

UNIVERSITY SENATE AGENDA
April 8, 2011: 1:45 pm, Rowan Hall Auditorium

ATTENDEES: Smitesh Bakrania, Tom Bendtsen, Lori Block, Gregory Caputo, Joe Cassidy, Bruce Caswell, Jay Chaskes, Hanmei Chen, Joel Crichlow, Robert D’Intino, Tom Doddy, Carol Eigenbrot, Jess Everett, Jon Foglein, Richard Fopeano, Bill Freind, Zenaida Gephardt, Eddie Guerra, Julie Haynes, Karen Haynes, Greg Hecht, Erin Herberg, Marlena Herman, Valarie Lee, Janet Lindman, Douglas Mann, Douglas Mapp, Deb Martin, Corinne Meredith, Eric Milou, Darren Nicholson, Diana Nicolae, Anne Phillips, Peter Rattigan, Dan Reigel, Will Riddell, Connie Rosenberger, Christine Saum, Nick Schmelz, Richard Scott, Midge Shuff, Sonia Spencer, Eileen Stutzbach, Uma Thayasivam, Barbara Williams, Tricia Yurak, Ieva Zake.

NOT IN ATTENDANCE: (Represented by Alternates) Herb Appelson represented by Jen Thwing, Jennifer Courtney represented by Julia Chang, Gerald Hough represented by Courtney Richmond, Rory McElwee represented by Michelle Soreth, Robi Polikar represented by Ravi Ramachandran, Pat Alexy-Stoll represented by April Ellerbee.

NOT IN ATTENDANCE: David Applebaum, Joe Basso (2nd consecutive absence), Mark Berkey-Gerard, Kate Boland, David Clowney (2nd consecutive absence), Larry Depasquale, Sue Hersh, Donna Jorgensen, Lili Levinowitz (3rd consecutive absence), Lawrence Markowitz, Jacqueline McCafferty, Lane Savadove, Skeff Thomas, Mary Beth Walpole.

1. Approval of Agenda – moved, seconded, approved
2. Introductions of Visitors - none
3. Approval of Minutes from March 11, 2011 (separate file) moved, seconded, approved with notation to add statement about discussion of presidential search.
4. President’s Report (page 3)
5. Committee Reports
 - a. Resolutions: Second Readings
 - i. Senate Technological Resources Committee Resolution on Equitable Scheduling of TEC Classrooms (page 7) - request to table until May meeting – moved, seconded, passed.
 - ii. Chairs Council: Senate Resolution to revise Senate Resolution 980224-1: “Election of Department Chairpersons” (pages 8-10) – Jeff Maxson not present to address concerns brought forth. Request to table – moved, seconded, tabled with one nay vote.
 - iii. APP: Resolution to Revise Senior Privilege Policy (page 11) – Motion made, seconded, carried with correction of one typo “Director” to “Dean”
 - iv. Ad Hoc Committee on Academic Integrity - Resolution to create a standing committee (pages 12-13) – Represent over six years of work to get this accomplished. The purpose of this resolution is to keep the Senate involved in the policy/process. Motion made, seconded, passed.
 - b. Curriculum Committee Report (page 14) Twelve Process C proposals. Items 206, 207, 216, 218, 715-719, 728 and 802 moved, seconded and passed unanimously. Item 321 moved, seconded and passed with 1 abstention.
 - c. Resolutions: First Readings
 - i. Resolution of Acclamation and Appreciation for President Donald Farish (page 15) – Motion to waive requirement for multiple readings moved, seconded and passed. Resolution was revised and currently reads as shown on page 15, then moved, seconded and passed with one opposed. The President will be at the University Assembled event at 1:45PM in the Student Center Ballroom on Friday, April 29th. A reception for President Farish will follow with refreshments for all. Ed Streb will give short talk, “roast,” and others are welcome to offer tributes to the president.
 - ii. Academic Policies & Procedures Resolutions

1. Resolution to Revise and Rename Laptop Policy (page 16) – first reading, take to departments for feedback. Purpose of policy is to promote use of these devices, but not to distract others in classroom.
 2. Resolution to Revise Policy for Repeating a Course (page 17) – First reading, take to departments for comments.
 3. Resolution to Revise the Academic Integrity Policy (pages 18-19) – First reading, bring back to departments.
- d. Budget and Planning Committee Report (page 20) – Under Ali Houchmand the UBPC is being included. Financial reports now being made available to entire committee by way of the open area, as compared to previous years when this information was requested but not provided. Committee requested cost savings suggestions from university community and received 75 ideas for savings or revenue generation. State appropriation goes to Cooper and then to Rowan, but so far Rowan has not gotten it. Apparently Cooper will be keeping it until June 30th. Amount of approx. 20 million dollars.

