amend the credit hour definition and policy. After lengthy debate, the UCC made several changes to that proposal and voted to submit that language to the October faculty assembly so that the faculty would have the opportunity to reconsider the credit hour definition and make clear the majority view on this crucial issue.

Particular problems with the current language include:

- The first “and” in the following sentence “The remaining two hours of student academic work will consist of some combination of faculty contact time and independent reading, writing, homework, research, community engaged experiences, practica, rehearsals, and performances” can be interpreted to require faculty contact time above and beyond the amount specified in the previous sentence. This would imply, among other things, that the current 50 minutes of class time per credit hour in most courses does not satisfy the new definition.

- The definition requires a minimum of 50 minutes of faculty contact time per credit hour, but the policies and procedures section still contains the following sentence: “Although class time is an important index of student learning, the definition stated about does not require a one-to-one correspondence between the number of credit hours assigned to a given course and the number of fifty-minute class hours or meetings per week.”

- The phrase “In its usual application” implies that courses that do not include 50 minutes of faculty contact time per week are unusual. This classifies thesis, independent research and internships as unusual despite the fact that virtually every department has such courses and that such courses are widely considered to be some of the most valuable
educational experiences available to students. Indeed, such courses are considered so valuable that they are often taught as overloads. Because this phrase ignores these very common exceptions, it provides no useful guidance to what is or is not “usual.”

- The language is unclear as to which activities “faculty supervised” modify.

- The sentence that begins with the phrase “In its usual application” contains no clear antecedent for the pronoun “it.” While “it” may be intended to refer to the definition, the sentence structure most closely associates “it” with “the three hours of student work,” which clearly has no “usual application.”

- The definition uses the phrase “50-minute hour” while no such hour exists in any known time-keeping system. And the definition talks about the “remaining two hours” when in fact the remaining time would be two hours and 10 minutes.

- The two sentences beginning with “Student academic work may include . . .” are redundant in their listing of many forms of student academic work such as research, community engaged experiences, practica and rehearsals.

Finally, the current definition of a credit hour needlessly eliminates the flexibility that is present in the federal definition and stressed by SACS. In its interpretive remarks concerning the federal definition of a credit hour, SACS stresses that this definition “does not dictate particular amounts of classroom time versus out-of-class student work” precisely because different courses achieve their goals in different ways (http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/Credit%20Hours.pdf).

If approved, the following language will appear in the UCC Bylaws (Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook, Chapter 2B, Article VI) and in the Courses of Study Bulletin (“Academic Regulations”).
Proposed handbook language (additions highlighted, deletions struck through):

**Definition**

One credit hour represents a minimum of three hours of student academic work per week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester, or an equivalent amount of student academic work distributed over a different time period. In its usual application, the three hours of student academic work must include a minimum of one 50-minute hour of faculty contact time per week. Faculty contact time consists of teaching, and student academic work may include lectures, seminars, tutorials, applied and studio instruction, and/or faculty supervised laboratories, supervised fieldwork, as well as research, community engaged experiences, practica, rehearsals, and writing labs. The remaining two hours of student academic work will consist of some combination of faculty contact time and independent reading, writing, homework, research, community-engaged experiences, practica, rehearsals, and performances.

The nature of the three hours of expected academic work and the way in which that work will be evaluated by faculty will be documented in proposals to the UCC for new or revised courses, and will be included in all course syllabi.

**Policies and Procedures**

In determining the credit hours for any given course, the University Curriculum Council shall consider both the amount of direct faculty instruction and the amount of expected out-of-class student academic work as reflected in sample syllabi, examinations, assignments, and other course materials. The University Curriculum Council may also require a department or program to conduct a periodic assessment of actual student achievement in order to demonstrate that its courses provide an appropriately rigorous learning experience.

Although class time is an important index of student learning, the definition stated above does not require a one-to-one correspondence between the number of credit hours assigned to a given course and the number of fifty-minute class hours or meetings per week. In determining the credit hours for any given course, the University Curriculum Council shall be guided by the norms of the relevant discipline and of higher education more generally.

As with all other curricular proposals, the University Curriculum Council’s determinations regarding credit hours will be submitted to the faculty for approval as consent agenda or discussion agenda items.
Proposed handbook language (clean copy):

One credit hour represents a minimum of three hours of student academic work per week for approximately fifteen weeks for one semester, or an equivalent amount of student academic work distributed over a different time period. Student academic work may include lectures, seminars, tutorials, applied and studio instruction, laboratories, supervised fieldwork, as well as reading, writing, homework, research, community-engaged experiences, practica, rehearsals, and performances.

The nature of the three hours of expected academic work and the way in which that work will be evaluated by faculty will be documented in proposals to the University Curriculum Council for new or revised courses, and will be included in all course syllabi.

In determining the credit hours for any given course, the University Curriculum Council shall consider both the amount of direct faculty instruction and the amount of expected out-of-class student academic work as reflected in sample syllabi, examinations, assignments, and other course materials. The University Curriculum Council may also require a department or program to conduct a periodic assessment of actual student achievement in order to demonstrate that its courses provide an appropriately rigorous learning experience.

