

University Senate Agenda February 5, 2016, 2:00-3:15 in Rowan Hall Auditorium
--

ATTENDEES: Stephanie Abraham, Lisa Abrams, Bonnie Angelone, Herb Appelson, Nathan Bauer, Nasrine Bendjilalli, Lori Block, Joe Cassidy, Jennifer Courtney, Patrick Crumrine, Jess Everett, Stephanie Farrell, Jon Foglein, Richard Fopeano, Tiffany Fortunato, Bill Freind, Mat Gendreau, Danielle Gougan, Jill Gower, Michael Grove, Sean Hendricks, Erin Herberg, Jane Hill, Joseph Johnson, Kristine Johnson, Subash Jonnalagadda, Andrew Kopp, Phil LaPorta, Charles Linderman, Janet Lindman, Julie Mallory-Church, Esther Mas Serna, Jonathan Mason, Lesley Mateo, DeMond Miller, JT Mills, Marge Morris, Scott Morschauser, Jennifer Nicholson, Bruce Plourde, Ravi Ramachandran, Robert Rawlins, James Roh, Lane Savadove, Ted Schoen, Christopher Simons, Dawn Specht, Mary Staehle, Dan Strasser, Umashanger Thayasivam, Nancy Vitalone-Raccaro, Shari Willis, Hong Zhang.

NOT IN ATTENDANCE: (Represented by Alternates) Terri Allen represented by Elif Bahn, Christine Davidson-Tucci represented by Esther Mummert, Tom Doddy represented by Michelle Andre, Diane Garyantes represented by Nick DiUlio, Lori Getler represented by Christine Larsen-Britt.

NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Karlton Hughes, Ane Johnson, Patrick McKee, Eric Milou, Kathleen Seeley (appointed 1/16), Beth Rey, Alan Shienbaum, Laura (Storino) Shinn, Mehmet Uygur, Beth Wassell, Charlene Williams.

EXCUSED ABSENCE: - Ozge Uygur (maternity leave)

2:00-2:20

1. Approval of agenda – moved, seconded, approved
2. Introduction of visitors - N/A
3. Approval of minutes from December meeting – moved, seconded, approved
4. President's report
 - a. 3+1 Degrees at County Colleges: Discussion of program with a brief overview. Enrollment not expected to be high for these programs.
 - b. Inspira land deal tabled by Board of Trustees – Came up for approval at BOT meeting, they decided to table it for a later date. Increased competition was discussed at the BOT meeting. Administration is cautiously optimistic that it will get passed.
 - c. Departmental censuses for the allotment of Senators (page 2): Many departments have hired faculty and staff. Some departments/offices will add additional senators.
 - d. Task Force for Distribution of Rowan Global Funds: Need data about how money is being generated from Rowan Global. College/Departments should be receiving more funds.
 - e. VPN changes (page 4): two medicals schools; HIPPA protection issue; VPN access is too wide. No changes if you've used it recently. H drive and O drive should work fine – expanded drive is available.

- f. Problems with technology in the classroom: Discussion about posting how to materials in the classroom for faculty using technology; Need better ways of communicating new technology
- g. Presidential house: President is currently living in a 55 or older complex in Glassboro – hard to hold functions. Foundation decided the president of Rowan needs a residence – purchased property in Mullica Hill.
- h. Date and location change for all day Senate Meeting: Tuesday, May 17 at 8:30 AM in Eynon Ballroom: Rowan Hall auditorium will not be available that day
- i. Barnes Award nominations due to Donna Ennis (ennis@rowan.edu) by February 12. For more information, visit <http://www.rowan.edu/president/senate/barnes/>

2:20-2:30

- 5. Title IX Policy (separate file): Presentation by Johanna Velez-Yelin – Memo sent to all University/Division heads. Memo included information about the Title IX Policy for students, employees. The on-line training has been made available to everyone on campus. The document makes the issue of Title IX very clear. Background and further Explanation: We are liable if we have information and don't report. Anyone with the authority to take care of the problem has a responsibility to report it. This includes adjuncts and faculty (those receiving a Rowan paycheck).

Q- Next steps after reporting?

They have prepared a resource guide, but it is a bit cumbersome to find information. Your role (as faculty/staff) is to let the student know that there are resources available to them. What happens next once they're in contact with our office? The process begins of how to address the issue.

Q – Do we (senate) have access to the document? Yes.

Q – Have we had legal officials look at the document? Yes, we have.