6. Old Business
7. New Business
8. Adjournment

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

1. Presidential Search Committee Update (page 3) – Search Committee will be announced Monday. Committee will consist of 5 board members, 1 student, 2 faculty members, 1 staff member, 1 dean, 1 CWA person. Jay Chaskes and Christy Faison will be liaisons to the committee but will have no vote.
2. CLAS Changes (pages 4-5) The information spoken about by Cindy Vito at our March senate meeting has been announced to the university community in an official statement. This shift of advising in the CLAS from faculty to professional advisors is stated to be saving the college four faculty FTE's. However, after considering the three half-time Assistant dean positions and the Senior Fellow, it appears the actual savings will be only a 2.25 FTE. About half of the departments are going to make this shift of advising for 2011-2012 academic year. The rest of the CLAS departments will switch over for the 2012-2013 academic year. For the upcoming year there will be a projected 2000 students to be advised by only four professional advisors.
3. Graduate Assistantships for 2011-12 – most departments won't be able to afford graduate assistantships. Provost has said he is willing to assist with payment of some GA positions. Departments should write a proposal to ask for funding from the Provost. Include what the GA will do, what value the GA would add, what % the department can pay, and propose what % the dean and Provost should pay.
4. Dean of Engineering Candidate Interviews – try to attend
 - a. Mohammad Alan: April 18th at 10:15AM in Lib 326
 - b. Shashi Lalvani: April 20th at 10:15AM in Lib 326
 - c. Joseph Rencis: April 27th at 10:15AM in Lib 326
5. Vice President for Enrollment Management Interviews – try to attend
 - a. John Dempsey: April 11th at 9:30AM in Linden Hall, Room 112
 - b. Jeff Hand: April 12th at 9:30AM in Robinson Hall, Dewey Lounge, Room 110
 - c. Art Goon: April 15th at 2:45PM in Linden Hall, Room 112
6. Search firm for presidential search will be on campus Friday. They will be in Student Center Room 144 at end of AFT meeting. It is important that many people be there to voice opinions and make our voices heard. Encourage others in departments to attend. Faculty must demonstrate interest and be as involved in this process as possible. Board won't expand size of committee, but we need to participate in other ways whenever possible.
7. Ali Houshmand will address Senate in May.

TO: H. Reed, Chairwoman Board of Trustees
FROM: E. Milou, President University Senate
DATE: March 25, 2011
RE: President Search Committee

On behalf of the University Senate, please accept my sincere appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the presidential search process. The Board's willingness to engage the University Community in the process is an excellent example of shared governance at its best.

As the body representing the University faculty and staff, the University Senate developed a process with detailed criteria for Presidential Search Committee candidates. We were pleased with the opportunity to share this process with you. As I discussed with you, the process was open and transparent. We understand and appreciate that openness and transparency are critical elements of how the Board will carry out the presidential search.

As part of the University Senate presidential search committee nomination process, members of the University Community submitted nomination packets with the detailed information outlined by the nomination process. The nomination packets were reviewed by a committee of the University Senate. Committee members ranked each packet and average rankings were computed for each nominee. On the basis of these rankings, the University Senate recommends seven (7) individuals for your consideration. They are listed below and relevant application information for each nominee is attached.

1. Sandy Tweedie
2. Skeffington Thomas
3. David Clowney
4. Cindy Vitto
5. Jay Chaskes
6. Jay Kuder
7. Peter Rattigan

We know that the Board will give these nominees its every consideration and trust that the presidential search process will include the best aspects of shared governance. It is in this spirit, that we look forward to working with you and to a successful outcome in the presidential search process.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or if I can be of assistance in any way. It is a pleasure for me to work with you and the Board. I know that you recognize the importance and the benefit of working with the talents and commitment of the University Community. Finally, I extend an invitation to you to address the University Senate on April 8th at 2pm.

TO: CLAS Faculty and Staff
FROM: Parviz Ansari, Dean, CLAS
DATE: March 11, 2011
RE: Reorganization Within the College

Yesterday afternoon, at the meeting of all CLAS department chairs, I announced various changes in the College that will take place beginning July 1, 2011. Because these changes will affect everyone in the College in one way or another, I want to make sure that all faculty and staff have a clear understanding of the coming changes and the opportunities that will become available:

1. First, at the University level, the decision has been made to divide the CAP Center into two separate entities, a center for career counseling and a separate center for academic advising. This shift will take effect July 1, 2011.
 - a. Career guidance and counseling will continue to be performed by CAP Center advisors under the direction of Lizziel Sullivan. The CAP Center will remain within the division of Student Affairs.
 - b. Academic advising for CLAS will be handled by professional staff advisors within an academic advising center (official name of the unit and exact number of advisors not yet determined). Professional staff advising will be phased in for our College during a two-year period. Please note that faculty are expected to continue to act as mentors to students and to answer questions about the discipline and potential careers that are beyond the scope of professional staff advisors.
2. I am looking for departments willing to shift their student advising during the 2011-12 academic year to the new academic advising center. Departments who elect to do this will relinquish their reassigned time for advising. We anticipate that all departments will shift their advising to the academic advising center the following year. This shift from faculty to professional staff advising should help the College regain approximately four faculty FTE's.
3. Kristen diNovi will be stepping out of her role as Assistant Dean and will assume the new title of Director of the soon-to-be-created advising center for the College. Kristen will be meeting soon with chairs in order to make this two-year transition to professional staff advising as seamless as possible for our students.
4. At the College level, it has become apparent that the Dean's Office is severely understaffed. Although we are by far the largest College, we have no more administrative staff than any of the other smaller Colleges. I have been able to negotiate with Dr. Houshmand for three additional half-time Assistant Deans, who will come from faculty. I will soon be posting College-wide notices asking for applications for the following positions, to begin July 1, 2011:
 - a. Assistant Dean for Student Affairs (to handle student issues Kristen previously dealt with)
 - b. Assistant Dean for Grants and Research
 - c. Assistant Dean for Assessment and Planning
5. The Assistant Dean positions will replace the Fellow positions (Dean's Fellow and Assessment Fellow) that I created this year.
6. To achieve a better balance in her work and personal life, and also to return to her true vocation of teaching, Cindy Vitto has made the decision to step down as Associate Dean as of June 30, 2011. She will continue to devote 1/4 of her time each semester to working with the Dean's Office and will assume the title of "Senior Fellow." I will soon be posting a College-wide notice asking for applications for Associate Dean, to begin July 1, 2011. Although the College and the Dean's Office in particular will miss having Cindy as a full-time presence, we look forward to continuing to work with her.
7. Because the business of the College has grown enormously, I have also been granted permission to hire a full-time Director of Finance. This individual will not deal with academic affairs but will serve as a fiscal planner for the College, as an assistant to me in fundraising and alumni relations, and as a public relations officer (picking up the PR duties Kristen has been handling). I will soon be posting a University-wide notice asking for applications for this position, to begin July 1, 2011.