In determining the credit hours for any given course, the University Curriculum Council shall be guided by the norms of the relevant discipline and of higher education more generally.

As with all other curricular proposals, the University Curriculum Council’s determinations regarding credit hours will be submitted to the faculty for approval as consent agenda or discussion agenda items.
CALL TO ORDER
President Dennis Ahlburg called the meeting to order. President Ahlburg thanked all those faculty members who have contributed to the design of the proposed curriculum over the past several years.

VICE PRESIDENT FOR FACULTY AND STUDENT AFFAIRS MICHAEL FISCHER
Vice President for Faculty and Student Affairs Michael Fischer continued the meeting as Chair.

MOTION TO CREATE A NEW TRINITY CURRICULUM
Professor Kimberlyn Montford, Chair of the University Curriculum Council, presented a motion to create a new Trinity Curriculum (*Courses of Study Bulletin*, “Degree Requirements”).

A motion was made and seconded to delete the requirement that all First-Year Experience courses be taught during the Fall semester. The motion was defeated.

The motion to create a new Trinity Curriculum was adopted.

MOTION TO CREATE CURRICULAR GUIDELINES
Professor Montford then presented a motion to create curricular guidelines (*Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook*, Chapter 2B, Article VII).

A motion was made and seconded to delete references to a final synthesis project within the Interdisciplinary Cluster. The motion carried.

A motion was made and seconded to specify that voting on the main motion be carried out by paper ballots. The motion carried.

The motion to create curricular guidelines was adopted as amended, with 117 votes for the motion, 17 votes against, and 5 abstentions.

ADJOURNMENT
There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 3:35 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Duane Coltharp
Secretary of the Academic Faculty Assembly
APPENDIX

Here follow the motions that were presented at the meeting of the Academic Faculty Assembly on January 31, 2014.
MOTION TO CREATE A NEW TRINITY CURRICULUM,
TO BE INCLUDED IN THE COURSES OF STUDY BULLETIN

If approved by the Academic Faculty Assembly, the proposed bulletin language (below) will appear in the chapter on “Degree Requirements” in the 2015-16 Courses of Study Bulletin. It will replace the material that appears on pp. 24-32 of the pdf version of the current (2013-14) Courses of Study Bulletin, including the current description of the Common Curriculum. The proposed bulletin language retains the current sections on the Residency Requirement, Information Literacy at Trinity University, and Student Responsibility.

THE TRINITY CURRICULUM

Trinity University offers undergraduate programs leading to the Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Music degrees. The University is fundamentally committed to ensuring that all Trinity undergraduate degrees represent the broad base of general learning with an underlying commitment to responsible participation in human affairs, which is called a liberal education.

The Trinity Curriculum has six Curricular Requirements that provide the foundation in the liberal arts and sciences for all the bachelor’s degrees awarded by Trinity University. Through these requirements, students acquire the necessary skills and disciplinary perspectives to navigate complex questions at Trinity and in their post-graduate lives. The requirements that must be completed in order to receive the bachelor’s degree are as follows:

1) The First Year Experience (FYE)
2) The Core Capacities
3) Approaches to Creation and Analysis
4) The Interdisciplinary Cluster
5) The Major
6) Fitness Education

Three optional Curricular Elements can further enrich a Trinity education:

7) Experiential Learning
8) Minors
9) A Second Major

Students are especially encouraged to include Element 7, Experiential Learning, in their curricula.

INFORMATION LITERACY AT TRINITY UNIVERSITY

Information literacy is the ability to gather, critically evaluate, and use information creatively and ethically. During their academic careers, Trinity students will receive systematic guidance and practical experience in order to prepare them for the knowledge economy of the twenty-first century. Students will learn to access information efficiently and to use it critically and competently. A systematic and coherent education in information literacy teaches students to understand the
information cycle, be aware of search tools and strategies across disciplines, and to use the major resources in their majors.

**GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS**

To receive an undergraduate degree a student must:

- Complete at least 124 semester hours (129 semester hours for a Bachelor of Science in Engineering Science; 132 semester hours for a Bachelor of Music, Major in Choral or Instrumental Music; or 141 semester hours for a Bachelor of Music, Major in Performance or Composition).

- Complete the six Curricular Requirements listed above.

- Complete at least 30 upper-division hours.

- Earn a minimum grade point average of 2.0 in both the major and the entire program of study.

- Satisfy the residency requirement. (See “Residency Requirement,” below.)

To become eligible for a second, and different, bachelor's degree, a student must earn a minimum of 30 additional semester hours of work in residence beyond the requirements for one degree, at least 18 of which must be upper division. He/she must also complete courses necessary to meet the specified requirements for the second degree and major. In all the additional courses the student must have at least a 2.0 cumulative grade point average. Two undergraduate degrees can be awarded simultaneously to the same person. However, the two degrees must be of different types, such as a B.A. and a B.S.