Q – What type of outreach is being conducted for students? We give presentations to students, via housing, we spoke at Take Back the Night, we also have plenty of resource materials available for students

Q- So do we also call, even if the student calls? Yes, we always call, no matter what.

Q- Is my job over after I report? Maybe not - Your responsibility is over but the student may request more of you. Maybe to walk the student over. Ext. 5830

2:30-3:05

- 6. Proposals from Academic Policies and Procedures: all second readings
 - a. Revisions to Attendance Policy (page 5): Motion carries unanimously.
 - b. Policy on the Electronic Submission of Coursework during Periods of University Closure (page 7): A few cases where faculty had due dates on days when the University was closed – should have a statement on the syllabus. Question about the email that Deb Martin sent out regarding this – appears that not everyone received it. Q – can we assume that the deadline means that it's a deadline for students? Students may not perceive it that way. There could be a difference in interpretation. All in favor: Motion carries unanimously.
 - c. Revisions to Academic Integrity Policy (page 8): First page, very minor change; additional change further down. Q-section D under definitions regarding submitting

the same work to two different classes? In the academic integrity training, a student should refer back to the original faculty member and get permission.

All in Favor: Motion carries unanimously.

- d. Interim Policy on Adjunct Credentials (page 22): Forward looking change and not designed to get rid of current policy

All in favor: Motion carries unanimously.

7. Curriculum report (Erin Herberg) (page 23)

Process Q on Sub-minors: First reading (separate file):

Designed to streamline the process and current offerings – working to figure out how to incorporate with Banner; specializations will be called concentrations. Concentrations equivalent to minors

COGS were passed – push to offer more. Proposal designed to tighten up the definitions and make sure we don't have over credentialing. Q- Once it's voted in, what's the timeline? This could take 18 months minimum.

Process Q on Moving Department of Geography and Environment to School of Earth and Environment:

BA program in Geology (new program): Motion carries unanimously.

BS program in Geology (new program): Motion carries unanimously.

Process Q on Moving Department: Motion carries unanimously.

8. Proposal to create a new Senate Committee on Graduate Education and the Division of Global Learning and Partnerships: First reading (page 24)

Could benefit from having a committee to work with Rowan Global. Will vote on it at the next meeting.

3:05-3:15

9. New business

Additional Items:

-Academic Integrity Committee needs volunteers

-Graduate Advisory Committee looking for a volunteer

Questions:

Q regarding teaching loads and this move to become a research institution? Bill will discuss with Provost and President.

Q regarding the new Business building not having enough classrooms? A3 and A4 buildings on Rowan Boulevard will have additional rooms.

Q is there a contractual cap on the class size? Boat load number? Bill sent the agreement to all Senators.

Q why not have a senate resolution pertaining to teaching loads? Bill stated that he would be happy to present any resolution drawn up.

Q Who controls classrooms and office space? The Space Committee makes final decisions, but the Deans submit requests. That means that faculty are typically overruled by Deans,

10. Adjournment

Distribution of Senators, Academic Year 2016-2017

Accounting and Finance: 19 faculty, 2 Senators
Art: 16 faculty and professional staff, 2 Senators
Biological Sciences: 17 faculty, 2 Senators
Biomedical Engineering: 3 faculty, 1 Senator
Chemical Engineering: 8 faculty, 1 Senator
Chemistry/Biochem: 23 faculty and professional staff, 2 senators
Civil/Environmental Engineering: 12 faculty and professional staff, 1 Senator
CMSRU: 16 faculty, 2 Senators
Communication Studies: 19 faculty, 2 Senators
Computer science: 18 faculty members, 2 Senators
Ed. Services Administration and Higher Education: 17 faculty members, 2 Senators
Electrical and Computer Engineering: 13 faculty and professional staff, 1 Senator
English: 15 faculty, 1 Senator
Foreign Languages and Literature: 8 faculty, 1 Senator
Geography/Environment: 8 faculty, 1 Senator
Health and Exercise Sciences: 21 faculty, 2 Senators
History: 14 faculty, 1 Senator
Interdisciplinary and Inclusive Education: 27 faculty, 2 Senators
Journalism: 7 faculty, 1 Senator
Language Literacy and Social Cultural Education: 21 faculty, 2 Senators
Law and Justice: 15 faculty, 1 Senator
Mechanical Engineering: 15 faculty and professional staff, 1 Senator
Management and Entrepreneurship: 17 faculty, 2 Senators
Marketing/BIS: 16 faculty, 2 Senators
Math: 36 faculty: 3 Senators
Music: 22 faculty and professional staff, 2 Senators
Nursing: 5 faculty, 1 Senator
Philosophy and Religion: 10 faculty, 1 Senator
Physics and Astronomy: 20 faculty and professional staff, 2 Senators.
Political Science and Economics: 11 faculty, 1 Senator
Psychology: 23 faculty, 2 Senators
Theater and Dance: 10 faculty, 1 Senator
Writing Arts: 44 faculty, 3 Senators
Library: Still being calculated
Professional Staff: Still being calculated
Athletics: 24 members, 2 Senators

