

University Senate

Minutes

Student Center 221 - May 9, 2006

In Attendance: Herb Appelson, David Applebaum, Joe Bierman, Greg Biren, Lori Block, Luis Brunstein, Bruce Caswell, Jay Chaskes, Joe Coulombe, Kevin Dahm, Richard Earl, Carol Eigenbrot, Robert Fleming, John Gallagher, Kathy Ganske, Dorie Gilchrist, John Hasse, Karen Heinz, Vasil Hnatyshin, Judy Holmes, Elisabeth Hostetter, Cristina Itode, Frances Johnson, Candace Kelley, David Klassen, Christopher Lacke, Phillip Lewis, Yuhui Li, Mary Marino, Brenda Marlin, Yusuf Mehta, Ellen Miller, Eric Milou, Esther Mummert, Bob Newland, Anne Phillips, Robi Polikar, Tanya Santangelo, Dan Schowalter, Karen Siefiring, Kathleen Small, Edward Smith, Rob Sterner, Marian Stieber, Don Stoll, Pay Stoll, Eileen Stutzbach, Maria Sudeck, Susan Taber, Skeff Thomas, Sanford Tweedie, Mary Beth Walpole, Barbara Williams, Cathy Yang, Tricia Yurak, Hong Zhang

Not in Attendance/Represented by Alternate: Larry Butler represented by Bernadyne Weatherford, William Carrigan represented by Jim Newell, Ihsan Isik represented by George Romeo, Lee Kress represented by Dan Schowalter, Mark Matalucci represented by Bonnie Wilson, Michael Weiss represented by Tony Smith

Not in Attendance: Roberta DiHoff, John Pastin

“Rule”: Discussion of all reports and debate on all resolutions limited to ten minutes.

Parliamentarian Note: Any rule may be suspended at any time by a motion to “suspend the rules.” Such a motion takes precedence over all other floor action, requires a second and a two-thirds majority to pass.

I. Agenda and Operational Rule approved.

II. Minutes of April 17, 2006 approved.

III. President’s Report (Separate page.): Bruce gave his report and thanked many people including those on the Executive Committee and the other officers.

IV. Committee Reports (In order of receipt of reports): All reports were approved. End of year resolutions were presented.

A. Curriculum: **Eric Milou** moved acceptance of nine curricular proposals.

All were approved. A proposal with guidelines regarding Writing Intensive Courses was also approved. (see attached).

B. Research: **Robi Polikar** presented a yearly summary of activities which included the report of a recent meeting held with administration regarding the NSFSG recommendations. (see attached)

C. Career Development: **Dan Showalter** presented the committee report. A recommendation regarding developing criteria for Career Development assessment was also approved. (see attached report)

D. Technological Resources: **Vasil Hnatyshin** discussed several major concerns and Initiatives of the committee. (see report). Two resolutions were presented and passed. One reiterated prior committee requests for more support for technology on campus. The other was a campus wide printing policy to save money.

- E. Promotion, **Sandy Tweedie** moved a large number of changes to the Memorandum of Agreement. Only one was deleted from the proposal #2 in “Significant Changes to the Agreement”. The other were passed to be considered by the bargaining unit.
- F. Committee on Committees : **Frances Johnson** presented a committee report and some recommendations for committee operation for next year. All were approved (see report).
- G. Campus Aesthetics and Environment: **Skeff Thomas** moved acceptance of the report which was approved along with a resolution regarding Rowan University and its relationship with the environment. (attached)
- H. Sabbatical Leave: **John Gallagher** Report accepted. See attached.
- I. Recruitment, Admissions and Retention: **MaryBeth Walpole** Report accepted. (see attached)
- J. Tenure and Recontracting: **Tricia Yurak** See attached report.
- K. Student Relations: **Lori Block** Report of activities accepted and attached.
- L. LOAC: **Don Stoll** The committee has completed a general education survey. This will help the institution look at general education in a much more in depth manner. Report accepted and is attached.
- M. Professional Ethics: **Barbara Williams** A resolution regarding guidelines which would assist the development of an all-campus Academic Honesty Policy was approved. (see attached)
- N. University Budget and Planning: **Bob Fleming** Report and summary accepted. Recommendations approved. Request of chair to continue meeting over the summer approved due to the concerns over next year’s budget.
- O. Intercollegiate Athletics: **Chris Lacke** Report approved. Resolution regarding the condition of the athletics facilities in Esbjornson and the Team House approved as follows:

Whereas the conditions of the basement of Esbjornson Gym and the Field House are deplorable and demand immediate remediation as listed in the attached letter of May 8, 2006 to President Farish, wherein a listing of the conditions is enumerated.....,

We in the Senate implore the Administration and the Board of trustees to take immediate and substantial remedial action.
- P. Academic Policies and Procedures: **Susan Taber** moved Senate reapproval of the Academic Dismissal and Probation Policy that we also approved in 1999 and 2004. The administration has again requested higher GPA thresholds for academic dismissal. Motion to reapprove 1999 and 2004 Senate policy approved. In addition, a draft of a new procedure for handling academic dishonesty situations was moved and accepted.

V. Open Period (11:30): **Christy Faison, Interim Provost:** Interim Provost Faison spoke of the highlights of the last two years in which her office and the Senate have accomplished many achievements. An enthusiastic round of applause followed.

VI. All-University Committees

The reports of all of the following committees were approved.

AA. Chairs Council, **Dick Scott**

BB. Awards, **Claudia Cuddy**

CC. Bookstore, **Robert D'Intino**

DD. Library, **Judy Lancioni**

CC. World Education Council, **Joy Xin**

VII. Election Results for 2006-2007 Senate:

Officers:

President: Jim Newell

Vice President: Eric Milou

Secretary: Julie Mallory-Church

Parliamentarian: To be nominated with approval of the Senate in the fall

Chairpersons

Academic Policies	Susan Taber
Campus Aesthetics	Skeff Thomas
Career Development	Dan Showalter
Committee on Committees	Dorie Gilchrist
Curriculum	Kevin Dahm
Intercollegiate Athletics	Greg Biren
Learning Outcomes	Don Stoll
Professional Ethics	Barbara Bole Williams
Promotion	Kathy Ganske
Recruitment, Admissions	Eddie Guerra
Research	Robi Polikar
Tech. Resources	Vasil Hnatyshin
Sabbatical Leave	Frances Johnson
Tenure and Recontracting	Tricia Yurak
Student Relations	Eileen Stutzbach
University Budget	Bob Newland

Executive Committee At Large

Jay Chaskes
Sandy Tweedie

VIII. Old Business none

IX. New Business none

X Meeting adjourned

2005-06 UNIVERSITY SENATE ANNUAL COMMITTEE REPORTS

STANDING COMMITTEES:

2005-06 Academic Policies and Procedures

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 5

Committee Chair: Susan Taber

Committee Members: (list here)

Manuel Pontes	Cindy Corison	Beth Wassell
Ravi Ramachandran	Kumiko Murashima	Larry Butler
Luis Brunstein	Carol Eigenbrot	Mark Matalucci
Heiu Nguyen	Kathleen Pereles (AFT-1)	Chris Lacke (AFT-2)
Justin Krapf (SGA)	Joseph Pantiliano (SGA)	Jennifer Savitsky (SGA)
Susan Taber, chair		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Reviews and recommends academic policies and procedures of the University, including grading policies, academic dismissal and academic warning procedures, honors and dean's list policies.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The committee considered proposed changes to the Academic Dismissal and Probation policy and the potential effects of the proposed changes on students and faculty. The Senate had approved revisions to the policy in 1999 and 2004 that were never implemented. The administration then requested that the Senate pass a version with higher GPA thresholds for Academic Dismissal. The GPA thresholds for Academic Dismissal and Probation (Warning) of the various versions are summarized below.

Policy and Date	Dismissal	Probation
Student Information Guide	"after enrolling for:" 24 credits–below 1.2 58 credits–below 1.5 90 credits–below 1.8	"Academic Warning" After attempting: 24 credits, at least 1.2 but below 1.6 58 credits, at least 1.5 but below 1.8 90 credits, at least 1.8 but below 2.0
Passed by Senate 5/11/99	After attempting: 12-24 credits-- below 1.5 24-59 credits–below 1.7 60+ credits, below 1.9	After attempting: 12-24 credits, GPA at least 1.5 but below 2.00 25-59 credits, at least 1.7 but below 2.00 60+ credits, at least 1.9 but below 2.00
Passed by Senate 5/14/04	After attempting: 12-24 credits–below 1.5 25-59 credits–below 1.7 60+ credits–below 1.9	After attempting: 12-24 credits, GPA>1.5 but <2.00 25-59 credits, GPA >1.7 but <2.00 60+ credits, GPA >1.9 but <2.00

Requested by Administration	After attempting: 24-59 credits—below 1.85 60-90 credits—below 1.9 90+ credits—below 1.94	After attempting 24 credits, GPA below 2.00
-----------------------------	--	---

The AP&P committee recommends that the administration implement the changes that were passed in 1999 and reaffirmed in 2004 and conduct an impact study before requesting further changes to the policy.

The committee also considered issues related to Academic Honesty. Some of the relevant issues are:

1. The current policy states that faculty will meet with the student before assigning a penalty for an act of academic dishonesty. A problem arises when the incident is discovered when a faculty member is grading papers at the end of the semester when the student may not be available. In December 2005, the provost directed the faculty to assign a grade of IN (Incomplete) in cases of suspected academic dishonesty as a placeholder until the faculty member can meet with the student. The committee felt that a placeholder grade other than IN should be created for situations in which the faculty member wants to withhold giving a grade until he/she can speak with the student about the incident.
2. Academic dishonesty cases are heard by a campus hearing board which is under the purview of Student Affairs. However, when students grieve a grade, the grievance goes through academic channels (department chair, dean, a grade grievance committee convened by the Associate Provost). It seems desirable to have all appeals related to grades go through the same process and have them handled by the academic side of campus.
3. Some faculty are reluctant to report students for acts of academic dishonesty because of compassion for the student and/or the difficulties in following the process. There is concern that some students may be able to repeat acts of academic dishonesty if faculty members do not report the instances and the actions taken.

The committee created a flow chart or “road map” of a process that could be used to deal with all violations of academic honesty, no matter when they are discovered. It is intended to serve as a starting point for generating a more usable and clearly defined process for dealing with incidents of academic dishonesty

The committee supports collaboration among three University Committees—Academic Policies and Procedures, Professional Ethics and Welfare, and Student Affairs—and the Student Government Association to create a proactive climate of academic integrity and to revise policies so that they are understood and supported by the Rowan community, including faculty, students, professional staff, and administrators

-1

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

Participate in a collaborative process with Student Affairs, Professional Ethics and Welfare, the Senate Officers, SGA, and the administration to create a positive culture of Academic Integrity and revise policies and procedures to support such a culture.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. The committee recommends that the administration implement the policy that was passed by the Senate in 1999 and again in 2004. It further recommends that the administration conduct an impact study for one to two years prior to the Senate’s considering higher GPA thresholds for Academic Dismissal. The impact study should gather evidence to answer the following questions:

1. Are there disproportionate effects on students who fall into any of the following categories: athletes, transfer students, EOF students, students of color?
2. Are students who need to re-take courses able to enroll in the classes they need to take to replace their Fs and/or Ds?
3. Is there an increase in the number of students withdrawing from courses?
4. Is there evidence of grade inflation?
5. Is there evidence that students are transferring in more courses from the county colleges?
6. How many more students are placed on Academic Probation or become subject to Academic Dismissal?
7. What is the effect on support services for the higher number of students who will be subject to Probation or Dismissal, including the resources for hearing appeals brought by the students?
8. Is there an effect on graduation rates?