A student who completes the requirements for two majors without earning the additional credit required for a second degree will receive a single degree with a double major.

**RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT**

Trinity believes that its students should fulfill at least half of their degree requirements in residence. With this principle in mind, the University establishes the following minimum residency requirements:

- At least 62 credit hours must be earned in residence to complete a baccalaureate degree.

- At least 15 credit hours of each major must be earned in residence, and at least 12 of those hours must be upper division.

- The last 30 credit hours before graduation must be earned in residence.
Exceptions for study abroad: Students with 62 or more semester hours earned at Trinity who wish to enroll in an approved study abroad program in their senior year may be exempted from the last 30 hours-in-residence requirement. Students who transfer to Trinity with 50 or more credit hours may count up to 15 semester hours of approved study abroad credit toward the 62-hour residency requirement. These same exceptions apply to special semester domestic programs approved by the Office of Study Abroad.

STUDENT RESPONSIBILITY

This Bulletin is designed to assist the student and academic adviser in planning and scheduling a degree program. Each student at Trinity University should keep in mind, however, that he or she alone is ultimately responsible for understanding and fulfilling all degree requirements.

CURRICULAR GUIDELINES

To encourage students to experience a broad range of educational experiences, the University maintains the following guidelines:

- The eight courses used to fulfill the Approaches to Creation and Analysis and the Interdisciplinary Cluster must come from at least seven different disciplines.*

- No course may be used to satisfy both the Approaches to Creation and Analysis and the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirements.

- No course may be listed as satisfying more than one of the Approaches to Creation and Analysis requirements.

- No course may satisfy more than one Core Capacity.

- The First-Year Experience (FYE) may not be used to satisfy any other graduation requirement.

- A minimum of 24 credit hours must be earned outside the major department and major requirements (n.b., only Engineering Science majors may include the FYE).

* For the purposes of this requirement disciplines are the subjects as categorized by the subject codes used in the designation of courses.
CURRICULAR ELEMENT I: THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE

Students should demonstrate the ability to analyze sophisticated texts and ideas through (1) reasoned discussion of substantive issues; (2) oral presentations; (3) analytical and argumentative writing; and (4) locating and evaluating diverse information sources to enhance their understanding of course materials.

Requirements:
All incoming students must complete one First-Year Experience during their first semester at Trinity. A new transfer student with 26 semester hours of transfer credit or whose high school graduation date is a year or more prior to his or her matriculation at Trinity is exempted from the First-Year Experience requirement. The total number of hours required for any Trinity degree shall not be reduced by an exemption from the First-Year Experience.

Explanation:
The First-Year Experience includes substantial instruction in written and oral communication skills while engaging a topic of widespread or enduring significance. For each topic, the First-Year Experience consists of multiple sections linked by a common syllabus and a weekly common learning experience for all students and faculty. Each section, comprised of approximately 15 students, is taught by two instructors from different departments, and is the equivalent of two three-hour courses for students.
CURRICULAR ELEMENT II: THE CORE CAPACITIES

Written, Oral, and Visual Communication

Students should demonstrate the ability to communicate effectively in a variety of contexts and within a variety of media.

Requirements:
To qualify for graduation with a bachelor’s degree from Trinity, a student must fulfill the requirements for Written Communication (WC) and Oral and Visual Communication (OVC) in the following ways:

- A student must fulfill the Written Communication requirement by successfully completing two courses designated with the abbreviation WC, including one upper-division course. Only one of these requirements may be satisfied by a creative writing course.

- A student must fulfill the Oral and Visual Communication requirement by successfully completing two courses designated with the abbreviation OVC.

Explanation:
Every WC course requires extensive writing and provides substantial instruction in written communication.

Every OVC course requires significant oral presentation supported by visual products and provides substantial instruction in oral and visual communication.

Digital Literacy

Students should demonstrate the ability to (1) investigate questions, solve problems, or engage in artistic expression through the systematic manipulation of digital information; and (2) evaluate the design, function, or cultural impact of a digital technology.

Requirement:
To qualify for graduation with a bachelor’s degree from Trinity, a student must fulfill the Digital Literacy requirement by successfully completing one course designated with the abbreviation DL.

Explanation:
Courses that carry a DL designation provide substantial instruction in principles and tools of digital information manipulation and significant activities where students employ those principles and tools to satisfy the two learning outcomes.

Engaged Citizenship

Students should demonstrate the ability to (1) identify and articulate the perspectives and values of diverse people, groups, and cultures both within the United States and beyond its borders; (2) gather and evaluate information from sources that facilitate cross-cultural understanding; (3) communicate in a foreign language at the intermediate level or above.
Requirements:
To qualify for graduation with a bachelor’s degree from Trinity, a student must fulfill the requirements for Global Awareness (GA), Understanding Diversity (DV), and Foreign Language (FL), as follows:

- A student fulfills the **Global Awareness** requirement by successfully completing **one** course (totaling no fewer than 3 credit hours) designated with the abbreviation **GA** or by successfully completing an approved study abroad program.

