ATTENDEES: Herb Appelson, Gina Audio, Lori Block, Kate Boland, Keith Brand, Joe Cassidy, Bruce Caswell, Hanmei Chen, David Clowney, Jennifer Courtney, Patrick Crumrine, Ron Czochor, Denis DiBlasio, Tom Doddy, Jess Everett, Jon Foglein, Bill Freind, Eddie Guerra, Steve Hartley, Erin Herberg, Sandy Jones, Donna Jorgensen, Monica Kerrigan, Valarie Lee, Michael Lim, Janet Lindman, Douglas Mann, Douglas Mapp, Rory McElwee, Thomas Merrill, Eric Milou, Amos Mugweru, Darren Nicholson, Susan O'Rourke, Keeley Powell, Kathryn Quigley, Ravi Ramachandran, Peter Rattigan, Dan Reigel, Beth Rey, Connie Rosenberger, Christine Saum, Lane Savadove, Mariano Savelski, Nick Schmelz, Edward Schoen, Midge Shuff, Christopher Simons, Mickey Smith, Eileen Stutzbach, Uma Thayasivam, Skeff Thomas, Sandy Tweedie, Barbara Williams, Tricia Yurak.

NOT IN ATTENDANCE: (Represented by Alternates) Robert Bullard represented by Lori Getler, Michael Grove represented by Maria Tahamont, Gerald Hough represented by Greg Hecht.

NOT IN ATTENDANCE: Carol Eigenbrot, Yuhui Li, Lawrence Markowitz, Deb Martin, Jacqueline McCafferty, Corinne Meredith, Jennie Thwing, Mary Beth Walpole.

1. Approval of Agenda – moved, seconded and approved
2. Introductions of Visitors – none present
3. Approval of Minutes from March 2012 (separate file) – moved, seconded and approved with one edit.
4. President's Report
    a. Senate President testimony to the Higher Ed Committee (page 2)
        Met with Rutgers Camden president and continued discussions with others at Rutgers-Camden – cordial and respectful.
    b. Reorganization Task Force BoT Resolutions (pages 3-5)
        Department of Nursing – caught attention – new school of Biomedical Sciences – never officially stamped or approved by Senate committee – questionable about how they went to BOT before coming to Senate. Provost never put his compromise in writing – took directly to BOT. Has been requested that it should go to Senate first. Eric asked that these have the designation (*) next to them asking that they not be implemented – he will address the board on Wed. when they vote on this.
    c. General Studies Task Force Update
        Broke into two subcommittees – meeting on April 17th to discuss – Larry Butler / Roberta Harvey co-chairs. Will update at end-of-year meeting.
    d. General Education Task Force Update
        Rory – expect to bring an update soon on progress – 3 open call innovation sessions – good turnout. Looking at a cornerstone – first year experience – introduce the literacies so students. Trying to introduce flexibility into the model – how we can get the literacy's to wave into the student's general education and how to not reinvent the wheel
    e. Duplicating (page 6)
        Does not fall into provost office – falls under Tom Gallia. Agreed to set up a committee –Jan Conrad (Art) and Deb Martin (Faculty Center), led by Joe Cardona.
    f. New software acquisition policy (page 7) – refer to Tech committee. There was no Senate input in this decision. It is now referred to the University Senate Technology Committee.
    g. Termination of OPSCAN and alternatives (page 8) – referred to Tech Committee (P. Lewis has researched alternatives - http://www.inspiroscan.com/inspiroscan.aspx). Bob Bullard, Chair of Senate Technology Committee – send comments to him
5. Open Period: President Houshmand
    Likely that some sort of merger will happen – medical education is important to Rutgers. Why do we care? If it's done right it will be very good for Rowan University IF the finances are there. As a consequence of

the merger, Rowan will be reclassified as a research institution. I would like to have two distinct campuses - Rutgers-Camden campus – keeping current programs – Rowan campus to continue with current programs. New programs will generate income needed but no merger will be successful if the faculty are not involved. Need to be patient and let this merger happen organically.

In January 2011 the board asked Dr. Houshmand to change his title to Provost and CEO. When appointed as Interim President his one year contract changed to a three year contract as Interim president. When and if a new president starts he would go back to previous position within remainder of contract. Six week ago after all presidential candidates had withdrawn, the BoT asked him to stay as President until the completion of a new search. He is not interested in being the FT president of the university. He wants to stay and serve as a faculty - quality of life is the reason. First thing he will do when the new president comes in – he will give an open letter of resignation for the new President to exercise.