The Senate Constitution details how Senators are apportioned:

The academic department, library, the athletics department, the professional staff, and Camden Campus constituencies shall be apportioned senators as follows:

“Fewer than 16 constituency members: One (1) senator.
At least 16 but fewer than 31 constituency members: Two (2) senators.
At least 31 but fewer than 46 constituency members: Three (3) senators.
And so forth, in increments of fifteen (15).

The Senate is elected in the Spring of the previous year for the next academic year based on the constituency members in the department at that time, not on projected or even expected numbers for the Fall. Once the Senate is constituted it remains as is until the next election cycle regardless of numbers increasing or decreasing within a constituency in a given academic year.”

Details of VPN Access

Some examples of services that do require the VPN when off campus:

- Direct access to h: and o: drives, though as noted below ExpanDrive provides the same level of access without the VPN.
- Internet Native Banner (INB only; Self Service Banner is available without the VPN).
- Access to the University's HPC environment and specialized computational resources (CC, RUCC, and CADD environments)
- Access to Remote Desktop (RDP) and other administrative interfaces for individuals responsible for supporting some aspect of an application or IT service.

Some examples of common services that do not require VPN access when off campus:

- Accessing your Rowan University email, either via Outlook or via the website at <https://exchange.rowan.edu>
- Banner Self Service, available at <http://www.rowan.edu/selfservice>
- Citrix and RowanCloud
- H: and O: drive access via ExpanDrive - <https://irt.rowan.edu/display/IRT/ExpanDrive>
- EMR access for SOM Healthcare professionals, which is provided through Citrix
- All instances of Blackboard (CMEB, SOM, Glassboro)
- Rowan's Google Apps for Education Services
- Rowan Online's Canvas

We've updated the IRT website to reflect this information as well -

<https://confluence.rowan.edu/display/IRT/Rowan+VPN>

Attendance Policy – Faculty & Students Responsibilities

Because classroom experiences vary greatly among disciplines, deliveries and instructors, Rowan's community of learners is best realized when teachers and learners interact in ways deemed appropriate for any particular class. Thus, although what constitutes attendance can differ from course to course, the following applies to all courses:

Responsibilities of Students

1) Students are expected to be present at each meeting of each scheduled class for which they are officially registered. Students are responsible for knowing the instructor's attendance policy as stated in the syllabus.

2) Students absent for any of the following reasons:

- Official University activities,
- Documented illness,
- Death of a family member or loved one,
- Inclement weather,

must inform their instructor with official or written documentation before the fact in the case of official University activities, or as soon as possible thereafter in cases of illness, death of a family member or loved one, and inclement weather. Students should consult with their instructor regarding acceptable documentation.

3) Rowan respects the diversity of faiths and spiritual practices in the university community. Students who wish to observe religious holidays which occur when classes are scheduled must inform their instructors before the fact, and preferably within the first two weeks of each semester, even when the exact date of the holiday will not be known until later. Students who make such arrangements will not be required to attend classes or take examinations on the designated days, and faculty must provide reasonable opportunities for students to make up missed work and examinations.

4) In the case of rare and compelling circumstances not listed in #2 above, students should make every effort to discuss reasonable accommodations with the instructor in advance if feasible or as soon as possible afterward.

Responsibilities of Faculty

1) Faculty are expected to keep accurate attendance records.

2) Attendance requirements must be part of the syllabus provided to students prior to the end of the drop/add period.

3) In the case of #2 under Student Responsibilities, faculty must make reasonable accommodation to provide these students the opportunity to make up their written work, tests, or other assignments at the earliest possible convenient time. In cases where graded classroom activities cannot be repeated and the student has not exceeded the maximum number of allowable absences (as explained below under #6), the faculty member will either provide an alternative graded exercise to replace the missed activity or remove the activity from the calculation of the student's final grade.

4) Faculty are under no obligation to make special provisions for students that are absent for reasons other than those listed above. However, faculty are encouraged to consider accommodations for rare and compelling circumstances.