- A student fulfills the **Understanding Diversity** requirement by successfully completing **one** course (totaling no fewer than 3 credit hours) designated with the abbreviation **DV** or by successfully completing an approved independent study project or an internship that substantially engages with the diversity issues listed below.

- A student fulfills the **Foreign Language (FL)** requirement by successfully completing an intermediate level or higher course in a foreign language sequence in a modern or ancient language taught at Trinity, or demonstrating equivalent proficiency by examination.

Explanation:
Every **GA** course addresses the history and culture of a region other than the United States.

Every **DV** course addresses diversity issues involving, e.g., race, ethnicity, ability, social class, gender, religion, or sexualities, primarily within the United States.

Every **FL** course focuses on cross-cultural understanding through the mastery and employment of foreign language skills.
CURRICULAR ELEMENT III: APPROACHES TO CREATION AND ANALYSIS

In order to master the skills of analysis, research, and creation, students should demonstrate the ability to use disciplinary approaches characteristic of (1) the humanities, (2) the arts and creative disciplines, (3) the social and behavioral sciences, (4) the natural sciences, and (5) quantitative disciplines.

**Requirement:**
To qualify for graduation with a bachelor’s degree, a student must successfully complete one course (totaling no fewer than 3 credit hours) from each of the following categories at Trinity:

- Courses that enable students to understand the human condition through the study of the arts, literature, history, philosophy, or religion (**humanities**);
- Courses that enable students to create aesthetic artifacts or performances (**creative expression**);
- Courses that enable students to engage in the scientific study of human behavior (**social and behavioral sciences**);
- Courses that enable students to engage in the scientific study of the natural world (**natural sciences**); and
- Courses that enable students to solve problems within a structured mathematical framework (**quantitative reasoning**).
CURRICULAR ELEMENT IV: THE INTERDISCIPLINARY CLUSTER

Students should demonstrate the ability to explore a complex subject of enduring or contemporary significance by employing multiple disciplinary methods.

Requirement:
To qualify for graduation with a bachelor’s degree from Trinity, a student must complete at least one Interdisciplinary Cluster.

The Interdisciplinary Cluster must be fulfilled by successfully completing three courses (totaling no fewer than 9 credit hours) from three disciplines in at least two disciplinary groups.* These courses may be structured as a part of a faculty-designed Interdisciplinary Cluster or student-designed three-course learning experience that meets the above guidelines and is approved by the University Curriculum Council. All courses in the Interdisciplinary Cluster must be taken at Trinity University, and only one of these courses may be used to fulfill the requirements of the student’s primary major.

Note: ID Clusters hold great potential to integrate Trinity’s liberal arts and pre-professional programs and to encourage productive collisions among disciplines. Courses used to fulfill the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirement may also be used to fulfill Core Capacity requirements, a minor, or a second major. It is envisioned that most students will complete the Interdisciplinary Cluster by the end of their sophomore year.

* For the purposes of this requirement disciplines are the subjects as categorized by the subject codes used in the designation of courses.
CURRICULAR ELEMENT V: THE MAJOR

The major provides for in-depth study of a field of specialization. The requirements for each major are found in this bulletin in the departmental listings. Students may elect multiple disciplinary majors or construct a second, interdisciplinary major in consultation with their major advisers.

The candidate for a baccalaureate degree must fulfill the requirements for a major in one of the departments or in one of the interdisciplinary majors listed in the Courses of Study Bulletin. Official admission to a major program occurs in the sophomore year, although the student may begin taking courses in the major department before official admission. A student may apply to major in two departments or programs.

After students achieve sophomore standing and before achieving junior standing (58 credit hours completed), they must apply for admission to the chair of the department in which they wish to major or to the chair of the interdepartmental major. Students may be accepted without conditions or accepted on a provisional basis. Provisional status, if imposed, should be noted on the form. At the end of the provisional period, the chair will notify the student and the Office of the Registrar of the final decision of the department or program. As part of the application process, students are strongly encouraged to complete an online evaluation of the first-year advising program.
CURRICULAR ELEMENT VI: FITNESS EDUCATION

Students should possess basic knowledge, understanding, or skills that will help them to make good decisions relating to health throughout life. The premise underlying this objective is that students will be more likely to engage in a healthy lifestyle of exercise and physical activity throughout their lives if they:

- possess the necessary skills to participate in a lifetime sport or activity, or
- understand fitness and its importance, or
- understand exercise and physical activity, and their importance.

This requirement may be satisfied by successfully completing one approved course.
CURRICULAR ELEMENT VII: EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

Trinity University believes that experiential learning is an important part of how students learn to apply knowledge in a real-world environment. It is therefore recommended that all Trinity University students complete at least one experiential learning (EXL) opportunity.