B. The committee also recommends that the responsibility and procedures for dealing with instances of

academic dishonesty be transferred to the academic side of the university (departments, deans, provost's office) and that the necessary committees and procedures be developed. The flow chart (separate document) provides a starting point for redesigning the system for handling incidents of academic dishonesty.

- C. The committee recommends that a place holder grade be devised that can be used in cases of suspected academic dishonesty when the faculty member cannot discuss the incident with the student prior to submitting semester grades.

2005-06 Campus Aesthetics and Environmental Concerns

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 4

Committee Chair and Years Served on Committee: Skeffington Thomas-6

Committee Members and Years Served on Committee: Fred Adelson, David Clowney, Esther DeEugenio, Dennis C Dougherty, Diane Hamilton, Peter Jansson, Thomas Gallia, Roberta Reavey, Cristina Iftode, Rob Sterner, Eric G. Spokas, Terry O'Brien, Lisa Hatchadoorian, Clara Popa. Ex-officio attendees: Ed Thompson, Joe Orlins, John Imperatore

Purpose of/Charge to Committee: Reviews and recommends proposed changes that affect the aesthetic quality of the campus environment; recommends acceptance or rejection of proposals to the university president; reviews existing aesthetic qualities and recommends needed changes and addresses campus environmental concerns that affect the health and well-being of the university community and/or the natural environment.

Summary of Activities this Year:

Drafted and forward resolution 060417-2 'Rowan University and the NEW Jersey Higher Education Partnership for Sustainability (NJHEPS)' *attached below*

Maintained a working relationship with the Campus Master Planning Committee, members attended two meetings with Sasaki and Associates in Work-session 2 and 3; issues addressed NJHEPS, LEED Standards, signage, public transportation, reforestation, recycling;

Provided feed back for the following projects: Salt Storage, Alumni house pine trees and landscaping; Education garden; Robinson circle; clock on meditation walk/class gift;

Toured Hollybush and South campus to Townhouses with Tom Gallia;

Discussed pieces of campus art, including: the Machinsky and Saganic sculptures- recommended completing Machinshky as part of infrastructure 3 project and to discuss Saganic fountain with presentation of options; The artwork for the science building, the education building, the townhouse project, the Co generation plant;

Supported and participated in 'Rowan Clean and Green' Days;

Received an update on campus recycling from John Imperatore;

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- It is recommended that a strong working relationship be maintained with facilities operations and planning. Russ Seagren, Glenn Brewer, Mark Showers and Ed Thompson, Mary Acciani and Kevin Muldoon should be invited to attend meetings. If there is a project on campus that warrants committee input, the appropriate project manager should be invited to make a presentation.

- The steering committee of the Campus Master Planning Committee should be notified of meetings; some members will attend.
- Implementation of the AY 2006 Environmental resolution should be assessed. The final stages of the process for Master Planning with Sasaki and Associates will take place in AY 2007. The final document should be reviewed for fulfilling the spirit of this resolution.
- The status of the infrastructure 3 project and the affect on the Saganic sculpture should be addressed and an active item of business (carry over from AY 04, AY 05 and AY 06).
- The status of the Arts Inclusion projects for the science building, the townhouse project and the co-generation plant should be assessed.
- John Imperatore should be invited to provide an update on recycling efforts.
- The CAEC committee should sponsor/participate in Earth Day celebration, April 2007.

2005-06 Career Development

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 3

Committee Chair: Lee Bruce Kress, History Dept.

Committee Members: (list here)

Hughes, Karlton, Instructional Technology	Oxley-Hillman, Krista, Educ. Institute, (AFT Rep.)	Morris, Majorie Music Library
Madero, Roberto, Foreign Languages and Literatures.	Romeo, George Accounting & Finance	Schowalter, Daniel Communication Studies
Monahan, Thomas, Educational Leadership	Stieber, Marian Music	Tang, Gina Elec. & Computer Engineering

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

To develop procedures for the receipt and processing of career development materials from the candidates and academic department assessment committees. To receive and consider the reports from the department assessment committees, the supporting documentation, and the statements of the President/designee concerning all employees being assessed. To prepare a report to the President containing its recommendations concerning the allocation of Career Development funds.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The committee was allotted \$30,000 by the University Administration upon which to make recommendations for improvements in the career development of faculty and staff. About 60 individuals were scheduled for post tenure or multi year contact review under the provisions of Legislative bill A-328. From these individuals, there were 30 requests for financial support for career development projects totaling approximately \$70,000.

The committee developed evaluative criteria and standards based on the quality, merit, and thoroughness of the applications and supporting materials. We then considered and discussed all requests carefully and made our specific

recommendations to the President of the University in conformity with the contract and the available funding. We found all the requests worthwhile, and we suggested that they all receive at least some assistance.

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

We suggest that the A-328 agreement between the University Administration and AFT Local 2373 be revised to include the specific criteria for Career Development assessment by the department and university committees. We also suggest that the application form in the contract be revised to eliminate any mention of funding for release time since that provision is no longer applicable.

RECOMMENDATIONS: NONE

2005-06 Committee on Committees

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 2 face-to-face and several via email

Committee Chair: Frances S. Johnson

Committee Members: (list here)

Donna Jorgensen

Michael Weiss

Janet Lindman

Anthony Robb

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Polls eligible faculty/professional staff on committee membership choices; prepares a balanced list of suggested members for each committee and submits the lists for Senate approval; reviews the existing committee structure and recommends changes; oversees the following special committees to which the Senate appoints members: Awards Committee, University Scholarship Committee, Library Committee, Bookstore Committee, World Education Committee, Interdepartmental Promotion/Tenure and Recontracting.

Summary of Activities this Year:

- Distributed letters with attached list of all non-tenured faculty to all new committee chairs at the Senate election meeting.
 - Letter invited committee chairs to use the list for committee selection in addition to data bank completed by the Senate.
- While not all volunteers received the committee that was their first choice, almost all volunteers received a committee assignment.
 - Sent thank you letters (via email) to volunteers not selected.
 - Maintained a list of volunteers for committee vacancies.
- Oversaw special committees' first meetings and chair election.
- Wrote letters to department chairs encouraging them to use the services of the COC to staff search committees needing outside members and other activities where additional committee membership was required.

- Recruited outside members for two search committees.
- Filled numerous committees vacancies because of resignations and/or illness.
 - Filled A328 committee vacancies.
 - Filled Department T&R vacancies (small departments)
- Redrafted committee selection letter. Added committee descriptions.

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

- While it is the responsibility of the Committee on Committees to suggest changes in committee membership and charges, we feel that committee chairs should have a voice in this process. As such, we suggest that Committee Chairs work with the COC to review committee charges and membership requirements so that changes may be brought to the Senate.
- We suggest that diversity and a wide representation of voices (senior, mid-career and new) be affirmed as a continuing value on all committees.
- We recommend that the past and present chair of COC attend the committee selection process.

RECOMMENDATIONS: None

2005-06 Curriculum Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 8

Committee Chair: Eric Milou

Committee Members: (list here)

Eric Milou, Chairperson	Kevin Dahm	Kathleen Small
Joel Rudin	Doug Cleary	Connie Rosenberger
Faye Zhu	Andrew Hottle	Marilyn Feke
Lorin Arnold	Kaye Passmore	Jill Perry
Deb Martin	David Klassen	Joe Coulombe
Tanya Schmidt	Natalie Reaves	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

- **Review all curriculum proposals**

Summary of Activities this Year:

- **Reviewed 268 curriculum proposals (700 proposals over two-year period)**
- **Created web based curriculum database for tracking proposals**
- **Created new guidelines for WI proposals**

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

- Committee should review guidelines for MG & LIT tags
- Closely monitor and document the revision & update of the curriculum catabase by the Web Development Office

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Rowan University: Writing Intensive Courses

The following components of a Rowan Writing Intensive course need to be reflected in the materials shared with the Senate Curriculum Committee:

1. Discuss how the course increases student writers' rhetorical awareness of writing within a particular discipline's intellectual community, i.e., ways of knowing, critical thinking, and what counts as *good* or *acceptable* writing within that community.
2. Include descriptions of assignments, both formal and informal, where writing is used as an integral part of learning: that is, students write not only to demonstrate knowledge of the subject matter (tests and research papers) but are engaged in exploratory writing, writing that they use to further their thinking, to deepen their understanding of the subject matter, to explore questions they have about the subject matter and their discipline.
3. Include descriptions of assignments that demonstrate a range of writing throughout the semester, engaging students in writing assignments formal and informal, high stakes and low stakes, graded and non-graded.
4. If a major project is assigned, discuss how the entire writing process - from identifying purpose, persona, context, and audience, to inventing, drafting, revising, editing, and publishing - is emphasized. Demonstrate how smaller, sequenced assignments contribute to larger projects.
5. Discuss how conferencing (peer response groups, workshops, or one-on-one meetings with the instructor) during the writing process will be used to help writers improve thinking and writing.
6. Describe how evaluative feedback (both written and verbal) and student revision moves beyond error identification (editing concerns) and challenges the writer to re-envision drafts in terms of audience reception, content arrangement, and author's purpose for writing.
7. Identify ways in which the course reflects department and discipline specific criteria for what is valued in good writing by way of rubrics, heuristics, and other evaluative instrument to guide students in evaluating their own writing and the writing of their colleagues. *
8. If the course capacity exceeds the recommended 12-22 students, explain the circumstances.

*Required number of assignments, pages, or words will vary by discipline and according to what exactly is counted (pages, words, and assignments) and the type of writing (polished pages, drafts, journals, etc.) assigned. Each department establishes a rigorous benchmark of production for its writing intensive courses to include types of writing and amount.

2005-06 Intercollegiate Athletics

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 6

Committee Chair: Chris Lacke, Mathematics

Committee Members: (list here)

Jay Accorsi	Charles Grinnell (SGA)	Will Riddell
Bonnie Angelone	Maccamas Ikpah	Joy Solomen (<i>ex officio</i>)
Greg Biren (AFT)	Chris Lacke	Ed Streb (NCAA Faculty Rep.)
Chris Gadarowski	John Pastin	Shari Willis

***Purpose of/Charge to Committee:* Monitors the entire operation of intercollegiate sports on the campus. The NCAA faculty athletics representative may serve as the chair of the committee. The athletic director shall serve as an ex-officio (non-voting) member of the committee.**

Summary of Activities this Year:

1. Completed five-year NCAA self-review of athletics program. Review is on file in the Athletic Director's

office.