I realize that in this time of general transition for the University, it may be difficult for us to absorb even more changes at the College level. However, be assured that the “Dean’s Team” remains intact, although the roles that Kristen and Cindy play will be altered next year and other members of faculty (or staff in the case of the Director of Finance) will be stepping forward into new positions within the Dean’s Office. Our goal remains to serve our students the best we can and also to work with our faculty and staff in a collegial, collaborative manner.

Please help us to make this transition as smooth as possible by nominating either yourself or a colleague for one of the positions that will soon be available, and please let me know if you have any questions as we move forward.

Summary:

Current Dean’s Office

Dean - Parviz Ansari

Associate Dean - Cindy Vitto

Assistant Dean – Kristen diNovi

Dean’s Fellow (3 credits) - DJ Angelone

Assessment Fellow (stipend) - Alison Krufka

Dean’s Office as of July 1, 2011

Dean – Parviz Ansari

Associate Dean (full-time position)

Director of Finance (full-time position)

Assistant Dean for Student Affairs (half-time)

Assistant Dean for Grants and Research (half-time)

Assistant Dean for Assessment and Planning (half-time)

Senior Fellow – Cindy Vitto (3 credits)

Senate Technological Resources Committee
Resolution on Equitable Scheduling of TEC Classrooms

Background:

Over the last 15 years, instructional technology has become a mainstay of teaching pedagogy. Electronic slideshows, the inclusion of internet and personal video into lectures and recitations, and the use of diverse media sources to enrich the educational experience have become standards for modern teaching. In addition, the pervasiveness of technology in the lives of all aspects of the Rowan community expands the learning environment from the classroom into the world. Despite the numerous advantages of instructional technology, the ability for instructors and faculty to schedule TEC Classrooms is limited by the lack of rooms across campus, and a request system that is inefficient.

One of the main roadblocks to reserving a TEC Classroom for classes is the required online form an instructor or staff member must fill out well in advance of the relevant semester. Individual faculty members frequently do not have their schedules finalized until late in the semester before the class commences, and therefore cannot provide the requested time and day reservations needed to guarantee a TEC classroom. The form currently being used must be submitted almost a full year before the class, and frequently has an incorrect semester indicated on the form (the website still indicates a deadline of 11/10/09 for the 2010 year). In addition, there is no feedback to the faculty requesting a TEC room that the request was received or awarded.

Therefore, this resolution intends to remedy this inequity by requesting that the academic scheduling office post more accurate information on the Tech classroom reservation form, and to allow faculty to reserve TEC rooms up until the month before final examinations to allow all faculty to have equal opportunity to be scheduled in the room that is the best fit to the class's needs. This will increase the number of classes that are properly assigned TEC classrooms, and decrease room changes that occur when instructors find that the room scheduled does not have the required technology.

Resolution:

Whereas the use of instructional technology has become a standard practice in teaching pedagogy over the last 15 years

Whereas there are limited TEC Classrooms at Rowan University

Whereas the reservation system requires faculty and staff to reserve a room well in advance of the date of final instructional scheduling by Departments.

Whereas many individuals do not have their instructional schedules finalized until several months before the academic semester begins.

Whereas each individual should have an equal opportunity to schedule a TEC Classroom if it is his/her choice, even if it necessitates a change in day or time of the class.

Be it also resolved that the University Senate recommends to the Office of the Registrar to institute a reservation policy that provides all faculty the opportunity to schedule a TEC Classroom until the deadline for Departments to finalize their instructional schedule. Non-TEC classroom scheduling will not be affected by this resolution.

Be it also resolved that the Registrar schedule TEC rooms based on the reservations received ONLY after the end of that Departmental deadline for final instructional schedules. Requestors will be notified in a timely fashion that the TEC request has been received, awarded, or denied due to space limitations. If a TEC classroom is unavailable for the days and times of the class, the faculty member and/or the Department will be given the opportunity to reschedule the class to accommodate the TEC request.