These opportunities may include:

- Experiential Learning (EXL) courses. EXL courses may include, but are not restricted to, those classes where students (1) engage and interact with the local or global community; (2) engage in project-based learning experiences beyond what is traditionally required in a class; or (3) create artifacts for an outside audience.

- Experiential Learning (EXL) Fellows Program. Students may participate in existing programs or pursue their own interests through a self-designed experience. These (co-curricular) experiences consist of activities that complement coursework and involve significant reflection. To be recognized as an EXL Fellow, students and their faculty advisors must submit a formal proposal to the Center for Engaged and Experiential Learning envisioned in the Strategic Plan, or other designated approval body.

Fellowship experiences generally fall into the following categories:

- Study abroad or cultural immersion;
- Independent undergraduate research;
- Creative activity, including original work in the arts;
- Internships;
- Field experiences designed to integrate academic study and career exploration; or
- Civic engagement.

We anticipate that many current departmental senior experiences meet the guidelines for an EXL opportunity, either as recognized courses or as part of the Fellows program. Once the curriculum is fully implemented, Trinity will consider designing an EXL certificate.
MOTION TO CREATE CURRICULAR GUIDELINES,
TO BE INCLUDED IN THE UNIVERSITY CURRICULUM COUNCIL BYLAWS

If approved by the Academic Faculty Assembly, the proposed handbook language (below) will appear in the 2014-15 version of the University Curriculum Council Bylaws, Faculty and Contract Staff Handbook, Chapter 2B, Article VII.

ARTICLE VII: CURRICULAR GUIDELINES

The following guidelines are intended to assist the University Curriculum Council in the work of implementing and assessing the Trinity Curriculum.

CURRICULAR ELEMENT I: THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE

A. Learning Outcomes:
Upon successful completion of the First-Year Experience (FYE), students will have demonstrated the ability to analyze and interpret sophisticated texts and ideas through:

- analytical and argumentative writing.
- reasoned discussion of substantive issues.
- oral presentations.
- locating and evaluating diverse information sources to enhance their understanding of course materials.

B. Course Requirements:
To be designated as fulfilling the First-Year Experience (FYE) requirement, a course will:

- consist of at least three sections, in the fall semester, linked by a common syllabus and a weekly common learning experience for students and faculty.
- include substantial instruction in written and oral communication.
- address a topic of widespread or enduring significance.
- articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

C. Student Requirements:
To receive credit for successful completion of a First-Year Experience (FYE) course, students will:

- discuss reading and lecture material in both subsections as a preliminary to writing essays.
- read approximately 1,200 pages of text.
- write at least 40 double-spaced pages of academic prose.
- demonstrate mastery of the course material in a 75-minute midterm and a three-hour final examination.
- give at least two oral presentations, with visual media support if appropriate.
locate and evaluate diverse sources of information.

D. Additional Notes:

• Students will receive one grade for the course, to be determined by the two faculty members in consultation with each other.

• First-year experience courses will be taught in the fall semester.

• Course materials are expected to draw on a variety of disciplines.

• The 40 pages of academic prose required of the students will be divided between the two subsections of the course. The topics of response papers may be developed for longer essays.

• Students will receive extensive critical commentary on both shorter and longer essays. This commentary will emphasize the development of writing skills in the following areas:
  o a focused introduction that establishes the terms of the argument.
  o a thesis, including a claim worth arguing, clearly defined terms, and a significant discursive context to be addressed.
  o logical structure in progressively unfolding paragraphs.
  o examples from the primary material and secondary sources in support of the thesis.
  o attention to relevant counter-arguments.
  o closure in the form of a balanced relation between summative conclusion and the issue(s) raised in the introduction.
  o well-formed paragraphs, with directive topic/transitional sentences, appropriate secondary sourcing and exemplification, and concluding sentences that prepare the way for the subsequent paragraph.
  o clear, unambiguous sentences based predominantly on active verbs.
  o citations, correctly formatted, where appropriate.
CURRICULAR ELEMENT II: THE CORE CAPACITIES

Written Communication (WC)

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of a Written Communication (WC) course, students will have demonstrated the ability to:

Either:
- write a sustained academic work with appropriate use of evidence and developed reasoning to support an argument.
- improve their writing in response to feedback.
- craft prose that conforms to the conventions of the relevant discipline.

Or, if satisfying part of the Written Communication (WC) requirement with a creative writing course, understood to include creative nonfiction, fiction, journalism, playwriting, poetry, screenwriting, etc.:
- write a sustained piece of original artistic work in a literary genre.
- improve their writing in response to feedback.
- use techniques and methods of the relevant genre or practice.