2. Took tour of athletic facilities and drafted a letter to the President's Office regarding unsafe conditions in the locker rooms and showers. (see attached)
3. Discussed policy of distributing free athletic passes. Discussed a variety of programs to charge a nominal fee for the passes. In addition to the pass, the individual will receive a Rowan Athletics item (hat, t-shirt, etc.) that is not available through other sources. The fee will exceed the cost of the item, thus bringing extra revenue to the athletics program.
4. Drafted a bylaw revision to change the composition of the committee. The revision comes to a final vote at the year-end meeting, so, hopefully, it will be in place by the time I am reading this on Tuesday, May 9.
5. Discussed issues regarding class availability and scheduling. These items are under the charge of a Provost's committee, which is being chaired by Ed Streb.
6. Examined Title IX and how Rowan meets the NCAA specifications.
7. Obtained an exclusive preview of the new Rowan logos.
8. Attended Student-Athlete Day luncheon to celebrate the academic achievements of those student-athletes earning a GPA of 3.0 or higher. This cohort comprises more than 50% of the student-athletes.
9. Began to discuss ways to assist student-athletes who are in need of academic help. The committee would like to frame this discussion in the context of all students who are in need of academic help, as we recognize that many students in both cohorts are succeeding.

Annual Suggestions/Recommendations

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

1. Continue to push for necessary repairs to current athletic facilities.
2. Analyze success of new athletic pass purchase program.
3. Continue to examine ways to identify and assist students in need of academic assistance. Examine possible interaction with Student Life committee on this topic.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

See attached letter to President Farish regarding condition of athletic facilities.

2005-06 Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 11

Committee Chair: Don Stoll

Committee Members: (list here)

Don Stoll, Chair	Dick Scott, LAS	Gini Doolittle, Education
Beth Wassell, APP Rep	Harold Thompson, Pro staff	Liz Hostetter, FPA
Robertta Harvey	Kevin Dahm, Curriculum Rep	Yusuf Mehta, Engineering
Craig Dillon, IR	Dorie Gilchrist, AFT Rep	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee: Engages in the ongoing review of the university's assessment principles

and observes the application of the principles in practice; reviews and recommends academic assessment plans in academic programs. General education, and student development; assists in the establishment of a process for the systematic review of assessment information collected each year.

Summary of Activities this Year: The mission of the LOAC during the 2005-06 academic year was:

- to continue to monitor the programmatic assessment activity on the RU campus conducted by the Assessment Consulting Team (ACT) and
- to begin the process of determining how to assess general education courses.

The Middle States assessment deadline of 2009 was noted.

Instead of having the committee identify criteria and a plan to assess general education, the committee decided to try to determine exactly what the goals of general education on the RU campus are.

To do this the committee decided to invite various stakeholders in general education to our meetings to discuss what they think general education should be. The committee was charged to come up with some ideas of who to invite. Invitees included the Provost, former and current Curriculum and LOAC chairs, members of the Provost's Task force on General Education Assessment and representatives from the Communication Studies and Writing Arts Departments regarding the Communication assessment practices. The report of the Task Force on General Education Assessment is available on the Provost's Web Page (<http://www.rowan.edu/provost/taskforce/#downloads>). The other defining document in terms of GE assessment is the undergraduate catalogue – also able to be downloaded by going to <http://www.rowan.edu/catalogs/>. The pertinent information is on page 39 ff.

In 2005 a Senate *ad hoc* committee did a revision of general education requirements. The new configuration creates three distinct sets of general education requirements depending upon the nature of the degree the student is pursuing. No attempt was made during this reconfiguration to address learning outcome assessment issues.

The prevailing belief seems to be that the goals of general education will be met if the student takes a range of courses in a variety of disciplines and passes each of the courses. The learning product of this experience will differ from student to student – hence assessing the learning outcomes other than on an individual-by-individual basis appears to be impossible with the possible exception of the communication (writing and speaking) skills as mastery of these skills can be measured and assessed.

The committee asked the chair to investigate how other institutions of similar size and makeup deal with general education assessment. The chair reported practices fall into roughly two categories: 1) students are required to take a discipline-specific course or courses in each discipline area covering the basics of that discipline and successfully completing these courses serves as the assessment criteria; 2) students are required to take a specific number of courses designated as meeting the criteria for general education – largely introductory courses in the various disciplines – and a capstone course or project is used to assess the effectiveness of these courses.

The Acting Provost, during her interview with the committee, urged the committee not to pursue the former practice because the university had recently undergone extensive work on general education course requirements and distribution.

Rather than reinvent the wheel, the committee decided to identify the values that under gird current practices in existing general education courses by surveying all faculty who teach general education courses. Five surveys were prepared, one each for the five disciplines in the existing Rowan general education banks, based upon the values identified in the Provost's Task Force on General Education Assessment. These instruments offer faculty teaching General Education courses the opportunity to gauge how central the values are to how they teach the courses and to offer their suggestions on what the values ought to be. The surveys – prepared with the assistance of Institutional Research - have been distributed and are being collected this spring.

-1

Annual Suggestions/Recommendations

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

- The results of the surveys will be tabulated and the findings presented to the University Senate during the fall of 2006.
- With the Senate's approval, the committee will hold hearings for members of each discipline during the fall of 2006 to discuss the results of the survey and arrive at a consensus of values that should guide each course offered in the general education banks.
- The outcomes of these hearings will then be brought to the Senate.

- The committee will begin the process of identifying objectives and means to assess whether general education at Rowan is meeting the values identified through this process.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

None

2005-06 PROFESSIONAL ETHICS & WELFARE

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 5

Committee Chair: Barbara Bole Williams

Committee Members: (list here)

Herb Applelson	Martin Itzowitz
Zenaida Gephardt	Robin McBee, AFT Rep
Diane Penrod	Barbara Williams, Chair
David Hespe	
Seth Bergmann	
Joy Wiltenberg	
Pat Quigley	
Pat Alexy Stoll	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Evaluates conditions under which faculty/professional staff function; recommends rules to ensure fair treatment for all faculty/professional staff members.

Summary of Activities this Year:

1. Committee worked in collaboration with two other Senate Committees (Academic Policies and Procedures and Student Relations) to develop campus-wide awareness of academic integrity.
2. Committee proposed initiation of Academic Integrity Task Force for 2006-07.
3. Committee developed draft for mission statement for *Developing a Culture of Academic Integrity* on Rowan University Campus. (See attached)
4. Chairperson engaged in discussion with individual faculty members regarding ethics issues (i.e., potential committee reviews).

-1

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

1. Maintain committee size and structure.
2. Ethics committee members serve two-year terms on a rotational basis in order to maintain continuity.
3. Continue collaborative work with other Senate committees on issue of Academic Integrity.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. In 2006-07, form a university-wide Task Force on Academic Integrity with representation from faculty,

professional staff, support staff, administration and students (all Rowan University constituencies).

2005-06 Promotion Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 5, includes one all-day meeting

Committee Chair: Sanford Tweedie, Communication

Committee Members: (list here)

Kathy Ganske, Education	Jim Newell, Engineering
Berrin Guner, Business	Cathy Yang, Liberal Arts and Sciences
Lili Levinowitz, Fine and Performing Arts	Joy Xin, AFT rep.

Purpose of/Charge to Committee: Supervises the election of college promotion committees, develops procedures for receipt and processing of promotion materials from candidates and college promotion committees, reviews applicant portfolios in light of the procedures established by the institution and the department and approved by the dean, certifies to the provost that the procedures have or have not been correctly carried out by both the department and college committees.

Summary of Activities this Year:

1. Fifty candidates signed up indicating the intent to apply for promotion by the October 15, 2005 deadline. Thirty-five portfolios were submitted to the All-University Committee. One of these was withdrawn by the candidate during deliberations. Of the 34 remaining portfolios, the committee voted to certify 24 (some with observations) and to not certify 10.
2. Applicant Distribution Reviewed by the Committee:
 - a. College of Business – 2 (both to full)
 - b. College of Communication – 3 (all to associate)
 - c. College of Education – 6 (4 to associate; 2 to full)
 - d. College of Engineering – 5 (3 to associate; 2 to full)
 - e. College of Fine & Performing Arts – 6 (2 to associate; 4 to full)
 - f. College of Liberal Arts & Science – 12 (10 to associate; 2 to full)
3. A letter for each candidate, detailing the decisions of the committee, was delivered to the provost on March 30, 2006 in accordance with the schedule in the agreement. Copies were sent to the applicant, the department committee and the college committee.

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

Committee Membership:

Because of the size of Liberal Arts and Sciences and the correspondingly large number of candidates from this college, the All-University Promotion Committee recommends that another representative from LAS be added to the All-University Promotion Committee.

Release time for chair:

In the view of the All-University Promotion Committee, the chair deserves 3 credit hours of reassigned time during the spring semester. The number of portfolios reviewed over the past three years has been 38, 25, and 34 (with one withdrawn this year after everyone had read it) and will continue to rise with the increase in tenure-track faculty. The Chair coordinates the college committee elections, organizes and coordinates the All-University committee, assigns readers to each portfolio, reads every portfolio, compiles certification letters, writes various reports, and responds to questions, queries, and concerns from candidates and chairs before, during, and after the process. This year, the All-University chair has received over 375 emails and written over 200 related to promotion, in addition to making and receiving numerous phone calls. The chair used to receive reassigned time. It appears to have been removed when the change in promotion procedures took place. The assumption was that this committee would be doing less work than in the past. While the onus of ranking candidates no longer rests with this committee, the workload does not appear to have been reduced.

Availability of Department/College Promotion Documents:

The All-University Committee proposes that all departmental/college promotion documents be placed on a password-protected area of the Senate website that is maintained and updated. Many promotion documents are clear, cogent, and easily navigated. As departments review and revise their promotion documents, these could serve as resources and models.

Ad Hoc Committees:

1) The Committee recommends that an ad hoc committee be formed to try to create greater alignment between the Promotion and the T&R documents. Suggested membership should include, but not necessarily be limited to: the chairs of the T&R and University Promotion committees, the President, chief negotiator and grievance chair of the AFT, and one or two candidates who recently went up for both promotion and tenure. Because so many candidates are now going up for promotion and T&R at the same time, having the documents parallel each other as much as possible would relieve some of the burden of putting the two files together during the same semester.

This ad hoc committee should also address whether or not page limits be suggested to candidates. The committee felt that some applicants, in their attempt to be comprehensive, created portfolios that were overwhelming to read. The committee believes that if a recommended page limitation for each section is provided to applicants, this will prevent the dilution of important information.

2) The Committee recommends that an ad hoc committee be formed to determine a more viable and less cumbersome way to elect College Promotion Committees than the one established by the *Memorandum of Agreement*. Trying to put together the College committees is always a difficult process. Changes need to be implemented. Suggested committee membership should include but not necessarily be limited to: the Presidents of the AFT and Senate, the negotiator and the University Promotion chair.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The following is broken down into three areas: (1) major changes to the *Memorandum of Agreement (MoA)*, (2) minor changes to the *MoA*, and (3) clarifications to the *MoA*. Rationales for the recommendations are contained within [brackets].