5) If a student develops a pattern of excessive and/or unexplained absences, the faculty should advise the student to request assistance from the Dean of Students.

6) Faculty (singularly or as part of a department or program) may establish additional reasonable attendance criteria that are consistent with the above. This may include setting a maximum number of absences for a course---whether excused or unexcused---after which a student should withdraw from the class ~~with a WF in accordance with the university withdrawal policy. Students may apply for a hardship withdrawal if their absences were primarily excused and due to extenuating circumstances. If the Dean of Students determines, in consultation with the faculty member, that excused absences were a significant factor, the withdrawal may be altered to a simple W.~~

Revised 5-31-2012

Policy on the Electronic Submission of Coursework during Periods of University Closure

Faculty increasingly, but not exclusively, accept the submission of coursework via electronic media such as Blackboard, Canvas, e-mail, etc. Doing so has several clear advantages, including the ability of students to submit coursework remotely or during periods of University closure. Faculty members who intend to require students to meet work deadlines via electronic submission, even if such deadlines fall during periods of University closure, should state this expectation explicitly in their syllabi. An exception to this policy would be made for online courses offered through the Rowan Global and Learning Partnerships which have unique calendars and are not affected by University closures.

ROWAN UNIVERSITY POLICY

Title: *Academic Integrity Policy*

Subject: *Academic Affairs*

Policy No: *AA: 2015:XX*

Applies: *University-Wide*

Issuing Authority: *Office of the Provost*

Responsible Officer: *Provost / Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs*

Adopted:

Amended:

Last Revision: *10/15/2015*

I. PURPOSE

The purpose of the academic integrity policy is to provide students, faculty, and staff with guidelines about what behaviors violate academic integrity expectations, and the process for addressing academic integrity problems.

II. ACCOUNTABILITY

Under direction of the Provost, all University Deans shall implement this policy and all faculty shall ensure compliance with the policy.

III. APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to all students, faculty and staffs of Rowan University.

IV. DEFINITIONS

- A. *Cheating*: Cheating is an act of deception by which a person misrepresents his or her mastery of material on a test or other academic exercise.
- B. *Plagiarism*: Plagiarism occurs when a person represents someone else's words, ideas, phrases, sentences, or data as one's own work. When submitting work that includes someone else's words, ideas, syntax, data or organizational patterns, the source of that information must be acknowledged through complete, accurate and specific references. All verbatim statements must be acknowledged through quotation marks [and properly cited](#). To avoid a charge of plagiarism, a person should be sure to include an acknowledgment of indebtedness, such as a list of works cited or bibliography.

- C. *Fabrication*: Fabrication refers to the deliberate use of invented information or the falsification of research or other findings with the intent to deceive.
- D. *Academic Misconduct*: Academic Misconduct includes the alteration of grades; involvement in the acquisition or distribution of unadministered tests; and the unauthorized submission of student work in more than one class.

V. POLICY

- A. The integrity of academic programs is imperative to Rowan University's mission. While acknowledging the social and collaborative nature of learning, the University expects that grades awarded to students will reflect individual efforts and achievements.
- B. All members of the Rowan community are responsible for understanding what constitutes academic dishonesty; upholding academic integrity standards and encouraging others to do likewise; and knowing the procedures, rights and obligations involved in the Academic Integrity Policy. Academic dishonesty, in any form, will not be tolerated. Students who commit an act of academic dishonesty are subject to disciplinary sanctions up to and including expulsion from the university.
- C. Violations of academic integrity are classified into four categories based on the seriousness of the behaviors and the possible sanctions imposed.
 - 1. A Level 1 violation may occur because of ignorance or inexperience on the part of the person(s) committing the violation and ordinarily include a very minor portion of the course work. A sanction for a level 1 violation will not exceed a failing grade on the assignment.
 - 2. Level 2 violations involve incidents of a more serious nature and affect a significant aspect or portion of the course. A second Level 1 violation will automatically become a Level 2 violation. A sanction for a Level 2 violation will not exceed a failing grade in the course.
 - 3. Level 3 offenses are even more serious in nature and involve dishonesty on a more significant portion of course work, such as a major paper, hourly or final examination. If a student had previously been found responsible either of one or more violations at Level 2 or higher, or of two Level 1 violations, an additional violation at any level will automatically become at least a Level 3 violation. A sanction for a level 3 violation will not exceed suspension from the University.
 - 4. Level 4 violations are the most serious breaches of academic integrity. They also include repeat offenses below Level 4 violations and violations committed while already on or after returning from Academic Integrity Probation.
- D. Reporting And Adjudication Of Academic Integrity Violations
 - 1. A student or University employee who has witnessed an apparent act of academic misconduct or has information that reasonably leads to the conclusion that such an act has or will occur should inform the instructor or the Office of the Provost.
 - 2. An instructor who believes that a student has attempted or committed an apparent act of academic misconduct should investigate the matter. Instructors are encouraged to consult with staff in the Office of the Provost.
 - 3. Role of Instructor
 - a. If the instructor then concludes that misconduct has occurred, he or she should obtain a copy of the Report of an Academic Integrity Violation (RAIV) form from the web, the