B. Course Requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Written Communication (WC) requirement, a course will:
- provide substantive and explicit instruction in the skills necessary for creating a sustained piece of writing as described in the Learning Outcomes. The nature of this instruction must be specified in the syllabus.
- provide multiple opportunities for students to employ and improve these skills, whether through several distinct written assignments or drafts of a single assignment.
- provide substantive written critical comments on students’ written work aimed at helping students improve their writing.
- be designed so that at least 20% of the course grade is determined by Written Communication (WC) curricular elements.
- articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of a Written Communication (WC) course, students will:
- Compose sustained original written text(s) developed throughout the semester as described in the Learning Outcomes.
D. Additional Notes
Ideally, Written Communication courses will have no more than 15 students, since providing substantive written critical comments is time-consuming.

Oral and Visual Communication (OVC)

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of an Oral and Visual Communication (OVC) course, students will have demonstrated the ability to:

- identify and use the elements of effective oral and visual communication.
- create and deliver effectively structured oral presentations using language correctly and appropriately.
- use visual media that are effective, appropriate, and well integrated into the presentation.
- analyze and critique oral and visual components of presentations.
- respond effectively to questions and comments from audience members.

B. Course Requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Oral and Visual Communication (OVC) requirement, a course will:

- provide substantial instruction in effective oral and visual communication.
- require students to create, analyze, and critique presentations that include oral and visual components that are suited to a purpose and context.
- enable students to a) learn the principles, models, and resources of oral and visual communication that distinguish it from written communication and b) develop an awareness of how people rhetorically construct themselves.
- be designed so that at least 20% of the course grade is determined by Oral and Visual Communication (OVC) curricular elements.
- articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of an Oral and Visual Communication (OVC) course, students will:

- complete substantial presentations or other projects.
- complete both oral and visual communication self-evaluations and critiques of others.
- complete at least one presentation that incorporates feedback from self-evaluations and critiques from an earlier presentation.

D. Additional Notes
One of the courses may be satisfied by an intensive, assessed experience such as successfully delivering a presentation that has oral and visual components at a national conference or in a student
research symposium, provided that preparation for such a presentation has been overseen by a faculty member and included substantial critique and revision of prior versions of the presentation. Credit for such presentations will be awarded only with the approval of the faculty mentor. To receive credit for such an experience the student must submit an OVC Credit form to the registrar with the signature of the faculty member who oversaw the presentation.

Digital Literacy (DL)

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of a Digital Literacy (DL) course, students will have demonstrated the ability to accomplish at least three of the following:

- program computers or manipulate software to solve problems, especially those that would be tedious, if not impossible, for humans to do without computers.
- program computers or manipulate software to produce solutions to aesthetic problems or engage in artistic expression.
- program computers or manipulate software to gather, manipulate, aggregate, organize (using meta-data), or analyze data, and to present information (in tabular and graphic format) attending to principles of design.
- analyze and effectively communicate features, capabilities, limitations, and development trends of digital technologies.
- understand and critically evaluate the social, political, psychological, or economic impact of digital information/media (e.g., related to social networks, privacy, copyright, crowdsourcing, etc.).

B. Course Requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Digital Literacy (DL) requirement, a course will:

- provide instruction both in the theory and the techniques necessary to complete a digital work using at least one appropriate technology, with the focus on developing the technical facility (Students must learn “how” to complete a digital work using at least one appropriate technology, not just “about” it).
- provide appropriate instruction about how software tools work to make it easier to learn and use new tools over time.
- enable students to apply their learning in the creation of a digital artifact.
- enable students to explore at least three of the student learning outcomes, as specified in the syllabus.
- be designed so that at least 20% of the course grade is determined by Digital Literacy (DL) curricular elements.
- articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.
C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of a Digital Literacy (DL) course, students will:

- use digital technologies to achieve three or more of the student learning outcomes stated above.
- engage in advanced usage of software tools to produce a digital artifact of the work done in the class.
- demonstrate a critical understanding of how digital technologies impact our world in class discussions, in written essay form and/or in their creative or artistic work.

D. Additional Notes
- It is recommended that the course provide evidence in the syllabus of at least two instructional modes for supporting student learning, i.e., online tutorials and/or instructional videos as well as conceptual explanations or additional instructional support in the form of a senior/advanced student, another faculty member, or staff technology consultant.

Global Awareness (GA)

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of a Global Awareness (GA) course, students will have demonstrated the ability to:

- analyze major historical events and processes that have given the regions in question their unique cultural character or affected their relations with other regions and peoples of the world.
- identify and articulate the perspectives and values of diverse peoples, groups, institutions, and cultures of regions outside the United States.
- gather and evaluate information from scholarly sources concerning the perspectives and values of the peoples of regions outside the United States.

B. Course Requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Global Awareness (GA) requirement, a course will:

- provide substantial instruction concerning the cultures, perspectives, and values of the peoples of one or more regions outside the United States.
- involve the study of one region only, the comparative study of two or more regions, or the study of the relations among two or more regions outside the United States.
- articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of a Global Awareness (GA) course, students will:

- read scholarly works concerning the cultures, perspectives, and values of peoples of the regions in question.
Complete at least one major presentation, paper, or research project focusing on the cultures, perspectives, and values of the peoples of the regions in question.