Significant Changes to the *Memorandum of Agreement*

The All-University Promotion Committee recommends several significant changes to the *MoA*:

1. Move the folder due date from approximately December 9 to either several days after the last day of the semester so that candidates can use student evaluations from that fall semester or to December 1 so that they can't use them at all. [Many candidates use student evaluations from fall semester, yet according to the *MoA* these should not be included.]
2. Require that a candidate needs to be tenured before being promoted. [That a candidate can be promoted before being tenured may put undue pressure on the T&R committee to make a recommendation in favor of the already-promoted candidate.] The following exception should apply: when an applicant has received tenure at another institution prior to coming to Rowan, she/he may apply for promotion before receiving tenure.
3. Allow candidates who are going up for tenure and promotion simultaneously to submit the same folder for both processes. [This presents a dilemma since tenure and promotion have different ways of structuring the documents. The main divergences include: T&R has no "Developing Learning Activities" and "Developing as a Teacher" sections, and the T&R agreement considers creating curriculum and advising to fall under service whereas the Promotion agreement considers these under teaching effectiveness. These discrepancies would have to be addressed.]

4. Require that a three-year time period pass between the time one attains the rank of associate professor and the time one attains the rank of full professor. [The committee feels there should be a sustained period of time for the candidate to demonstrate achieving the requirements for full professor. The committee feels that this time period should be no less than three years.]
5. Require candidates to provide more longitudinal evidence of a “consistent pattern of excellence in Teaching” (3.2311 and 3.2421). [The current requirement is one peer observation within the past twelve months and two student evaluations within two years. These, however, could—and sometimes are—from one semester. The committee recommends two colleague observations from different semesters and three student evaluations from at least two different semesters.]
6. Add the candidate’s college dean to the list of those who receive copies of the All-University committee letter. The Committee has found that departmental/college documents are not in agreement with the *MoA* and therefore would like the deans to know how this has been addressed by the All-University Committee.
7. The All-University Committee recommends that a standard letter to outside evaluators be created and made available to department committee chairs. This will clarify what the evaluator is to comment on in the candidate’s file.

Minor Changes to the Memorandum of Agreement

Note: A suggested application and checklist reflecting these changes are attached.

The All-University Promotion committee recommends:

1. The procedures for promotion should be clarified, streamlined and presented in only one place in the document. [Many requirements are discussed in multiple places. For example, outside evaluators are discussed on pages 13 and 18. Faculty Development and Individual Development Plans are found in both 5.24 & 5.315.]
2. That the departmental chair initial each item on the candidate’s checklist, attesting that all required elements of the promotion file are included.
3. The candidate include a full vita as part of the portfolio, as these are sometimes clearer about documentation and dates than is the portfolio itself. Or, revise 5.22 concerning the applicant’s portfolio to read, “...Complete documentation (e.g., chapter or book) supporting an individual’s request for promotion ~~may~~ (replace with *will*) be incorporated by reference, (add *following a standard scholarly reference format,*) in the portfolio and included as supplementary documentation in an/ appendix(es). [Portfolios often contained incomplete references of research and creative activity, especially lack of dates. This information is critical in determining the candidate’s accomplishments *since* the date of last promotion or date of employment at her/his present rank.]
4. Require that the names of chairs of departmental committees be forwarded to the Senate office when promotion committees are formed, usually at the beginning of October. [Otherwise, the committee has no idea who these people are until portfolios are submitted to the Senate office at the end of February.]
5. Require that candidates submit a Table of Contents of their supplemental material. *Or* that they submit full documentation of articles listed and the first page of each article/book. *Or* require that an additional copy of supplemental materials be submitted to the All-University Committee, as well as the one provided the dean.
6. Change section 3.243 of the *Memorandum of Agreement* under Research and Creative Activity to read: “Evidence for this body of work must reflect a consistent pattern of scholarly accomplishments since *the date of application* for promotion to associate professor.” [The *MoA* currently states, “Evidence for this body of work must reflect a consistent pattern of scholarly accomplishments *since attaining* the rank of associate professor.” A strict interpretation would argue that this occurs when the promotion to associate goes into effect. However, this leaves candidates with a period of uncountable scholarship: that time during which assistant professors have applied for associate professor (December) but not yet been granted the promotion and the time the promotion goes into effect (normally September of the following year).]
7. Require that the external evaluator’s vita be included in the candidate’s promotion file.
8. Clarify whether external evaluator should comment on all research and creative activity or only that since promotion to associate professor. [5.23 states that the external evaluator will comment on research and creative activity. 3.232 states that the candidate must demonstrate “[s]uccessful experience in Research and Creative Activity . . . since attaining the rank of assistant professor.” 5.343 states that the department committee shall, “After carefully considering the applicant’s portfolio and the comments of the external reviewer on the appropriateness of the candidate’s scholarly accomplishments . . .” Applying all of these criteria requires that the external evaluator discuss

only that work since the candidate became a full professor. This is confusing for candidates.]

9. That 5.3441 and 5.3442, which discuss the department committee meeting with the candidate, be changed to read: *This meeting will occur at least two working days prior to the portfolio and report being forwarded to the next level. The candidate will sign and date the committee's report, signifying receipt and adequate time to review the report and append a written response if desired.* [Since many committees do not finish their work until the deadline day, this does not allow adequate time for the candidate who receives a negative vote to decide whether to send his/her portfolio forward and to write a rebuttal, if s/he chooses. The Committee recommends that a timeline be stipulated.]
10. Change 5.642 of the *MoA* to read that the All-University Committee shall “*Certify or not certify* to the provost that the procedures for promotion within the department and college were applied correctly or that the procedures for promotion within the department and college were applied correctly.” [Currently, the section reads, “Certify to the provost that the procedures for promotion within the department and college were applied correctly or incorrectly.” Thus, all files are certified, but that is not the normal application of the term “certification.”]

Clarifications to the Memorandum of Agreement

The Committee recommends several clarifications be made within the *MoA*:

1. Make clear that original scores/sheets and signatures from those administering student evaluations are to be included.
2. Make clear that candidates for full professor must differentiate between their research and creative activities and practice and professional service since becoming an associate professor in their documents.
3. Clarify the following items in the application for promotion:
 - a. That the dates candidates provide reflect when the portfolio is submitted to the department committee.
 - b. In #11 of the application, the professional teaching experience section should clarify that, in the total teaching years section, candidates should count only full-time professional teaching experience. [Many count adjuncting and teaching assistantships towards this total, making it difficult for the committee to ascertain total years of full-time teaching.]
4. Include the recommendation for associate to professor by the departmental and college committee in the portfolio since 3.232 stipulates that the candidate must demonstrate “[s]uccessful experience in Research and Creative Activity . . . since attaining the rank of assistant professor.” [Including the letter will allow the Committee to better understand what was previously considered for promotion to associate.]
5. Require that the letter to the department chairperson declaring intent to apply for promotion, as required by 5.12, be included.
6. Require that documentation of dean’s approval of external evaluator needs to be included.
7. Better delineate how folders move around and who is responsible for this physical movement from office to office. In addition, the Committee recommends that at no time should folders be returned to candidates until the candidates have made the decision to withdraw from the process. [Currently, candidates who receive a no vote have their files returned to them, even though they may still decide to forward them.]
8. Stipulate in writing that candidates can write a response/rebuttal at any point in the process and ask that it be included in his/her portfolio. [This is a common practice, but not all candidates are aware of it.]
9. Provide evidence that department and college committees conducted interviews with candidates.

2005-06 Recruitment, Admissions, & Retention Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 7

Committee Chair: MaryBeth Walpole

Committee Members: (list here) MaryBeth Walpole, (Chair), Bill Carrigan, Jay Chaskes, Carol Clark, Joy Cypher, Jennifer Kadowec, Mary Marino, Walt Quint, Patrick Spearman, Michael Vigorita, Maria Rosado, Ieva Zake, Michael

Grove, Franklin Campbell-Jones, David Vaccaro, Jared Hasse (SGA), Tom Tiver (SGA), Jillian Dagion (SGA), Joanne Damming, representing the VP for Student Affairs

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Reviews and evaluates recruitment and admissions policies and procedures, specifically those which relate to curriculum, programs and instruction, and academic standards affecting progress toward a degree; recommends needed changes.

Summary of Activities this Year:

- Reviewed the 2004-2005 Annual Report, agreed to focus on recruiting and admitting a diverse student body, with particular attention to Latino students.
- Received information from the admissions office regarding recruiting and admitting students of color, reviewed report
- Met with the Director of Admissions and Interim EOF/MAP director to discuss recruitment and retention of students of color
- Reviewed and discussed census information for the State of New Jersey and the seven southern counties
- Met with Hector Rios and two of his former students to discuss a study they had done on Latino student attrition. One outcome of this is an orientation session for Latino students that Hector and Maria Rosado agreed to assist with.
- Reviewed data on percentages of student groups in other New Jersey state colleges and county colleges.
- Drafted recommendations

-1

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

Representation:

Membership that represents multiple vantage points across campus is important, and representatives should include someone from Admissions, the Registrar, the Career and Academic Planning Center, and coordinator of the Rowan Seminar. Ex-officio members should continue to be VP for Student Affairs, the director for the Center of Student Life and Development, and the director of International Student Services. Although a representative of the VP for Student Affairs regularly attended meetings, other representatives from the above offices did not. We suggest that representatives be officially named to the committees so that notices go to everyone and schedules can include them. It continues to be advantageous to have one faculty member from each college, and an AFT, professional staff, and at least one student representative. The student representatives attended more this year than in previous, and made important contributions. Additionally, it is recommended that there be continuity in the membership of this committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

A. We recommend that the Admissions Office put into place specific initiatives for increasing the numbers of underrepresented students, in keeping with the strategic plan. Given that increasing the numbers of these students is stated as a goal in the strategic plan, the Admissions Office should develop and clearly articulate a plan for fulfilling such a goal. We recommend the Admissions Office consider the following initiatives:

- 1) Planning open houses and orientations targeted for specific groups.

- 2) Planning Visitation Days for underrepresented students after they are admitted and before they deposit to welcome them.
- 3) Planning additional admissions visitations for underrepresented students
- 4) Planning admissions visitations for underrepresented students earlier in their high school experiences, possibly even in middle school.
- 5) Creating a plan for targeting community college students for transfer, who are disproportionately underrepresented students.