**Senate Resolution to revise Senate Resolution 980224-1:
“Election of Department Chairpersons”
3-8-2011**

1. WHEREAS there are no provisions in the “Election of Department Chairpersons” guidelines in the event that a chairperson steps down before his or her term is completed.

WHEREAS there are no provisions there for the case where a new department is created,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following be added after the eighth paragraph (beginning “If a chairperson cannot be elected”):

In the event that a chairperson resigns before the end of his or her term an election will be held according to the guidelines above. The person elected will then serve out the remainder of the term of the departing chairperson and the department will hold another election for chair for a three-year term. In the event that a new department is created (due to a merger or otherwise), a chair will be elected immediately from among the members who will constitute that department, and that chair will serve until the end of the three-year chairs’ term cycle at which other chairs are elected.

2. WHEREAS there are no provisions in the guidelines for a tie or a three-way election,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the following be added after the sixth paragraph (beginning “The person receiving”):

In the event that no candidate receives a majority of the votes of those eligible, a run-off election will be held. This could be the case if:

- * There is an election of three or more candidates, in which case the two candidates receiving the greatest number of votes will participate in the run-off election.

- * There is an election of two or more candidates and they receive an equal number of votes. In this case, a run-off between the same candidates will be held. This may be repeated in the case of another tie, or the department may vote to have the Dean or Vice President/Provost appoint a temporary chair as detailed below.

3. WHEREAS the number of members on the election committee is not relevant in the case of a tie vote in the department,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that in the “Often Asked Questions” section, question 6 should be deleted.

**ELECTION OF DEPARTMENT
CHAIRPERSONS
*Senate Resolution #980224-1***

Elections for all department chairpersons are to be held during the spring semester. Elections must be in accord with University Senate policy and the State/Union Agreement. All elections must be completed and reported to the appropriate Dean and the University Senate office by April 30.

Only the following are PEOPLE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE:

- All full-time permanent faculty, including those on leave.
- All full-time professional staff assigned to a department, including those on leave.
- All on-going three-quarter time faculty and professional staff assigned to an academic department, including those on leave.*
- Faculty on full-time alternate out-of-unit assignments are NOT eligible to vote.

Each election shall be by secret ballot and shall "be conducted in a formal, unquestionable procedure so that it will ensure a fair and just expression of each department member's preference." The elections are to be conducted by an odd-numbered election committee of the department. This committee will prepare ballots, make all other arrangements necessary for the balloting, EVEN IF THERE IS NO DECLARED OPPOSITION, and open and count ballots at the ballot box.

The ballot box is to be resealed and taken by members of the election committee to the office of the appropriate Academic Dean where it will be stored.

In any department, the election committee may request that a committee of the University Senate supervise election procedures. No member of that committee may be a member of the department conducting the election.

The person receiving a majority (ONE MORE THAN 50 PERCENT) of ALL ELIGIBLE VOTERS of a department shall be declared elected. The term of office for all newly-elected or re-elected chairpersons shall be three (3) years starting July 1st.

In the event that an election result is contested, or called into question by a department member, upon his/her formal written complaint to the Vice President/Provost within ten (10) days of the election, the Vice President/Provost or the appropriate Academic Dean will, in the presence of the complainant and the department election committee, re-open and cause to be recounted the ballots cast in the election. If this does not satisfy the complainant, the Vice-President/Provost may call for another election, which will then be held under his/her supervision. The Vice President/Provost may request that the University Senate also send a representative to aid in conducting the election. The vice President/Provost may not in any way attempt to influence the outcome of this election. The Vice President/Provost's sole concern will be with the election procedures. No further appeals may be made following this election.

If a chairperson cannot be elected from among department members, the department may seek a chairperson outside the immediate department. In the event the department is unable to elect a chairperson, the department may then, by simple majority, vote to have the appropriate Academic Dean or the Vice President/Provost appoint a temporary chairperson for no more than one (1) year.

*Ongoing three-quarter-time faculty who fill one-year temporary positions WILL BE eligible to vote. Temporary three-quarter time faculty who fill ongoing three-quarter time positions WILL NOT be eligible to vote.

Often Asked Questions About Election of Department Chairpersons:

1. How many times can the same person serve as chair?
Answer: Unlimited
2. No voice voting—must be done as outlined in Department Election of Chair Guidelines
3. If any faculty member(s) is out of town/country during election time, every effort must be made to reach this person(s).
4. Does chair have to be tenured?
Answer: No, but the president has been hesitant in approving non-tenured department chairs.
5. Can faculty members who will not be here next year vote for the department chairperson?
Answer: yes.
6. Tie?
Answer: An uneven number of faculty should be on a committee. Winner must have a majority of the vote.

Resolution to Revise Senior Privilege Policy

WHEREAS, the current policy regarding senior privilege does not require approval from the instructor of a graduate course.

WHEREAS, there are antiquated versions of the policy in circulation that should be replaced with one that uses current terminology.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,

That the policy regarding senior privilege should be changed to include the requirement for instructor approval.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,

That the attached policy be revised as shown in the attached version

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,

That a revised senior privilege form be implemented that includes all necessary signatures reflected in this revised policy.