departmental office, or the Office of the Provost. The instructor should complete as much of the RAIV form as possible prior to meeting with the student, including the appropriate type of violation/level.

- b. The instructor should make reasonable attempts to meet with the student in question as soon as possible. When necessary, such meetings may be conducted by telephone or electronic mail. In this meeting every effort should be made to preserve the basic teacher/student relationship. The student should be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation and to review and sign the RAIV if he/she so chooses. The student's signature signifies that he/she is aware of the alleged violation and understands where information on next steps in the procedure can be found. The student should be allowed to remain in class and complete course work until a final resolution is reached.
- c. For Level 1 and Level 2 violations, the instructor should indicate sanctions on the RAIV before the student signs the acknowledgement section of the RAIV form. (Instructors do not recommend sanctions for Level 3 and 4 violations.) Instructors may recommend sanctions up to and including a failing grade for the course depending on the level of violation. Students should not sign the form if they have additional questions or want to consult staff in the Office of the Provost.
- d. At the conclusion of the meeting the instructor must provide the student with a copy of the RAIV form, whether the student signed the form or not. The instructor should then forward the form and all supporting documentation to the Office of the Provost.
 - i. Level 1 violations: The instructor will make the determination on whether a violation has occurred and on the penalty. Appeals go directly to the Office of the Provost and will be heard by the Academic Integrity Review Board.
 - ii. Level 2 violations: The instructor will make the determination of whether a violation has occurred and on the penalty. Appeals go directly to the Office of the Provost and will be heard by the Academic Integrity Review Board.
 - iii. Level 3 and 4 violations: The Office of the Provost will refer the matter to the Academic Integrity Review Board for adjudication at a hearing. The Board will issue a finding and recommendation to the Office of the Provost, which will make the final irrevocable decisions on both rulings and appeals.
- e. Additional sanctions, including suspension or expulsion from the university, may be recommended when requested by the instructor, requested by the academic unit in which the violation occurred, or when stipulated by the academic integrity policy (i.e. the level of the violation or the existence of previous academic integrity violations by the student).
- f. In the case that an instructor must assign a grade before the case is resolved, the instructor should assign a grade of "INC," which will be changed when the case is resolved.

E. Academic Integrity Review Board

1. The Academic Integrity Review Board may be convened for adjudication of an allegation of academic dishonesty.
2. The Academic Integrity Review Board is chaired by the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The Chair shall be a participating but nonvoting member of the Board.
3. The Board is composed of six regular members.
 - A minimum of two student members from a pool of between 7 and 14 students who are appointed by the Student Government Association. Student members must be matriculated and in good standing with the University.
 - Two members of the faculty who are appointed by the University Senate President.

- Two members of the administration who are appointed by the Office of the Provost.
 - Two alternates from each category will also be appointed.
4. When convening the Academic Integrity Review Board for adjudication of an allegation of academic dishonesty, a quorum of four members, including at least one student, one faculty member and one administrator, must be present.

F. Rights in Hearings

1. The University disciplinary system is not a criminal or civil law process and the legal procedures applicable in criminal and civil cases will not apply. This policy is not intended to supersede any existing law or regulation.
2. University disciplinary hearings will accord the following specific rights to all students:
 - a. To receive written notice of the alleged violation.
 - b. To have reasonable access to the case materials prior to and during any hearing.
 - c. To have access to advice by an individual of his or her choosing, including an attorney. However, the advisor may not participate in the hearing. The student must sign a FERPA waiver indicating he/she has consented to have the individual present.
 - d. To participate in the hearing, present information on his or her own behalf, call witnesses and question information provided at their hearing. This does not include the right to directly question witnesses.
 - e. To receive written notification of the decision reached and a list of any sanctions imposed.