B. We further recommend the following initiatives to aid in both the recruitment and retention of diverse students:

- 6) Residence Life exploring ideas for themed housing, for example by floor. These themes could include racial or ethnic themes and could include academic themes.
- 7) Exploring ways to increase awareness of and support for Latino Cultural Awareness month and other programming throughout the year, with appropriate financial resources that are not reallocated from existing initiatives.
- 8) Exploring the idea of a Latino Studies concentration
- 9) Providing appropriate and visible signage for the Multicultural Affairs Office

2005-06 Research Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 7

Committee Chair: Robi Polikar

Committee Members:

Leigh Botner	Jane Graziano
Brian Lefebvre	Keith Johnson
Craig Dillon	Michael Lim
Greg Biren	Richard Frazee
James Heinzen	Sheri Chinen-Biesen
Judith Holmes	Robi Polikar
Ihsan Isik	
John Hasse	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee: The research committee monitors research and research services on campus to identify and address issues of research interest. The committee makes recommendations for (i) promoting research and research awareness on campus; (ii) meeting resource needs for research; and (iii) establishing policies to ensure that research related issues on campus are addressed appropriately. The committee solicits, compiles and disseminates input from the campus community to insure that the *faculty, staff, students, and administration are aware of current research efforts, resources and challenges.*

Summary of Activities this Year:

The research committee undertook two main issues during the 2005-2006 year:

1) Propose revised guidelines for preparation and review of non-salary financial support grants (NSFSG). During its first year of implementation, the NSFSG ad hoc committee noticed some serious shortcomings in the entire process: the faculty were not given adequate guidelines in preparing a competitive grant proposal; and the review process was neither efficient (due to every members having to read every proposal), not sufficiently fair (due to understandably lack of expertise of the committee members in other areas of research). The research committee prepared a detail set of guidelines for preparation as well as review of these proposals. The proposed changes were brought to senate floor as

a resolution, which was accepted with no objections.

The committee – after 4 months – received comments from the (academic council?) which reviewed our suggestions. Unfortunately, they have practically ignored all of our suggestions. A meeting with the provost's office is being planned to further discuss this issue.

2) In response to complaints from many faculty members, the research committee discussed the issue of providing a tuition fellowship to graduate research assistants who are funded through external grants. Lack of such a benefit makes Rowan very competitive in external funding opportunities, and severely restricts our ability to recruit quality graduate students. The research committee prepared a resolution recommending that a tuition fellowship be provided to such students. A detailed background report on the merits of such a program, as well as suggestions on how it could be funded was also presented to the senate. The senate unanimously approved the resolution.

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

1. Both of the above mentioned issues should be followed up
2. The dean of the graduate school has asked the committee to discuss effective ways to inform / educate the faculty on responsible conduct of research. The committee did not have time to consider this issue during 2005-2006 year. This is indeed an important issue, and hence needs to be discussed in a timely manner.

2005-06 Sabbatical Leave Committee

COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON: John V. Gallagher

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

	Sabbatical Leave	Total 11 - including Chair	College/Library
1	CHAIR, John Gallagher	Faculty or Professional Staff	Education
2	Sonia Spencer	Faculty or Professional Staff	LAS
3	Steve Cone	Faculty or Professional Staff	Education
4	Kenneth Albone	Faculty or Professional Staff	Communications
5	Ella Strattis	Faculty or Professional Staff	Library
6	Robin McBee	Faculty or Professional Staff	Education
7	Gary Itzkowitz	Faculty or Professional Staff	LAS
8	Denyse Lemaire	Faculty or Professional Staff	LAS
9	Harold Lucius	Faculty or Professional Staff	Business
10	Susan Bowman	Faculty or Professional Staff	FPA
11	Janice Rowan	AFT Representative	Communications

PURPOSE OF/CHARGE TO COMMITTEE:

The Sabbatical Leave Committee shall receive applications, conduct a review of applications and make its recommendations to the President in accordance with the current contractual agreement.

NUMBER OF MEETINGS HELD THIS YEAR: Three

November 22, 2005 Organization Meeting

December 7, 2005 Working Session

December 8, 2005 Working Session – Committee completed work

SUMMARY OF YEAR'S ACTIVITIES:

- The Procedural Guidelines on the Senate Page were updated.
- All-university notification by campus-wide email and by letter was sent announcing the signup period and deadlines for this year's cycle of sabbatical leave application.

- A list of all campus members who are eligible for sabbatical leave was obtained from the Provost's office.
- Committee members met for an organization meeting November 22, 2005 where we discussed procedures, stressed confidentiality of the process and deliberations, and scheduled working sessions. Committee members received their copies of the applications.
- Committee members met on December 7th and 8th 2005 to conduct the work of the committee, discussing the merits of each application, and voting and ranking each application.
- Data of the voting were placed on spreadsheets for reporting purposes.
- A report of the committee's decisions and recommendations was sent to the President February 27, 2006 along with copies of the applications.
- Based upon the recommendations of the President to the Rowan Board of Trustees at their meeting of April 26, 2006, all 24 semesters recommended by the Senate Sabbatical Leave Committee were approved and granted by the Board.
- The Senate should note that six outstanding sabbatical leaves deferred from previous years when semester sabbatical leaves were funded at 100% salary, were granted at the contractual salary of 75%.
- A meeting in 2005 with the AFT, Senate and Mr. Zazzali of the Provost's Office resulted in a decision to require any deferred applicant to take the deferred sabbatical leave during AY 2006 or AY 2007. Failing to take either of these options, deferred candidates would revert to a status as if they never applied and were granted sabbatical leave and all longevity data would be reset as if the deferred leave was never granted. Six deferred candidates will take their leaves AY 2007 and are included in the above resolution by the Board. Five individuals, who did not apply to activate their deferred leave, will fall under this agreement.

SUGGESTIONS [non-binding] FOR NEXT YEAR (Size, Representation, Functions, etc.):

1. Excel spreadsheets were developed for use during the work of the committee, placed on a CD, and will be passed from committee chair to new chair each year. A master copy of the spreadsheet CD should be kept in the Senate office. In this way, the committee chair could take a laptop to committee meetings to use the spreadsheet in the calculations work of the committee. This would greatly ease the work of the committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Sabbatical Leave Committee membership is currently ten faculty/professional staff/librarians plus an AFT Representative. We recommend that the Senate constitution/by-laws revision include a membership distribution of at least one member from each college of the University, one librarian, and the AFT representative.

2005-06 Senate Student Relations Committee (SSRC)

Committee Chair: Lori Block PHR

Committee Members: Lori Block (Chairperson of Committee & Career and Academic Planning Center), Alison Krufka (College of Liberal Arts and Sciences), Mary Beth Hegel (McSiip/NJSSI/NJMSP/SJMP),

Richard Earl (College of Communications), Roberta Dihoff (College of Liberal Arts and Sciences)

David Applebaum (College of Liberal Arts and Sciences), Karen Heinz (College of Liberal Arts and Sciences), Mary Lee Donahue (College of Communications), Bonnie Wilson (Academic Success Center, Student Affairs), Dan Reigel (Admissions, Student Affairs), Cindy Kammer (AFT Rep).

Tina Pinocci, Assistant Vice-President of Student Affairs and George Brelsford, Associate Vice President of Student Affairs also attended meetings. Joe Mulligan, Assistant Dean of Students presented at the October meeting the proposed new Code of Conduct.

Purpose of Charge:

"To evaluate existing and proposed relations and procedures and initiate recommendations for changes"

Number of Meetings Held this Year: There were six meetings held this year.

Also, there were numerous email discussions as well. The committee also hosted a student forum on academic honesty in March.

Summary of Year's Activities: Our committee was very active researching, discussing and presenting many agenda items to be addressed.

The Assistant Dean of Students presented at the October 2005 SSRC meeting a proposed revised Code of Conduct, from the Division of Student Affairs. The chair, on behalf of the committee wrote a letter to the Vice –President of Student Affairs and Assistant Dean of Students with the committee concerns regarding this new proposed Code of Conduct. The Vice-President wrote a response to the committee's letter. The Senate President, Bruce Caswell requested of President Farish a side by side comparison of the revisions. Late in the spring semester a document with paraphrased revisions was presented to the committee. The committee still wishes to receive a document that would provide a side by side comparison of the revision of the Code of Conduct.

As a result of discussions surrounding a Code of Conduct and academic honesty, the committee sponsored a "Town Hall" or Student Forum on academic honesty at Rowan University. It was held on March 29th at 7pm in the Student Center Pit. Forty students were in attendance and ten faculty and professional staff. Dr. David Appelbaum served as the Master of Ceremony of the evening. The Student Forum consisted of open dialogue between the audience of students and panel moderators. The students were posed scenarios regarding academic honesty in groups facilitated by a faculty or staff moderator. The students later came together to report on their discussions and were quite willing to share their views on what they perceived as academic honesty was and was not. They also shared that there were "gray" areas. At the end of the evening the students were asked who should be developing a code of conduct and who should be enforcing it. In general the students believed that they the students of Rowan University should be able to be a part of the development of a code of conduct and of the adjudication of cases involving academic dishonesty.

Enclosed are the tabulations of evaluations distributed at the student forum on academic honesty.

As a result of hosting the student forum and after a review of the proposed Code of Conduct, the committee believes that a "Declaration of Core Values and Guiding Principles" should be developed and adopted at Rowan University in order to begin to cultivate a community of academic honesty on campus.

The Committee also addressed this academic year the "Readmission Policy". Committee member Dan Reigel from the Admission Office conducted research as to the readmission policy's of aspirant institutions. In discussion amongst the committee, it was established that there were a lot of nuances to the situation of readmission and who it would affect that the committee will hope to again revisit this topic next year.

The Committee was extremely concerned with the lack of student involvement in the committee for the second year. It is the strong recommendation of the committee to recruit students other than SGA to "sit" on this committee. This would not eliminate but include members of SGA.

The reason behind this proposal is in light of the promises made to this committee at the end of last year and beginning of this current academic year. SGA assured that they would have representation on this committee. Again, it was virtually non-existent.

2005-06 Technological Resources Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 6

Committee Chair: Vasil Hnatyshin

Committee Members:

Vasil Hnatyshin	Gerald Hough	Krishan Bhatia
Mark Sedlock	Robert Lipartito	Joe Bierman
Peter Rattigan	Hong Zhang	Eddie Guerra
Jerry Spencer	Jim Haugh	Shifei Chung
Dex Whittinghill	Tom Fusco	Kashdan, Zachary M.
Eileen Stutzbach	Steve Hartley	Candace Kelley

Purpose of/Charge to Committee: Technological Resources Committee monitors technological resources to insure that the services and resources meet the needs of the campus community in research and academic pursuits. By soliciting and compiling input from the campus community, the committee attempts to insure that the faculty, staff, and students are aware of the current technological services on campus that can and do support these efforts. Responses to a periodic faculty and staff survey will insure that a collaborative effort exists in developing recommendations to enhance the University vision in the areas defined by the committee charge.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The Technological Resources Committee examined the following issues during the 2005 -2006 year:

- **Computer Competency Exam:** the committee worked together with the Provost's office and the department of Information Resources to evaluate and purchase the new software for Computer Competency Exam developed by company called Kenexa. In the course of the year the Committee evaluated the software and provided the feedback to the department of Information Resources. In April 2006 Information Resources reported that the new software had been purchased. In May 2006 the Technological Resources committee will undertake configuration of the new Computer Competency Tests for incoming freshman.
- **Transition for GroupWise to Exchange:** at the start of the 2005-2006 school year there were several concerns raised regarding transition from GroupWise to Microsoft Exchange. Mark Sedlock reported that all the issues were resolved and the transition has been successfully completed.
- **Technology Enhanced Classrooms:** at the start of the 2005-2006 school year there were several concerns raised regarding current equipment in technology enhanced classrooms. To learn more about this issue the Technological Resources committee met with Neil Toporski, the Director of Instructional Technology, who reported that smart classrooms utilize AMX technology which is about 7-10 years old and is failing. Furthermore, inadequate number of staff members together with almost constant occupancy of the technology enhanced classrooms prevents the Instructional Technology from fixing all arising problems in timely manner. Currently, Instructional Technology is in the process of introducing a new type of lectern. New lectern is supported via a single computer and is smaller, safer, and costs 50% less than the original AMX models. In December 2005 the Technological Resources committee conducted a tour of the technology enhanced classroom with new lectern. The Technological Resources committee reports that new lectern is an excellent teaching tool and is a significant improvement over currently used AMX

technology.