Undergraduate Senior Privilege

Seniors at Rowan University who have earned a 3.0 GPA may request permission from The College of Graduate & Continuing Education (CGCE) to register for one graduate level course per semester for two semesters, not to exceed a total of six (6.0) credit hours. Students may take a graduate course for application to an undergraduate degree. If the number of graduate semester hours is to be applied to a graduate degree, the student must request a transfer of credit from The College of Graduate & Continuing Education (CGCE). Approval from the instructor of the graduate course(s), the department chair of the graduate program, the undergraduate program advisor, and The College of Graduate & Continuing Education (CGCE) is required for a student to be allowed to enroll in a graduate course for undergraduate credit. Permission and final approval for exceptions to the policy must also be obtained from the Dean or designee of The College of Graduate & Continuing Education (CGCE), who reserves the right to limit the number of graduate courses in which seniors may register. Undergraduate students who register for graduate level courses without permission of the Dean or designee of The College of Graduate & Continuing Education (CGCE) will have their registrations withdrawn.

RESOLUTION
TO CREATE A UNIVERSITY STANDING COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Submitted February 28, 2011, by Bruce Caswell on behalf of the Ad Hoc University Senate Committee on Academic Integrity.

Whereas, academic integrity is a core value of the university,

Whereas, as a core value of the university academic integrity should receive the constant vigilance, involvement, and promotion of the University Senate,

Therefore, be it resolved the University Senate establish through its by-laws a standing committee to be known as the Committee on Academic Integrity with the charge and membership provided below.

Rationale

The Academic Integrity Policy was developed by a University Senate Task Force created when three existing Senate Committees -- Professional Ethics and Welfare, Student Relations, and Academic Policies and Procedures -- raised questions about the adequacy of existing university policies, procedures, and training on academic integrity for both faculty and students.

Since the three aforementioned committees have distinct charges that do not meet the needs for academic integrity, the task force determined that a comprehensive approach is preferable if academic integrity policy is to maintain the high profile essential to the quality of the learning environment. With the creation of the Academic Integrity Policy, the Ad Hoc University Senate Committee on Academic Integrity was established to address the complex challenges of promoting a culture of academic integrity among instructors and students, raising the awareness of instructors and students, and enhancing professional expertise on academic integrity issues and strategies on campus. Since academic integrity is first and foremost a pedagogical and scholarly concern, the locus for these activities should remain in the University Senate. The hearing of individual offenses and the enforcement of policies would remain with the appropriate administrative units. This collaboration is consistent with the principle of shared governance and will serve to strengthen the University Community.

Charge

The University Senate Committee on Academic Integrity would be charged as follows:

- Develop expertise and serve as a resource on issues and strategies relating to academic integrity, including discipline-specific practices, copyright issues, the impact of digital media, and pedagogical best practices
- Organize design and delivery of curricular and co-curricular¹ resources and activities to support instructors and students including the Academic Integrity Seminar
(Note: The content of the Academic Integrity Seminar, along with the content of three faculty workshops and supporting materials and a presentation for doctoral students, has already been developed and will be made available to the committee.)
- Develop and deliver programming through the Division of Student Life to introduce new freshman and transfer students to our academic integrity policy and to support all students

The adjudication process as described in the Academic Integrity Policy will remain the responsibility of the Office of Academic Affairs, with the exception of the Academic Integrity Seminar. The committee will not replace the Academic Integrity Review Board nor be expected to participate in the adjudication process.

The Office of Academic Affairs will handle procedural matters pertaining to the Academic Integrity Seminar, including identifying and contacting students who are required to attend.

The Academic Policies and Procedures Committee will continue to have responsibility for refinements to the policy with comment and recommendations from the Committee on Academic Integrity.

The content of the Academic Integrity Seminar, along with the content of three faculty workshops and supporting materials and a presentation for doctoral students has already been developed and will be made available for use and/or adaptation by the committee.

The committee will be supported by the Office of Academic Affairs, the Faculty Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning, and the Division of Student Life, which will sponsor appropriate activities and provide support such as assistance with scheduling, arranging rooms, and making copies.

Membership

The membership of the University Senate Committee on Academic Integrity would be large, 21 in all, in keeping with the importance of the academic integrity to campus culture and operations. The committee would be composed of:

- Eight (8) faculty representatives from the six academic colleges, one faculty member each from Business, Fine and Performing Arts, Engineering, Communication, and Education and three faculty member each from Liberal Arts and Sciences representing the natural and physical sciences, humanities, and social and behavioral sciences.
- One representative from CGCE, either faculty or professional staff.
- One faculty representative from a graduate program.
- Two student representatives (plus an alternate).
- One representative from Instructional Technology.
- One librarian from the Campbell Library.
- One representative from Orientation and Student Leadership Programs, one representative from Residential Learning and University Housing, and one representative from the Academic Success Center.
- Non-voting liaisons designated by each of the Senate committees on Professional Ethics and Welfare, Student Relations, and Academic Policies and Procedures as well as the Senate Committee on Technological Resources, for a total of four liaisons.

Chair

The chair of the University Senate Committee on Academic Integrity would be elected annually from the Senate membership during the Senate's annual committee chair elections. The chair would fill one of the membership slots above according to the chair's department.