G. Description of Sanctions

1. A student may receive a single or multiple sanctions for violations of the Academic Integrity policy. Factors to be considered in deciding sanctions will include present demeanor and past disciplinary record of the student and the nature and severity of the violation.
2. Sanctions which may be imposed upon a student found responsible for a Level 3 or Level 4 include the following:
 - a. Notation of Academic Integrity Violation on Transcript: When a student fails a course because of a Level 3 or Level 4 violation, this will be noted on the student's transcript. The notation can be removed from the transcript at the student's request provided the student has had no further academic integrity violations for one calendar year (365) days. The student can have a maximum of one such notation removed in his/her career as a Rowan student.
 - b. Academic Integrity Probation: Academic integrity probation is a period of one calendar year (365 days) indicating that a student is no longer in good standing with the university vis-à-vis academic integrity because of a Level 3 or Level 4 violation. (This status is distinct from Academic Probation, which concerns academic performance.) Any subsequent Academic Integrity Violation while in this status will likely result in suspension or expulsion from the university.
 - c. Suspension: Beginning on the date the suspension takes effect, the student is no longer a registered student, may not attend classes, nor receive grades for a specified period of time. In addition, while in this status, the student is not permitted to be present on the campus or at a University-sponsored event for any reason whatsoever. The suspension will be noted on the student's academic transcript as disciplinary suspension. The student is not entitled to any refund of any fees after published refund dates.
 - d. Expulsion: Beginning on the date the expulsion takes effect, the student may never again be a registered student, may never attend classes, nor receive grades. In addition, the

student may never be present on the campus nor at a University-sponsored event for any reason whatsoever. The expulsion will be noted on the student's academic transcript as Academic Integrity Expulsion. The student is not entitled to any refund of any fees after published refund dates.

VI. ATTACHMENTS

- A. Attachment 1, Definition Examples
- B. Attachment 2, Classification of Academic Integrity Violations by Offense
- C. Attachment 3, Academic Integrity Review Board Procedures
- D. Attachment 4, Academic Integrity Flow Chart for Instructors
- E. Attachment 5, Report of an Academic Integrity Violation (RAIV)

ATTACHMENT 1 DEFINITION EXAMPLES

A. *Cheating*

Examples of cheating include but are not limited to:

- Copying from another person's work.
- Allowing another person to copy your work.
- Using unauthorized materials such as a textbook or notebook during an examination or using technology to illicitly access unauthorized materials.
- Using specifically prepared materials such as notes written on clothing or other unauthorized notes, formula lists, etc., during an examination.
- Collaborating with another person during an examination by giving or receiving information without permission.

B. *Plagiarism*

Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to:

- Quoting, paraphrasing or even borrowing the syntax of another's words without acknowledging the source.
- Using another's ideas, opinions or theories even if they have been completely paraphrased in one's own words without acknowledging the source.
- Incorporating facts, statistics or other illustrative material taken from a source, without acknowledging the source, unless the information is common knowledge.
- Submitting a computer program as original work that duplicates, in whole or in part, without citation, the work of another.

C. *Fabrication*

Examples of fabrication include but are not limited to:

- Citation of information not taken from the source indicated.
- Listing of sources in a bibliography or other report not used in that project.
- Fabricating data or source information in experiments, research project or other academic exercises.
- Misrepresenting oneself or providing misleading and false information in an attempt to access another user's computer account.

D. *Academic Misconduct*

Examples of academic misconduct include but are not limited to:

- Intentional deceptive action to gain an academic advantage.
- Submitting written work to fulfill the requirements of more than one course without the explicit permission of both instructors.
- Changing, altering, falsifying or being accessory to the changing, altering or falsifying of a grade report or form, or entering any university office, building or accessing a computer for that purpose.
- Stealing, buying, selling, giving away or otherwise obtaining all or part of any unadministered test/examination or entering any university office or building for the purpose of obtaining an unadministered test/examination.
- Coercing any other person to obtain an unadministered test.

- Substituting for another student or permitting any other person to substitute for oneself to take a test or examination.
- Altering test answers and then claiming instructor inappropriately graded the examination.
- Violating the Network and Computer Use Policy, also known as the “Acceptable Use Policy, Network and System Services” established by Information Resources. Currently available at: <http://www.rowan.edu/toolbox/policies/network/>.
 - Below are some examples of violations listed in the policy. Students should refer to the policy for the full list of violations.
 - Each user is solely responsible for all functions performed from his/her account(s) on any system.
 - No user may violate Federal Copyright Law. This means he/she may not alter, copy, translate, transmit, or receive software, music, images, text, or any other information licensed to or copyrighted by another party unless the license or copyright explicitly permits he/she to do so.
 - No user may attempt to monitor another individual's data communications, nor may he/she read, copy, change, or delete another individual's files or software, without the prior permission of the owner.
 - No user may send messages that are likely to result in the loss of the recipient's work, system downtime, or otherwise compromise a remote user's system. This includes, but is not limited to, redistribution of computer viruses or trojan horses.