**Understanding Diversity (DV)**

**A. Learning Outcomes**
Upon completion of an Understanding Diversity (DV) course, students will have demonstrated the ability to:
- identify and articulate the diverse human experiences, identities, and cultures in the United States.
- analyze how social and cultural systems adapt to changing historical circumstances.
- analyze differences in power and privilege among groups and how these differences may lead to the domination, exploitation, and exclusion of some groups by others.
- gather and evaluate information from scholarly sources concerning diversity.

**B. Course Requirements**
To be designated as fulfilling the Understanding Diversity (DV) requirement, a course will:
- provide substantial instruction in the social, political, cultural, or historical dimensions of one or more enduring social or cultural divisions in the United States, such as race, ethnicity, ability, linguistic difference, social class, gender, religion, or sexuality.
- demonstrate how scholars in one or more academic disciplines study enduring social or cultural divisions.
- explore how social or cultural divisions help define groups and their relation to power, privilege, and oppression.
- articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

**C. Student Requirements**
To receive credit for successful completion of an Understanding Diversity (DV) course, students will:
- read scholarly works concerning diversity.
- complete at least one major presentation, paper, or research project focusing on a diversity topic.

**D. Additional Notes**
- A student may also fulfill the Understanding Diversity requirement by successfully completing an approved independent study or internship that meets all the requirements, objectives, and outcomes listed above.
- Ideally, students will explore means of communicating cross-culturally and interacting effectively in a diverse society.
**Foreign Language (FL)**

**A. Learning outcomes**
Upon successful completion of a Foreign Language course, students will have demonstrated the ability to:
- communicate at the appropriate level of the course.
- read and write texts using appropriate vocabulary and grammar.
- understand the spoken language and to speak at an appropriate conversational speed. For ancient languages, students should read aloud with accurate pronunciation, phrase grouping and inflection.
- articulate general knowledge of the foreign cultural tradition(s) associated with their language of study, including historical and contemporary traditions and values.

**B. Course Requirements**
To be designated as fulfilling the Foreign Language requirement, a course will:
- provide substantial instruction in the acquisition of communication skills in a modern or ancient language.
- provide opportunities for students to participate in conversations, and to read and write texts of the appropriate level of difficulty, using appropriate vocabulary and grammar.
- articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

**C. Additional Notes**
- A student fulfills the **Foreign Language (FL)** requirement by successfully completing the INTERMEDIATE 1 Level or higher of a foreign language sequence in a modern or ancient language taught at Trinity University, or by demonstrating equivalent proficiency by examination.
CURRICULAR ELEMENT III: APPROACHES TO CREATION AND ANALYSIS

Humanities

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of a Humanities course, students will have demonstrated the ability to:
• discuss the significance of ideas, texts, performances, or cultural artifacts within an appropriate intellectual or historical framework.
• apply the interpretive or analytical methods that characterize at least one of the humanistic disciplines.

B. Course Requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Humanities requirement, a course will:
• enable students to understand the human condition through the study of the arts, literature, history, philosophy, religion, or related disciplines (humanities).
• provide substantial instruction, direction, and/or modeling in the themes and content of the relevant discipline or disciplines.
• introduce students to the critical approaches and methodologies of the relevant discipline or disciplines.
• articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of a Humanities course, students will:
• produce written work or other artifacts that demonstrate competence in the learning outcomes stated above.

Creative Expression (CE)

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of a Creative Expression (CE) course, students will have demonstrated the ability to:
• create an aesthetic artifact or performance that demonstrates an understanding of disciplinary techniques.
• reflect on and critically assess their creative work.

B. Course requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Creative Expression (CE) requirement, a course will:
• provide substantial instruction about the creative process.
• engage students practically in the making of aesthetic artifacts or performances.
• offer students the opportunity to reflect on and critically assess the process and products of their creative work.
• articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of a Creative Expression (CE) course, students will:
• create at least one aesthetic artifact or performance that is a substantial and primary part of the course.
• reflect on and critically assess their creative work, either in class discussions, meetings with the instructor, and/or through written assignments.

Social and Behavioral Sciences

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon the successful completion of a Social and Behavioral Sciences course, students will have demonstrated the ability to:
• identify and articulate the major concepts and approaches utilized in one of the social or behavioral sciences.
• collect, analyze, or interpret relevant scientific evidence and formulate conclusions based on that evidence.
• identify and articulate the limitations of the approaches (e.g., theories, models, methodologies) within one of the social or behavioral sciences.

B. Course Requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement, a course will:
• provide substantial instruction in human behavior and social interactions.
• examine at least one of the basic theoretical, analytical, or methodological approaches of the social and behavioral sciences, elucidating the selected approach or approaches within the broader context of the social and behavioral sciences.
• utilize quantitative and/or qualitative methods (e.g., causal reasoning, hypothesis testing, experimental design, modeling, critical analysis, ethnography, fieldwork, interviewing) in the analysis of human behavior and social interactions.
• articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of the Social and Behavioral Sciences requirement, students will:
• demonstrate mastery of the learning outcomes through written assignments, exams, or projects, and oral presentations and/or class discussion.
• provide critiques which incorporate discussion of the shortcomings of theories, models and methods within one of the social and behavioral sciences.