Curricular refers to learning activities that take place in the classroom or within the context of academic courses; co-curricular is the term for learning activities beyond the classroom. Here, it refers specifically to programs such as orientation and activities that are part of residential learning.

The Academic Integrity Seminar is a one-hour workshop that students are required to attend if found responsible for a serious violation by the Academic Integrity Hearing Board or if requested by the instructor as a sanction for any violation. The Seminar is usually offered twice a semester, depending on demand.

Report of the University Curriculum Committee
 April 8, 2011: Submitted by Janet Moore Lindman

Process C

SCC#	College	Title	Department
10-11-206	Communication	COGS in Editing and Publishing for Writers	Writing Arts
10-11-207	Communication	COGS in Creative Writing	Writing Arts
10-11-216	Communication	COGS in Technical and Professional Writing	Writing Arts
10-11-218	Communication	COGS in Writing and New Media	Writing Arts
10-11-321	Education	Creation/Dissolution of a Department	Teacher Education
10-11-715	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Geography and Environmental Studies	Geography/Anthropology
10-11-716	Liberal Arts and Sciences	BA in Geography	Geography/Anthropology
10-11-717	Liberal Arts and Sciences	BA in Integrated Studies in Geography/Environment	Geography/Anthropology
10-11-718	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Concentration in Applied Geographic Knowledge and Skills	Geography/Anthropology
10-11-719	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Concentration in Geographic Inquiries in Global Issues	Geography/Anthropology
10-11-728	Liberal Arts and Sciences	BS in Geographical Information Science	Geography/Anthropology
10-11-802	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Physics Courses	Astronomy/Physics

Process A

SCC#	College	Title	Department
10-11-120	Business	Management electives	Management/Entrepreneurship
10-11-125	Business	HRM in Health Promotion	Management/Entrepreneurship
10-11-127	Business	Personal Finance Management	Accounting/Finance
10-11-128	Business	Finance Major	Accounting/Finance
10-11-129	Business	Marketing Electives	Marketing/MIS
10-11-130	Business	Marketing Electives in MBA Marketing Specialization	Marketing/MIS
10-11-512	Fine and Performing Arts	Arts Administration Leadership	Theatre/Dance
10-11-513	Fine and Performing Arts	Producing and the Arts	Theatre/Dance
10-11-514	Fine and Performing Arts	Arts Planning: An Elegant Process	Theatre/Dance
10-11-515	Fine and Performing Arts	Audience Development	Theatre/Dance
10-11-516	Fine and Performing Arts	Education and Outreach Programs in the Arts	Theatre/ Dance
10-11-517	Fine and Performing Arts	Curatorial Practice in the Arts	Theatre/Dance
10-11-518	Fine and Performing Arts	Independent Study in Graduate Theatre and Arts Administration	Theatre/ Dance
10-11-519	Fine and Performing Arts	Production/Performance/Arts Administration Project	Theatre/Dance
10-11-520	Fine and Performing Arts	Internship in the Arts	Theatre/Dance
10-11-808	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Computer Science Specializations	Computer Science
10-11-810	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Compiler Design Theory	Computer Science
10-11-811	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Concepts in Artificial Intelligence	Computer Science
10-11-812	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Information Visualization	Computer Science
10-11-813	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Computer Animation	Computer Science
10-11-814	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Advanced TCP/IP and Internet Protocols and Technologies	Computer Science
10-11-815	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Wireless Networks and Systems	Computer Science
10-11-816	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Computer Networks	Computer Science
10-11-817	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Design Implementation of Operating Systems	Computer Science
10-11-818	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Computer Game Design Development	Computer Science
10-11-819	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Introduction to Computer Game Design	Computer Science
10-11-820	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Advanced Software Engineering	Computer Science
10-11-821	Liberal Arts and Sciences	Computer Graphics	Computer Science

<p>ROWAN UNIVERSITY SENATE</p> <p>RESOLUTION OF ACCLAMATION AND APPRECIATION FOR PRESIDENT DONALD J. FARISH</p>

Whereas President Farish led Rowan University on an historic path, transforming this institution into a well-respected regional university,

Whereas President Farish directed the construction of new academic facilities including Science Hall and Education Hall,

Whereas President Farish has strengthened relationships between the University and the borough of Glassboro, leading to the development of the Rowan Boulevard project,

Whereas President Farish has directed the initial phase of establishing Cooper Medical School of Rowan University,

Be it resolved that the University Senate expresses its deep gratitude and appreciation to President Donald J. Farish for his exemplary leadership of the university community.

Resolution to Revise and Rename Laptop Policy

WHEREAS, the laptop policy is in need of revision to include a diverse range of mobile electronic devices.

WHEREAS, the intent of the policy is to promote the use of these devices as a method of instruction.

WHEREAS, the uninhibited use of mobile electronic devices create distractions that are detrimental to the learning environment.

WHEREAS, proficiency in the English language is an implied prerequisite to attend Rowan University.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,
the laptop policy be renamed the Mobile Electronic Device policy

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
the Mobile Electronic Device Policy should clearly state that these devices are allowed at the discretion of the instructor and should not be used in a manner that is distracting to students or the instructor.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
instructors are under no obligation to allow the use of electronic dictionaries or translation devices beyond those needed to accommodate a documented disability

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
the policy be revised as shown in the attached version to enact the changes mentioned above.