- **Linux/Unix Help on the web:** during school year 2005 -2006 several faculty members asked for help operating computers that ran Linux or UNIX operating systems. The Technological Resources Committee contacted Mark Sedlock who set-up a link from the Information Resources web-page to the web-page that contain documentation, help, FAQ, and other resources for Rowan University computers that ran Linux or UNIX operating systems.
- **Professional Staff Equipment:** during school year 2005 -2006 several faculty members raised the question of who provides equipment and support for professional staff. The Technological Resources Committee contacted Tony Mordosky, the Associate Provost for Information Resources, who reported that the department of Information Resources maintains the computer replacement cycle as recommended by company named Gardner, which does the hardware change prediction. Currently, 85% of professional staff have been moved to the 4-year equipment replacement cycle; IR currently working to take care of the remaining professional staff personnel. Generally, IR is responsible for supporting and updating equipment for professional staff. The main problems are with the equipment replacement cycle are: inadequate funding and difficulty in keeping track of the equipment's age. Centers and institutes suppose to operate on the "break even" approach and should be self-funded; their equipment is not included in the Information Resources department's budget. Unfortunately, some institutes make no money and thus do not have any available funds for equipment. In such cases, the institutes are placed on the list for equipment replacement in the IR. However, with already long list of other equipment that has to be replaced (e.g. faculty, professional staff, and campus infrastructure which all take precedence over centers/institutes) it could take a while before the centers/institutes will receive necessary equipment.
- **Printing and Copying on Campus:** due to sharp increases in the paper and toner spending the Technological Resources committee was charged with investigating the current printing practices on campus. The department of Information Resources conducted a study and reported that there is an abuse of printing privileges by members of Rowan University community. To promote more responsible attitudes towards printing, the Technological Resources committee wrote and distributed a Rowan University announcement asking students and employees to re-evaluate their printing practices and try to limit the amount of information they print. In addition, after several long discussions including consultation with Tony Mordosky, the Associate Provost for Information Resources, the Technological Resources Committee decided that implementing a campus-wide policy that limits the number of pages a student could print per specific time period (e.g. month or semester) would be a good solution to the problem.
 - Students will have a flat limit on the number of pages they can print
 - The limit will be lifted for students or course sections when the course work requires students to print more (expected to happen very rarely)
 - Students who exceed their limit will be charged for each extra page printed

Such a policy will NOT influence typical Rowan University student, will reduce printing abuse on campus, and will facilitate more responsible and more economical use of printing resources on campus.

Furthermore, Informational Resources estimates that the purchasing and installing a software system for managing printing on campus will cost around \$5,000 while annual savings could be as high as \$15,000.

- **Support for Information Resources:** Over the course of the 2005-2006 academic year, the Technological Resources committee has reviewed several documents provided by the Department of Information Resources and had several discussions with Anthony Mordosky, Associate Provost for Information Resources, and Neil Toporski, the Director of Instructional Technology, on the issue of current funding of Information Resources. While the expectations of and demands on Information Resources have grown exponentially over the last several years neither the funding nor the staff has materialized to meet those needs. Information Resources is under-funded and under-staffed by almost every measure reviewed by this committee. It is the mission of this Committee to have a positive and productive influence on technology use at Rowan; in that capacity the Technological Resources Committee urges University administration to re-evaluate current technology funding and provide better support for Information Resources.
- **Music Library:** at the end of 2005-2005 academic year the Technological Resources committee was notified that the Music Library, along with members of the Music Department faculty, is interested in moving forward in developing an infrastructure for the delivery of online digital audio for classroom and student use. The Technological Resources Committee will examine this issue during the next academic year.
- **Rowan University to require laptops for all students:** Recently the Provost's literacy task force started looking into a possibility of requiring all incoming freshman to purchase a laptop. The Technological Resources Committee will conduct a preliminary research of this issue and will develop a recommendation during the next academic year.

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

Follow-up on the issues discussed during the 2005-2006 academic year:

- **Computer Competency Test.**
- **Campus-wide printing policy for students.**
- **Funding for Information Resources**

Examine new issues:

- **Implement campus-wide printing policy for organizations and faculty**
- **Music Library**
- **Laptops for the students**

RECOMMENDATIONS: 2005-06

**TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE RESOLUTION:
SUPPORT FOR INFORMATION RESOURCES**

BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

As at many Universities, technology has become a truly indispensable component of our daily lives at Rowan. From the ubiquity of email and high speed Internet access from every corner of every building to course materials distributed on the web and our daily interactions with students on-line, the conveniences brought by modern computing have become necessities. During this transition Information Resources has rapidly become a critical component of the core mission of the University. In order to continue to meet the evolving needs of the University Information Resources requires increased funding and additional staff.

The office of Web Development is a good example of a department that has experienced extensive growth but has seen little in increased support to deal with the demand. Web Development currently maintains approximately 150 institutional web sites, 30 web based software applications, and a number of specialized web sites for different campus organizations. In calendar year 2001, Rowan's primary web server received 75 million hits. In calendar year 2005 there were 305 million hits, and in 2006 there will be an estimated 374 million hits. To help keep pace with the growth in web sites and the 400% increase in utilization over the last five years the Web Development staff has received exactly one new staff member, increasing their overall full-time, non-clerical staff to three individuals.

Network and System Services is another department that has experienced a similar growth in services offered and utilization while actually experiencing a loss of staff. In 2001 there were 6,000 network ports on the Rowan Campus. As of April 2006, there are 13,000. The University's server infrastructure, which is particularly demanding on staff resources, has experienced explosive growth as well, increasing from 41 servers in 2001 to over 90 servers today. During this period of growth the NSS staff has actually become smaller. The only clerical line in the department has been permanently removed and the line for the one staff member that retired during this period has been removed from the department.

Technology Enhanced Classrooms have quickly become an expected feature for many classroom lectures. Presentations that were previously done on chalk boards or with overhead projectors have quickly moved into the 21st century and now include many kinds of media that require a wide array of equipment. These TEC rooms include DVD players, computers, high fidelity audio systems, projector display systems and touch panel control systems that help all of the equipment to work together. Due to the necessarily complex integration of the varied components in each TEC room they tend to be very maintenance intensive. In 2001 there were 13 TEC classrooms available to Rowan faculty supported by two employees in Instructional Technology. As of April 2006 there are 88 TEC classrooms – an increase of more than 500% with no change in the number of support staff.

Perhaps the most illustrative comparison is to another New Jersey State University on our list of aspirant institutions based on data collected in 2004. The College of New Jersey (TCNJ) is a slightly smaller institution with 6,102 FTE students to our 7,656. TCNJ has 65 full time staff in their central IT organization compared to our 53. Expressed as a ratio to students, TCNJ has one full-time central IT person for every 94 students; Rowan has one for every 145 students. The director of TCNJ's IT organization held a cabinet level position, ours reports to the Provost. TCNJ spends approximately \$1000 per student on their central IT operating budget. Rowan's allotment is \$772 per student.

While these examples taken in isolation may not be indicative of a systemic problem, the broader picture they paint together illuminates the fact that we're simply not allocating the resources we need to technology at Rowan. It has become clear that technology is playing an increasingly important role in Rowan University's ascension to "the next level." Sufficiently funding our Information Technology infrastructure is a critical step in getting there.

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS, the Technological Resources committee of the University senate has interviewed with and reviewed several documents provided by the Associate Provost for Information Resources over the course of the 2005-2006 academic year, and

WHEREAS, These documents included comparative financial and staffing data in the area of technology support for several of Rowan University's peer and aspirant institutions, and

WHEREAS, Information Resources has rapidly become a critical component of the core mission of the University, and

WHEREAS, the expectations of and demands on Information Resources have grown exponentially while neither the funding nor the staff has materialized to meet those needs, and

WHEREAS, Information Resources is under-funded and under-staffed by almost every measure reviewed by this committee

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the University Senate that we urge Rowan University administration to re-evaluate current technology funding and provide better support for Information Resources.

TECHNOLOGICAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE RESOLUTION:

CAMPUS-WIDE PRINTING POLICY

BACKGROUND:

Rowan University offers a wide array of computing, networking, and instructional resources and services to members of the university community. Computer laboratories provide a learning environment that supports teaching and learning at Rowan.

Computer printing and support is essential for students to successfully accomplish course and graduation requirements. All Rowan computer laboratories provide laser printing for students. Printing is considered essential for academic needs -- but not for non-academic organizations and events such as Fraternities, Sororities, sports, and their flyers. The latter organizations are encouraged to use Printing/Duplicating Services for large print jobs.

Recently Rowan University's spending for printing on campus has increased significantly. In the 2004 fiscal year, in the Rowan Hall, Mimosa, and Bunce computer laboratories, \$13,853.90 was spent on paper and another \$34,362.54 was spent on toner (\$48,216.44 total costs). For the 2006 fiscal year Information Resources estimates a 40% increase from the last year in paper and toner costs alone. A similar situation occurs in the Library: in 2004 the Library spent over \$6,000 on paper and almost \$11,000 on toner, and in 2005, \$8,000 was spent on paper and over \$15,000 on toner. These numbers do not include replacement and maintenance of the printers.

To identify the problem, Instructional Technology evaluated student printing jobs. According to the study a typical student on average prints just over 120 pages per month. However, 3-4% of the students frequently consume over 500 pages per single printing job, far exceeding the student average. This means that 3-4% of the student population is responsible for over 30% of all printed pages and associated costs. It seems unlikely that these print volumes were a result of purely academic need and most likely the result of student abuse for personal or organizational intent.

A simple and effective solution to the printing problem would be to introduce a campus-wide policy that will install a flat limit on the number of pages a student could print per month. In rare cases, when course work requires student to print more than the introduced limit, the Informational Resource will temporarily increase the page limit for that student or the whole section of the course. All the other students who exceed their monthly page limit will be charged for each additional page printed.