Natural Sciences

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of a Natural Sciences course, students will have demonstrated the ability to:
• identify and articulate the difficulties and choices related to data collection by either (a) planning and conducting data collection or (b) acquiring a “raw” (non-processed) data set and investigating the methods by which it was collected (metadata).
• effectively use quantitative methods such as statistical analysis or model construction to interpret data.
• produce effective visual representations of scientific data (e.g., a graph) and communicate a scientifically valid interpretation of visually represented data.
• apply the results of scientific concepts and research to the natural world.

B. Course Requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Natural Sciences requirement, a course will provide opportunities for students to:
• apply scientific reasoning to the collection and evaluation of data in order to solve problems within the context of an existing body of scientific knowledge.
• learn how scientific studies are designed and executed, and recognize the implications of design choices.
• apply quantitative reasoning techniques, such as statistics or model development, in the analysis and evaluation of scientific data.
• effectively communicate the data and results of scientific studies.
• find and critically analyze sources of scientific information.
• apply scientific concepts/research to the natural world.
• articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of a Natural Sciences course, students will:
• evaluate factors associated with the design of an experiment or challenges associated with the acquisition of raw data.
• find and critically analyze sources of scientific information.
• on multiple occasions (a) collect and analyze data (descriptive, experimental, or computational) or (b) investigate and analyze raw data sets collected by others.
on multiple occasions, analyze and interpret data using quantitative methods such as statistical evaluation or model construction.

- on multiple occasions, produce an effective visual representation of scientific data and communicate a scientifically valid interpretation of that data.

- on multiple occasions, apply scientific concepts/results (e.g., data, recent scientific advances, laws, theories) in a broader context related to the natural world.

D. Additional Notes
The Student Requirements listed here are intended to provide artifacts that permit assessment of student achievement for all Learning Outcomes listed above. Assessment tools may include (but are not limited to) lab reports, problem sets, examinations, oral presentations, or research papers. A single assessment tool (e.g., a research paper) may fulfill multiple Student Requirements.

Quantitative Reasoning

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of a Quantitative Reasoning (QR) course, student will have demonstrated the ability to:

- represent and solve a problem in a framework involving mathematics, statistics, computation, or symbolic logic.

- communicate their results.

- describe the significance and limitations of the quantitative approach.

B. Course Requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Quantitative Reasoning (QR) requirement, a course will:

- enable students to represent and solve problems within a quantitative framework involving mathematics, statistics, computation, or symbolic logic.

- provide diverse opportunities for students to articulate both their process and communicate their results.

- be structured so that quantitative methods are the primary focus of the course.

- articulate the official Learning Outcomes (see above) in the course syllabus.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of the Quantitative Reasoning (QR) requirement, students must engage in appropriate learning activities to enable them to demonstrate the learning outcomes.
CURRICULAR ELEMENT IV: THE INTERDISCIPLINARY CLUSTER

A. Learning Outcomes
Upon successful completion of an Interdisciplinary Cluster students will have demonstrated the ability to:

- place the cluster topic in a critical context and articulate how multiple disciplinary methods inform the study of the topic.
- use analytical and interpretive methods appropriate to at least two disciplines.
- exhibit a critical understanding of differences in methodology between multiple disciplines.
- draw connections between the completed coursework.

B. Requirements
To be designated as fulfilling the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirement, an Interdisciplinary Cluster will:

- enable students to employ analytical and interpretive methods from two or more disciplinary approaches to examine a significant question.
- consist of five or more courses from at least three disciplines that address a particular topic or theme.

C. Student Requirements
To receive credit for successful completion of an Interdisciplinary Cluster, students will:

- take three cluster courses from three disciplines and at least two disciplinary groups.
- maintain a portfolio that includes assignments produced in each course.
- complete a final synthesis project that demonstrates the learning outcomes. This assignment will be designed and completed in consultation with the committee in charge of interdisciplinary clusters.

D. Additional Notes

- The cluster requirement can also be met by a student-designed three-course learning experience that meets the requirements in A, B and C above and is approved by the faculty involved in those courses, the committee in charge of interdisciplinary clusters, and the University Curriculum Council.
- The synthesis project will be a one-credit course administered by an appropriately compensated Clustermeister.
- Courses used to fulfill the Interdisciplinary Cluster requirement may also be used to fulfill Core Capacity requirements, a minor, or a second major. Only one course of the Interdisciplinary Cluster may be used to fulfill the requirements of the primary major.
- Clusters must have a means of coordinating among participating faculty, reviewing new courses proposed for a cluster, and conducting final student evaluations.
• Ideally, students will complete the Interdisciplinary Cluster by the end of their sophomore year.