Mobile Electronic Device Policy

The use of laptop or notebook microcomputers and other mobile electronic devices for classroom activities is allowed at the discretion of the instructor. The use of such electronic devices should not be a distraction to other students or the instructor. Students are expected to use electronic devices only as part of ongoing class activities. If an instructor believes the use of electronic devices is detrimental to the learning environment or gives any student an unfair advantage, then the instructor may prohibit their use at any time. Also, the use of any device for purposes of audio or video recording may occur only with the prior approval of the instructor.

The assumption is that proficiency in the English language is a requirement for attending Rowan University. Thus, instructors are under no obligation to allow the use of electronic dictionaries or translation devices beyond those needed to accommodate a documented disability. However, if an instructor allows the use of dictionaries or translation devices, the following guidelines should be followed:

- ✦ The instructor should verify that no advantage is gained from access to the device.
- ✦ The instructor should verify that the device cannot be used to access other information, either stored or Internet based.
- ✦ The instructor should state a policy on use of such devices to clarify what constitutes acceptable use and to ensure that there is no perception of unfair advantage on the part of other students in the class.

Resolution to Revise Policy for Repeating a Course

WHEREAS, the current policy regarding the repetition of a course is unclear and is subject to misinterpretation.

WHEREAS, the intent of the policy is to compel students to consult with a department if they wish to take a course more than twice.

~~WHEREAS, students repeating basic skills courses have a clear justification for such repetition.~~

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,
the policy should be revised to state clearly that approval from the department chairperson is required for a student to take course more than twice.

~~AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
basic skills courses should be exempted from this policy~~

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
the policy be revised as shown in the attached version to enact the changes mentioned above.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
the relevant approval form be changed to reflect this revised policy.

Repeating a Course

In the event that a student repeats a course, the grade received for the repeated course will constitute the final grade for that **course** for cumulative G.P.A. purposes whether the grade is higher or lower than the grade received in the original course. The original grade, although not counted in the cumulative G.P.A., remains on the student's transcript.

The same course may not be taken more than twice, including withdrawals, unless approval from the department chairperson where the course is housed is granted. The approval by the chairperson is for one repetition of the course, and further repetitions will require a separate approval. Previous approval is no guarantee of approval for future repetitions.

Except for general education and Rowan Experience courses, more stringent restrictions may be determined by the individual departments/colleges, only to meet standards recommended by accrediting bodies, statutory regulations, and/or professional societies.

Resolution to Revise the Academic Integrity Policy

WHEREAS, the instructional session required of some students for violations of academic integrity are referred to as “Academic Integrity Seminars” and are distinct from “Academic Integrity Workshops” offered for faculty and others.

WHEREAS, students are entitled to the submission of written statements and additional documentation in their defense to the Academic Integrity Review Board

WHEREAS, students are entitled to call witnesses to present testimony with advance approval of the Academic Integrity Review Board and guidelines should be provided for the conduct and rights of these witnesses if they are Rowan students.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED,
the term workshop be replaced with seminar in the Academic Integrity Policy

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
the attached statement regarding the submission of written statements and documentation be appended to the Academic Integrity Policy

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED,
the attached statement regarding the calling of witnesses be appended to the Academic Integrity Policy

1. Change the term workshop to seminar in two places:

Under section III

Level 1 Violations

Recommended Sanction(s): Make-up assignment at a more difficult level or assignment of no credit for work in question, required attendance at a **seminar** on academic honesty, and/or an assignment that will increase the student’s awareness of academic integrity.

Under section VII

Description of Sanctions

Notation of Academic Integrity Violation on Transcript: When a student fails a course for reasons of academic dishonesty, this will be noted on the student’s transcript. The notation will be removed from the transcript after the student completes an academic integrity **seminar** or its equivalent. The student can have a maximum of one such notation removed in his/her career as a Rowan student

2. Amendments to Academic Integrity Review Board Procedures

a. For matters not being adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Review Board (Levels 1 and 2), the Board will conduct a sanction review to determine whether the student has prior violation and then determine appropriate additional sanctions.

b. When applicable the Office of the Provost will be responsible for providing both the student and the instructor with proper notice concerning their participation in a hearing before the Academic Integrity Review Board. In addition, notice of the results of hearings and matters referred for sanction review will also be provided. In the event that either the student or the instructor does not attend a scheduled hearing the matter will be heard based on the written record and the information provided by the party in attendance.

c. Hearings conducted by the Academic Integrity Review Board will be closed to all members of the campus and outside community except those directly involved with the case.

d. The burden of proof rests upon the complainant, who must establish, on the basis of the standard of a “preponderance of evidence,” that it was “more likely than not” that the accused student is responsible for the conduct violation based on the weight of the credible information presented.

e. Any student appearing at a hearing before the Academic Integrity Review Board for adjudication of an allegation of academic dishonesty may challenge the assignment of any member of the board to his/her case. Upon hearing the details of the challenge, the Chair will either uphold or deny the challenge.