Such a policy will NOT influence a regular Rowan University student. In fact, in most cases Rowan University students will not notice any changes. However, such policy will reduce printing abuse and will facilitate more responsible and more economical use of printing resources on campus. Informational Resources estimates that the price of purchasing and installing a software system for managing printing on campus will be around \$5,000 while annual savings could be as high as \$15,000. Furthermore, a large number of universities implemented a similar printing policy (see attached survey).

RESOLUTION:

WHEREAS: in the face of looming fiscal crisis Rowan University should strive to become more financially responsible and use available resources more efficiently.

WHEREAS: Rowan University is experiencing sharp increases in printing costs.

WHEREAS: the increase in printing cost is largely due to an abuse of printing privileges by a small group of students, and irresponsible attitudes towards printing on campus by Rowan University students and employees (e.g. it costs nothing, so print away).

WHEREAS: a campus-wide policy that installs a flat limit on the number of pages a student could print per specific time period (e.g. month or semester) is a simple and effective solution to the printing problem.

- Students will have a flat limit on the number of pages they can print
- The limit will be lifted for students or course sections when the course work requires students to print more (expected to happen very rarely)
- Student who exceed their limit will be charged for each extra page printed

WHEREAS: such a policy will NOT influence regular Rowan University student. In fact, in most cases Rowan University students will not notice any changes.

WHEREAS: such a policy will reduce printing abuse on campus and will facilitate more responsible and more economical use of printing resources on campus.

WHEREAS: Informational Resources estimates that the price of purchasing and installing a software system for managing printing on campus will be around \$5,000 while annual savings could be as high as \$15,000.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: Rowan University should implement a campus-wide printing policy that will limit the number of pages a student can print.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: Rowan University should provide Information Resources with necessary funds to purchase and install appropriate software in a timely fashion.

2005-06 Tenure & Recontracting Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 23 (including 16 hearings)

Committee Chair: Tricia Yurak

Committee Members: 7

Tricia Yurak, Chair	Jim Newell (Coll of Engineering)
Michael Banutu-Gomez (Coll of Business)	Winnie Still (Prof Staff)
Julia Chang (Coll of Communications)	Paule Turner (Coll of FPA)
Ben Fisher (Library)	Joy Xin (Coll of Ed)
Kauser Jahan (Coll of Engineering)	AFT Reps (rotating: Joy Wiltenburg & Sandy McHenry)
Yuhui Li (Coll of LAS)	
Stu McGee (Prof Staff)	
Brenda Marlin (Prof Staff)	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

TENURE AND RECONTRACTING: Develops procedures ensuring equitable treatment for all faculty/professional staff, screens candidates not under tenure or multi-year contracts, and recommends to the University President those qualified for retention. Cannot serve concurrently on Departmental Tenure & Recontracting Committee.

Eligibility: 8 Tenured Faculty (at least one from each College)

1 Librarian

3 Professional Staff

1 AFT Rep

Total 13

Summary of Activities this Year:

The Tenure & Recontracting Committee prepared written evaluations of 66 applications in the Fall and 23 applications in the Spring. In the Fall, hearings were held for 7 applicants, and in the Spring, hearings were held for 1 applicant.

The Chair participated in a Fall T&R workshop coordinated by the Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence and, when requested, assisted candidates and departmental committees with questions regarding the Memorandum of Agreement and required application materials.

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: None

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Reminders & suggestions for candidates and departments for the upcoming year:

Adherence to the Memorandum of Agreement:

- Both candidates and departmental committees need to adhere to designated deadlines stated in the Memorandum of the Agreement.
- As indicated in the Memorandum, applicants must turn in a Supplemental file that includes all previous evaluations from the Department, Dean or Supervisor, Senate, and President, as well as previous student evaluations and peer observations.
- Throughout their probationary period, candidates should collect student evaluations every semester (usually from two classes; consult Memorandum). As stated in the Memorandum, each of those evaluations should be included in the candidates' most recent applications.

Communication within departments:

- Candidates and departmental committees are encouraged to coordinate as early as possible each semester to ensure 1.) that all required materials are included in the applications and 2.) that any questions regarding the

Memorandum are clarified by the All-University T&R Committee, the Union, and/or the Provost's office.

Clarity of evaluative criteria:

- Departmental committees are encouraged to review their criteria for purposes of clarity, and then to base their candidate assessments clearly on those criteria.

2005-06 University Budget & Planning Committee

COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRPERSONS: Robert Fleming and Robert D'Augustine

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Robert Fleming (Co-Chairperson) (Management/MIS)
Robert D'Augustine (Co-Chairperson) (Administration and Finance)
Katherine Boland (Institutional Research and Planning)
T.R. Chandrupatla (Mechanical Engineering)
Ray Cibo (IFPTE)
Denis DiBlasio (Music)
Rick Hale (Administration and Finance)
Greg Hecht (Biological Sciences)
Scott Hanners (SGA)
Larissa Kyj (Accounting and Finance)
Phillip Lewis (University Senate)
Chuck Linderman (CWA)
Jeffrey Maxson (Composition and Rhetoric)
Esther Mummert (College of Communication)
Robert Newland (Chemistry and Biochemistry)
Corann Okorodudu (AFT)
Nicholas Schmelz (Elementary Education/Early Childhood)
Patrick Wescott (Elementary Education/Early Childhood)

PURPOSE OF/CHARGE TO COMMITTEE:

The University Budget and Planning Committee maintains a meaningful dialogue on budget and planning decisions between the University Administration and the University Senate.

NUMBER OF MEETINGS HELD THIS YEAR:

Six UBPC meetings have been held thus far this year. The meeting dates were as follows:

September 19, 2005
January 4, 2006
March 1, 2006
March 10, 2006
March 31, 2006
April 19, 2006

President Farish participated in three of these meetings. Interim Provost Faison participated in one meeting. One of the meetings was an organizational meeting of the co-chairpersons and subcommittee chairpersons. Additionally, the three subcommittees held separate meetings with the five Division Heads.

SUMMARY OF YEAR'S ACTIVITIES:

The Committee monitored the University and State budget situation throughout the year. The Committee reviewed and prioritized funding requests received from the Division Heads for the FY07 budget. Requests for new faculty lines under the FY08 budget have not been addressed yet given the current budget uncertainty.

Three subcommittees were utilized in this review process (Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Administration). These subcommittees were chaired by Robert Newland, Patrick Wescott, and Kate Boland, respectively. The Committee also reviewed and commented on University planning documents. As Co-Chairperson, Robert Fleming attended the Board of Trustees Budget and Finance Committee meetings.

The Committee plans to review budget suggestions received from the administration shortly. Given the current budget situation, the Administration will continue to utilize the Committee over the next two months. Dr. Farish will want to confer with the Committee at some point late in the budget process regarding budget measures that he is implementing and other related matters. Ideally, we would invite the members of both this year's and next years' Committee to that meeting.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT YEAR:

1. Authorize, as has been done in the past in times of budget uncertainty, the University Budget and Planning Committee to continue to fulfill its charge through the end of June 2006.
2. Continue to function as an integral component within the University's planning and budgeting processes.

ALL-UNIVERSITY COMMITTEES:

2005-06 Medallion Awards Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 2

Committee Chair: Claudia Cuddy

Committee Members:

Claudia Cuddy-chair	Faculty or Professional Staff
Joyce Wood	Faculty or Professional Staff
Janet Moss	Faculty or Professional Staff
Hong Ling	Faculty or Professional Staff
Jodi Bornstein	Faculty or Professional Staff
Marilyn Feke	Faculty or Professional Staff
Frank Epifanio	Faculty or Professional Staff
Cathy Parrish	Faculty or Professional Staff
Tony Smith	AFT Representative

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

The Committee approves the senior students selected by departments and other groups to receive honors for outstanding achievement in curricular and service areas. The student must be a graduating or walking senior who meets the criteria for the award.

The committee takes care of ordering the medallions, sending out the information packets, publicizing, communicating with departments, sending letters to the recipients, sending follow-up thank-you letters to sponsors, and taking care of budgetary concerns.

Summary of Activities this Year:

Our first meeting set in motion some plans, but we were waiting for decisions coming from the president's cabinet. When the guidelines were in place, early January, packets went out to departments, and in February, the committee met to validate that the students on the selection forms were seniors and on the correct college lists. From there, the chair sent out letters to students and ordered the medallions.

Rowan had a new seal this year, so we went to a new vendor, Pitman Jewelry, for a new mold casting. The new medallions are

larger and thicker, and they come with a beautiful display box. The presentation is quite impressive.

The chair coordinated with the individual colleges as to when they needed their certificates and medallions. Spreadsheets were typed and information was given to University Relations for publicity purposes. Individual spreadsheets were sent to colleges.

Lists were given to Ms. Stubbs for graduation programs.

Thank you letters to the sponsors will be sent, as well as letters to the college community reminding everyone that their award can be made perpetual if the \$1500 is received by June 25. After that, the perpetual cost is \$5000.

Number of awards given out in 2006: 72 awards: 64 undergrad, 8 grad

BY COLLEGE:

Business: 5 (4 perpetual)

Communication: 13 (10 perpetual) (1 new award)

Education: 10 (5 perpetual) (1 new award)

Engineering: 5 (4 perpetual)

Fine & Performing Arts: 8 (8 perpetual) (3 new awards)

Liberal Arts and Sciences: 16 (5 perpetual)

Recognition/Nomination: 7 (2 perpetual)

Graduate School: 8 (4 perpetual)

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year:

Either a small committee of 3 people or one person per college is sufficient. Unless each college is represented, then we don't need more than 3 people. Tasks are administrative and organizational.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Make earlier deadlines, perhaps February 10. Packets could be sent out in December.

Revise selection forms for clarity.

Communicate with separate colleges as to their awards distribution.

More publicity for the nominated awards: courage, leadership, distinguished senior. (We get only 1 or 2 nominations for those awards.)

Put all certificates in certificate folders and envelopes before delivering to the individual colleges.

Provide award description with the certificate since the students don't get a program anymore.

2005-06 Bookstore Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: Two: 1 fall and 1 spring

Committee Chair: Robert S. D'Intino, PhD

Committee Members:

John A Aderinto	Soyoun Bae Suh	Soyoun Bae Suh
Charles J. Brett	Robert S. D'Intino	Stephen J. Hartley
Larry Litwin	Eileen M. Morrow	Scot Morschauer

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Mediates faculty, student and bookstore relations and concerns. This committee provides an ongoing evaluation of staffing levels of the bookstore, works on improving the perceptions about the bookstore's work, both within the bookstore and externally among the rest of the campus, and facilitates cooperation of the faculty with bookstore needs and the bookstore with faculty and student needs.