ATTACHMENT 2
CLASSIFICATION OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY VIOLATIONS BY OFFENSE

Violations of academic integrity are classified into four categories based on the seriousness of the behaviors and the possible sanctions imposed. Brief descriptions are provided below. These are general descriptions and should not be considered as all inclusive.

A. Level 1 Violations

1. Level 1 violations may occur because of ignorance or inexperience on the part of the person(s) committing the violation and ordinarily include a very minor portion of the course work. A sanction for a level 1 violation will not exceed a failing grade on the assignment.
2. Example: Improper footnoting or unauthorized assistance with academic work on the part of a first-year Rowan University student.
3. Recommended Sanction(s): Make-up assignment at a more difficult level or assignment of no-credit for work in question, required attendance at an Academic Integrity Seminar, and/or an assignment that will increase the student's awareness of academic integrity.
4. Reporting Mechanisms: Matters involving Level 1 violations are normally adjudicated by the instructor and sanctioned accordingly. A record of this violation will be retained in the Office of the Provost in accordance with State record retention guidelines. The student can appeal the determination in accordance with policy.

B. Level 2 Violations

1. Level 2 violations involve incidents of a more serious nature and affect a significant aspect or portion of the course. A second Level 1 violation will automatically become a Level 2 violation. A sanction for a Level 2 violation will not exceed a failing grade in the course.
2. Example: Quoting directly or paraphrasing without proper acknowledgment on an assignment or failing to acknowledge all sources of information and contributors who helped with an assignment.
3. Recommended Sanction(s): A failing grade in the course, Academic Integrity Probation and/or the imposition of other lesser sanctions as deemed appropriate.
4. Reporting Mechanisms: Matters involving Level 2 violations are normally adjudicated by the instructor and sanctioned accordingly. A record of this violation will be retained in the Office of the Provost in accordance with State record retention guidelines. The student can appeal the determination in accordance with policy.

C. Level 3 Violations

1. Level 3 offenses are even more serious in nature and involve dishonesty on a more significant portion of course work, such as a major paper, hourly or final examination. If a student had previously been found guilty either of one or more violations at Level 2 or higher, or of two Level 1 violations, an additional violation at any level will automatically become at least a Level 3 violation. A sanction for a level 3 violation will not exceed suspension from the University.
2. Example: Copying from or giving assistance to others on an hourly or final examination, plagiarizing major portions of an assignment, using forbidden material on an hourly or final examination, presenting the work of another as one's own, or altering a graded examination for the purposes of re-grading.
3. Recommended Sanction(s): A failing grade in the course, Academic Integrity Probation, and suspension from the University for one or more semesters with a notation of "Disciplinary Suspension" placed on a student's transcript and/or the imposition of other lesser sanctions as deemed appropriate.

4. Reporting Mechanisms: Matters involving Level 3 violations are adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Review Board. A record of this violation will be retained in the Office of the Provost in accordance with State record retention guidelines.

D. Level 4 Violations

1. Level 4 violations are the most serious breaches of academic integrity. They also include repeat offenses below Level 4 violations and violations committed while already on or after returning from Academic Integrity Probation.
2. Example: Forgery of grade change forms; theft of examinations; having a substitute take an examination; any degree of falsification or plagiarism relating to a senior or graduate thesis; using a purchased term paper; sabotaging another's work; the violation of the clinical code of a profession.
3. Recommended sanction: Expulsion from the University and a permanent dismissal notation on the student's transcript and/or the imposition of other lesser sanctions as deemed appropriate.
4. Reporting Mechanisms: Matters involving Level 4 violations are adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Review Board. A record of this violation will be retained in the Office of the Provost in accordance with State record retention guidelines.

ATTACHMENT 3
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REVIEW BOARD PROCEDURES

A. Overview of Hearing Process

1. Level 1 and 2 violations are adjudicated by the instructor and reported to the Office of the Provost. The Office of the Provost determines whether the student has committed a prior violation and adjusts the level of violation accordingly. The Academic Integrity Review Board annually reviews reports of Level 1 and 2 violations to confirm that classifications of violations and subsequent sanctions that were imposed were appropriate. Level 3 and 4 violations are referred directly to and adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Review Board.
2. The possible findings and outcomes of hearings conducted by the Academic Integrity Review Board are summarized below. Academic Integrity Violation is abbreviated as AIV.
3. Appeal of Level 1 Violation

Possible Findings	Outcomes
Student is not responsible for an AIV.	Student is cleared. Grade must be recalculated without the penalty for the alleged violation.
Student is responsible for a Level 1 violation.	Level 1 sanctions are upheld.