f. A Board member will withdraw from adjudicating any case in which he/she cannot reach a fair and objective decision.

g. Because legal procedures will not be formally applied, the Chair will make all determinations on questions of procedure and admissibility of information presented and will not be excluded from hearings or Board deliberations except that s/he will not vote. The Chair will exercise control over the manner in which the hearing is conducted to avoid unnecessarily lengthy hearings and to prevent the harassment or intimidation of witnesses. Anyone who disrupts a hearing or who fails to adhere to hearing procedures may be excluded from the proceeding.

h. The accused student may submit a written statement to the Board prior to the hearing. Submission of such a statement is not a substitute for participation in the hearing. The student may also provide, in advance or during the hearing, additional documentation that is directly relevant to the case.

i. With advance approval from the Academic Integrity Hearing Board, the accused student is allowed to call witnesses to present testimony that is directly relevant to the case. Character witnesses are not permitted. The student must sign a FERPA waiver indicating consent to have the witness present. The witness will be called into the hearing only to present testimony and to be questioned by the Board. The student may not address the witness or the Board while the witness is present. If the witness is a Rowan University student, no immunity is implied; any information provided may be used in subsequent hearings. The witness will be informed that he/she cannot be compelled to appear, stay at the hearing, or give any testimony if unwilling. The witness will sign a statement to that effect.

j. The Board will review all materials and hear all information pertinent to the case from the complainant, the accused and all witnesses. Members of the Board, including the Chair, will be free to ask relevant questions in order to clarify information or resulting issues.

k. After hearing all the information, the Board will deliberate privately until a decision is reached by a majority vote. A tie vote will result in a finding of “not responsible.”

l. If the student is found “responsible”, both the academic and non-academic past disciplinary records of the accused student will be supplied to the Board by the Chair. Other information from the Chair which is relevant to the choice of sanction(s) may also be introduced at this point, including information concerning sanctions imposed against other students for similar offenses. No information directly related to the case in question may be introduced for the first time unless the accused student has been informed and allowed to review and comment on the information. The Board will recommend to the office of the Provost which sanctions to impose.

m. Following the hearing, the Office of the Provost will provide the accused student with written notification of the decision reached, the reason for the decision and information regarding the University’s appeal process. If the student is ultimately found “responsible,” a record of the decision will be placed in the student’s advising folder.

University Budget and Planning Committee Report

April 1, 2011

The UBPC met at 11 AM on March 4th and March 26th. The next meeting is scheduled for 11 AM April 8th. Bruce Caswell attended the BoT Budget and Finance Committee meeting on March 24th.

BoT B&F Committee: The B&F Committee is close to finalizing the budget for FY 2011-2012. The budget is close to being balanced and most savings are being sought to make up the deficit. The budget may be adopted at the June BoT meeting. This would be the earliest the budget has been approved in many years. The B&F Committee is very pleased with the new budget process, the timeliness of the information they are receiving, and the quality and level of detail. The UBPC has had access throughout the process to all of this budget information through open area postings by Sally McCall.

The draft FY 2011-2012 budget provides for a 3% increase in undergraduate tuition and fees. This increase, in addition to helping balance the budget, would go towards four new priorities: (1) scholarships to attract more students in financial to the university; (2) upgrading and maintenance of informational technology; (3) reducing the backload (of over \$100 million) of deferred maintenance; and (4) new program development. Without knowing the details, the UBPC passed a resolution supporting these priorities in general as a valid justification for a modest (about the rate of inflation) increase in tuitions. The UBPC has particularly concerned about the lack of specifics on new program development, which the UBPC assumed to be revenue enhancing efforts.

The bad news is that the state will not be covering any of the fringe benefit costs of employees of the new medical school.

UBPC Actions: In addition to the resolution passed as described above, the UBPC is engaged in the process of reviewing 75 ideas for cost savings and revenue enhancements received as a response to the solicitation to the senate and the campus community. Each idea is being evaluated for its (1) academic impact; (2) dollar value of its cost savings or revenue enhancement; (3) investment costs; and (4) payout timeframe.

1. Jay Kuder is taking 15 of the ideas the Academic Affairs Budget Task Force for its comments and our reviewing and would go UBPC's solicitation met March 26, 2011. Bruce Caswell attended the The agenda included an update on the 2012 budget process, a further discussion of possible cost savings and revenue increases the UBPC could recommend to the CEO, and a discussion of the verification of the implementation of past years' recommendations.
2. John Schmalzel has assumed responsibility for all ideas involving energy savings. He has invited Peter Jansson, Director of the Center for Sustainable Design, to speak about the immediate possibilities for bringing solar power to present briefly about the 10 MW project and the student inventory of potential energy savings.
3. Greg Hecht is working on cost-benefit data on summer Friday closing.
4. Esther Mummert has research and presented some ideas on generating more revenue through "camps and conferences."
5. Bruce Caswell has OPRA-ed a list of current administrative positions and salaries. A list of 120 such positions has been received which appears to be out-of-date and incomplete.
6. The UBPC also is working on verifying whether past committee recommendations were fully implemented.

The BoT B&F Committee indicated at its last meeting that it would like the UBPC to communicate regarding any recommendations it comes up with.