Summary of Activities this Year:

At the two formal committee meetings held during this academic year, a major topic of discussion during the meetings was the rapidly changing business model for university bookstores across the USA and how this was impacting the Rowan University bookstore. Major topics addressed during the committee meetings included: (1) The July 2005 College Textbook survey and 47-page report prepared by the US General Accounting Office. Much discussion focused on how this national report illuminated Rowan bookstore problems and challenges; (2) Issues of student purchases of textbooks on line and the related issue of students purchasing English language texts published in other countries, e.g. UK or India; (3) Major discussions about new bookstore marketing ideas, especially the "shrink-wrap" packaging of a student's entire set of text books that were preordered; (4) discussion and suggestions about the bookstore on-line ordering system; (5) discussions and suggestions for more closely interrelating professor's textbook orders with the bookstore's scheduling needs; and (6) attempting to find ways to better communicate to faculty how the bookstore orders, delivers, and buys back textbooks based on faculty recommendations.

In addition, Robert S. D'Intino, the bookstore committee chair, had numerous meetings in person and on the telephone with Bookstore Director Eileen M. Morrow and Assistant Director John A Aderinto about bookstore policies and operations. Dr. D'Intino supervised one of his MBA consulting students to conduct a bookstore freight pricing analysis that is still ongoing. Result of this analysis will be reported in next year's committee report.

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year: (i.e., size of committee, representation, functions, etc)

Operations recommendations :

The bookstore committee has the charge to serve as a communicator and coordinator between the bookstore and the larger Rowan University community of students and faculty. Committee members should continue to work to better understand both the bookstore constraints and student and faculty needs and requirements, and help serve as an honest broker to ensure better communication.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Policy recommends for the upcoming academic year include the following:

- Focus committee efforts to better understand the bookstore business model problems and what faculty can contribute to help solve some of these problems.
- Work to better communicate with faculty the timing and logistics of student textbook purchases, returns, and buybacks, especially in terms of faculty decisions on submitting book adoption forms in a timely manner so

students can receive the best prices for their used textbooks.

- Continue to dialog with the Bookstore Director and Assistant Director about the type of information that they can supply that will help faculty better utilize the bookstore resources to advance teaching and better serve Rowan students.
- Consider preparing and administrating a new Faculty Satisfaction Survey created by the National Association of College Bookstores. This survey was last conducted at Rowan in 2005 and reported an overrating of 3.90 on a scale of 1=low to 5=high. However the sample was small with only 53 surveys returned. The bookstore committee could sponsor this survey and increase the survey response to better identify areas of faculty concerns regarding the bookstore.

2005-06 Chairs Council

COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSON: Richard A. Scott, Chair of Geography and Anthropology

COMMITTEE MEMBERS: All Rowan University Department Chairs

PURPOSE OF/CHARGE TO COMMITTEE: To provide a channel through which department chairs may readily communicate with other chairs in order to share information and solve problems; enable junior chairs to take advantage of the expertise of more experienced chairs; act as a clearinghouse to share information that individual Chairs obtain from their respective professional societies; participate in the formation of hiring committees for Deans and in the scheduling of interviews.

NUMBER OF MEETINGS HELD THIS YEAR: During the Spring Semester, the Chairs Council held three lunch meeting. The Council also organized two Banner workshops, and will participate in the county college articulation meeting.

SUMMARY OF YEAR'S ACTIVITIES: The lunch meetings held early in the semester focused on developing a set of questions for the candidates for Provost. During the interviews of Provost candidates many chairs attended and participated in the session set aside for us. The third lunch meeting, held late in the semester, provided a forum for airing and discussion of a wide range of issues including the possibility / desirability of staggered terms for chairs. With the financial backing of the Provost, the Council also facilitated sending two chairs to a American Council on Education Workshop for Department Chairs to be held in Washington, D.C. in June. The council is working with the Associate Provost's Office to organize the Third Annual County College Articulation meeting to be held on May 23rd. The first of the two Banner workshops, led by Sue Hersh, dealt with the faculty self service functions of the program. The second workshop, to be held in early June, will focus on budgeting, an item of concern to chairs because of the plans to decentralize budget controls. This workshop will be led by Bob Newland, Chair of Chemistry and Biochemistry and Sue Hersh.

2005-06 Library Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 5

Committee Chair: Judith Lancioni

Committee Members: 13

1	Ron Block	Faculty
2	James Coaxum	Faculty
3	Tom Kloskey	Professional Staff
4	Lee Kress	AFT Representative

5	Judith Lancioni	Faculty
6	Ellen Miller	Faculty
7	Susan Murphy	Professional Staff
8	Kathy Sernak	Faculty
9	Maria Sudeck	Faculty
10	Jaime MacEwen	SGA Representative
11	Danielle Conto	SGA Representative
12	Tyria Shoulars	SGA Representative
13	Greg Potter	Acting Library Dean

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Review and make appropriate recommendations regarding the available learning resources of the University. Review the management policies governing the use of the University's learning centers and materials. Serve as liaison between the Campbell University Library and academic departments and faculty. Liaison with the Rowan University Friends of Campbell Library.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The All-University Library Committee concentrated its efforts on two issues: funding and Library/Faculty interaction.

Funding:

- Nicholas Yovnello attended two meetings and briefed the committee on the Book Allocation Formula, Electronic Database costs, and EBSCO charges. He answered questions about the relationship between electronic databases and print journal subscriptions. He also explained how library funds are allocated to specific departments, who then request the purchase of books and audio-visual materials that would enhance the collection within a specific discipline. There was considerable discussion of the formula used to allocate funds and potential revisions that would lead to a more equitable distribution of funds.
- The committee also discussed the current budgetary shortfall and the effect it might have on the resources of a Library already struggling to meet the needs of a growing number of undergraduate and graduate programs and an increased emphasis on academic research. Without increased funding, the Library may not even be able to keep up with the 7%-14% rate of inflation and the growing cost of electronic databases. For example, a one-year subscription to a particular science database costs \$30,000. Adding one Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers database would cost \$24,000 per year. Clearly, if the Library is to meet Carnegie standards, its funding must be increased on a permanent basis.
- Finally, the committee discussed the Campbell Grant and the role it should play in helping the Library to meet its growing obligations. The Library has not received Grant Funding in two fiscal years.

Library/Faculty Interaction:

The Committee twice invited Library Liaisons to meet and discuss ways in which communication between faculty and library staff could be improved so that faculty could become more familiar with and make more efficient use of library services and collections. Each department is allotted a dollar amount for purchasing materials that would enrich the Library's collection. Currently, liaisons select books they consider appropriate to the needs of various departments and handle departmental requests for the purchase of books and audio-visual materials or for journal subscriptions. They also notify each department in the fall as to what purchases have been made. The committee discussed with the liaisons additional measures for enhancing the relationship between faculty and liaisons. These included:

- Liaisons could visit departments to explain what library services are available to them (specialized databases, etc.) and to determine what their specific needs are.
- Faculty could submit syllabi to their liaison, who could then determine what resources are available and what additional resources would be helpful.
- Liaisons could send out a periodic newsletter via email to inform departments about individual workshops, new databases, and new acquisitions in their field.

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year:

The All University Library Committee recommends that next year's committee consider the following:

- Inquire into the allocation of the Campbell Gift Funds
- Revisit the need for revising the formula for allocating library acquisition funds to individual departments
- Inquire into the status of fifth floor renovations

RECOMMENDATIONS 2005-2006:

The All University Library Committee resolves that the Campbell Library budget, especially funds for materials acquisition, be increased substantially.

The University seeks to encourage the quality and quantity of research and the growth of both undergraduate and graduate programs. These plans for growth will require additional funding for collections, databases, and services. Moreover, the academic status which the University aspires to cannot be attained without providing funds for a state-of-the-art library.

2005-06 University Scholarship Committee

Committee Members

Marcus Wright, Chairperson
Melanie Dorsey
Erin Herberg
Alisa Hogan
Leslie Spencer
Mildred Rodriguez
Chris Simons
Adrian Rusu
Joel Crichlow
Laurie Hohwald
Georgette Sahn
Maccamas Ikpah
Marguerite Stubbs (representing President's Office)

The committee met on the following dates:

- January 17, 2006 to determine the chair and review committee procedures with Marguerite Stubbs.
- March 13, 14, 21 and 22 to review recommendations (each recommendation was read by two committee members)
- April 3 to determine scholarship recipients

The committee wishes to thank Marguerite Stubbs for the expert help she gave us throughout our work.

2005-06 World Education Council

Number of Meetings Held this Year: Once each month

Committee Chair: Joy F. Xin

Committee Members:

An, Shan	Korieh, Chima
Caswell, Bruce	McCafferty, Jacqueline
Ciavarelli Maria	McCannon, Afrodesia Egypt
Han, Aiguo	Rosado, Maria
Ihunnah, Anthony	Smith, Edward
Katz, Craig	Timberman, Tara
Klapper, Melissa	Wang, Youru
Knoesel, Ernst	Xin, Joy

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

This World Education Council brings together faculty and staff from all areas of the university who share an interest in and a commitment to international education at Rowan. It serves as a resource to the university community for the coordination of international activities and scholarly events, the globalization of the curriculum, international week, and administrative procedures that facilitate study abroad and international student life at Rowan. The Committee is also the advisory board for Rowan's International Center.

Summary of Activities this Year:

This year the committee met once a month to discuss issues such as bilateral agreements with foreign universities and institutes, review proposals to support international education, develop policies related to student transfer credits from foreign universities, develop criteria for international awards, and to develop a proposal supporting faculty exchanges.

The committee reviewed:

- a. the proposal for a bilateral agreement with Lille University, France (proposed by the Business School);*
- b. proposals for a bilateral agreement with 3 universities in China (proposed by the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences): Xi'an International Studies University; East China Normal University; Beijing Institute of Technology and Mining*
- c. the proposal for an agreement with Studio Art Centers International (SACI) in Florence, Italy;*
- d. the proposal for a bilateral agreement with the University del Sagrado Corazon, San Juan, Puerto Rico (proposed by the Camden campus);*
- e. the proposal to support the SEA Semester program (proposed by the Biology Department);*
- f. provided input regarding the proposal for a bilateral agreement with the University of Ankara, Turkey*
- g. vetting procedures for bilateral agreements with overseas universities and institutions.*

The Committee developed:

- a. a policy for student transfer credits from foreign institutions and universities;*
- b. criteria for International study awards and forwarded to the Senate Awards Committee;*
- c. a proposal regarding foreign faculty housing for the University Planning & Management Committee;*

The Committee recommended:

An international student for the International study award

The Committee discussed and/or supported:

- a. a possible bilateral agreement with the University of Gambia, Africa*
- b. study abroad enrollment and its increase*
- c. international Week*
- d. the dissemination of information on international events, also in the form of the International Center's newsletter*
- e. Phi Beta Delta (the International Honor Society – the Rowan chapter is Delta Lambda)*

All committee members feel that this committee is productive, efficient, and valuable.

Suggestions for Operation in Upcoming Year:

The committee functions very well. It is an open committee. We hope this committee could be considered as a standing committee in the future

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- As a committee, we should report to the Senate committee;
- As a committee, we need Senate's support on the following issues:
 1. offering housing to international students in the academic year
 2. offering housing to international students in summer
 3. offering possible lodging on campus for foreign faculty when involving in academic and research activities
 4. increasing enrollment of international students in both undergraduate and graduate programs