4. Appeal of Level 2 Violation

Possible Findings	Outcomes
Student is not responsible for an AIV.	Student is cleared. Course grade must be recalculated without the penalty for the alleged violation.
Student is responsible for a lesser (Level 1) violation.	Student is responsible for a lesser offense. Penalty is lowered as appropriate and course grade is recalculated.
Student is responsible for a Level 2 violation.	Level 2 sanctions are upheld.

5. Level 3 and Level 4 Sanction Hearings

Possible Findings	Outcomes
Student is not responsible for an AIV.	Student is cleared. Grade is recalculated without the penalty for the alleged violation and entered to replace the Incomplete.
Student is responsible for a lesser (Level 1 or Level 2) violation.	Student is responsible for a lesser offense. Penalty is determined as appropriate. Course grade is recalculated and entered to replace the Incomplete.
Student is responsible for a Level 3 violation.	Level 3 sanctions are recommended as appropriate.
Student is responsible for a Level 4 violation.	Level 4 sanctions are recommended as appropriate.

B. Additional Procedural Guidelines

1. For matters not being adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Review Board (Levels 1 and 2), the Office of the Provost will conduct a review to determine whether the student has any prior violation and then determine appropriate additional procedures.
2. 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 will 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. A Board member will withdraw from adjudicating any case in which he/she cannot reach a fair and objective decision.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. 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.
11. 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."
12. If the student is found "responsible" the Board will recommend the appropriate sanctions to be imposed.
13. Cases heard by the Academic Integrity Review Board that result in a finding that the student is responsible for an academic integrity violation are automatically appealed to the Provost, who

reviews the case and findings and provides a final decision. This will be the final step in the adjudication process.

14. Following the hearing, the Office of the Provost will provide the accused student with written notification of the decision reached and a list of any sanctions imposed. If the student is found "responsible," a record of the decision will be placed in the student's advising folder.

ATTACHMENT 4
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY FLOW CHART FOR INSTRUCTORS

Rowan University Academic Integrity Flow Chart for Instructors - [AcademicIntegrityFlowchart_2009.pdf](#)

ATTACHMENT 5
REPORT OF AN ACADEMIC INTEGRITY VIOLATION (RAIV)

Rowan University Report of an Academic Integrity Violation (RAIV) - [RAIV Elec Form.docx](#)

Interim Policy on Adjunct Credentials

Rowan University expects that adjunct professors will hold at least a Master's Degree in a related field to the subject matter that they are teaching. However, the administration recognizes that in some specific courses, practitioners who hold a Bachelor's Degree and possess substantial professional experience in the field may be appropriate choices for adjunct positions. In such cases, specific approval from the Dean and Provost are required prior to making an offer of employment.

Moving forward, we would not anticipate hiring adjunct professors who do not possess at least a Bachelor's Degree, though the administration reserves the right to waive this requirement in exceptional circumstances in which a prospective adjunct has achieved national renown in his or her field.

For employees who have worked in non-tenure track teaching capacities for Rowan University for at least ten years and have demonstrated their proficiency in the classroom, we will accept either an Associate's Degree or 90+ credits of progress towards a Bachelor's Degree as a suitable credential for continued employment, subject to approval by the Dean and Provost.

Curriculum Senate Report February 3, 2016

The following proposals are being submitted for Senate Approval

Process F- New Degree Program Proposals

The following proposals have been approved by the Senate Curriculum Committee.

Proposal #	College	Department	Proposal
15-16-8049	Earth and the Environment	Geology	BA in Geology
15-16-8050	Earth and the Environment	Geology	BS in Geology

Resolution to Create A New Senate Committee

GRADUATE EDUCATION AND GLOBAL LEARNING AND PARTNERSHIPS

Reviews and recommends academic policies and procedures in the Division of Global Learning and Partnerships, including the development of online and hybrid courses, as well as traditional courses offered by DGLP. Also reviews and recommends academic policies and procedures for graduate programs not housed in DGLP.

Eligibility: 8 Faculty (to include at least 1 representative from each College)

2 Professional Staff

2 SGA Reps

2 Graduate Students

1 AFT Rep

Total: 15