6. Presidential Search Resolution (page 9)
   Motion to waive rules to discuss this at Board meeting – passed unanimously. Expresses our disappointment with the search – rules waived – all in favor, and approved. Motion to approve resolution, seconded - recommended to change wording for new president to start July 2014 – other discussion occurred – recommended to add "the search was not concluded in a timely manner "directly" leading all candidates to withdraw. Voted and approved with 1 opposed, 1 abstention.
7. Standing Committees & Task Forces
   a. Academic Policy and Procedures
       i. RAIV Update (pages 10-12)
          Major changes – provost makes the final decisions – restored the right to record but was told not a good idea by the council – pg. 12 – bottom of page – Additional changes suggested by the provost – Level 3 and 4 violations – Board will issue finding and recommendation to Office of the Provost. – 3 changes total. Motion approved, seconded – no opposed, no abstentions, approved.
       ii. Attendance Policy (page 13)
          First reading –revisions include: religious holidays as a list and given a paragraph –
       iii. Policy on Faculty Use of Plagiarism Detection Websites (pages 14-15)
          Removal of "opt out" option for use of Plagiarism detection Websites. FERPA applies – when being submitted to a plagiarism website – must be approved and personal information must be removed

   b. Curriculum Committee Report (pages 16-18)
       A process proposals only
   c. Budget and Planning Committee Update (pages 19-21)
8. Old Business
9. New Business
   a. Resolution/Recommendation to include Learning Outcomes in Curriculum Proposals (page 22)
       Will be emailed to everyone. First reading
10. Adjournment – 3:10p.m.

SENATOR CUNNINGHAM, CHAIR
ASSEMBLYWOMAN RILEY, CHAIR

Thank you for the opportunity to address you today. I rise as the Rowan University Senate President serving my 5th term as Senate President and a mathematics professor in his 15th year of service to Rowan.

First, let me extend a welcome to the scores of distinguished faculty/staff from Rutgers-Camden.

As all of us in this room are well aware, we await a final decision from the governor and politicians. Unlike many reports, Rowan faculty/staff are not pushing for the merger to happen; but together with our administration in the spirit of shared governance, we have merely taken the position that if it comes, we want to be ready and therefore have alerted our campus and set up planning teams to do some preliminary work, just in case.   CHANGE is reality at Rowan and we have little choice but to embrace it.

If the merger becomes a reality, the first and probably most difficulty challenge will be how to repair relations between Rutgers-Camden and Rowan. Whether intentional or not, much of what has been said by Rutgers-Camden administration, faculty and staff, and students, has been perceived by the Rowan community as derogatory, even demeaning.   My hope and that of my colleagues is that the conversation can become professional and civil.

Rowan has a proud history of civil conversation. Many of you may recall that just across the street from this very building in 1967, Soviet Premier Alexei Kosygin and President Lyndon B. Johnson spent more three days in discourse that led to a greater understanding between the two countries.

In the 45 years since, Rowan has grown from a regional Normal school to a multi-accredited institution.

It is important to note that the up-front cost commitments necessary for just the initial integration of administrative systems could well be projected into the millions. Moreover, Rowan will have to absorb the financial burden of maintaining components such as a major upgrade in our library holdings, IT support, and a host of other things that are covered centrally by Rutgers University. None of this is noted in the Barer report and it is naïve to believe that there are not significant costs associated with this merger.

Let's be clear, a merger is something that cannot really be established by fiat or order. It's going to take interactions faculty-to-faculty, student-to-student, staff member-to-staff member, administrator-to-administrator. Across all of these groups, the Rowan community is ready and willing to undertake that work, as hard and as time-consuming as it promises to be, for the sake of the larger good that COULD come from joining our two excellent institutions.

Politicians, colleagues, students in attendance, please remember that Universities are not businesses. And that the heart of a University is its students and the soul of a University is its faculty.   Please as you continue to debate the pros and cons of this merger, don't forget to consult with, engage, and listen to the heart and soul of our Universities.

REORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES INTO THE COLLEGE OF SCIENCE AND MATHEMATICS, THE COLLEGE OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES AND THE SCHOOL OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees passed a resolution on February 17, 2010 calling for all departments and units to seek ways to operate more efficiently, and

WHEREAS, the current College of Liberal Arts and Sciences contains 14 different departments and will grow to 16 with the addition of nursing and biomedical sciences and engineering while no other college in the university contains more than 5 departments, and

WHEREAS, the creation of an interdisciplinary school facilitating joint appointments for current and future faculty between existing departments in the college of engineering and the school of biomedical sciences, and between faculty in the college of science and mathematics and the school of biomedical sciences will increase efficiency and minimize the number of new faculty required to develop the biomedical sciences and engineering department, and

WHEREAS, this reorganization will facilitate more focused operations within both the College of Science and Mathematics and the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and

WHEREAS, the reorganization will improve the ability for the University to develop new multidisciplinary programs in other technical areas as our mission evolves over time, and

WHEREAS, a task force of faculty and staff from all impacted departments was convened by the Provost to examine potential reorganization and recommend best practices and to explore issues involved in the transition, and

WHEREAS, this resolution reflects a reorganization plan supported by the task force, by the impacted departments, by the dean's council, and by the President's Cabinet,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that

1. The current College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will be reorganized into two colleges: The College of Science and Mathematics and the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences.

2. The College of Science and Mathematics will contain the following departments:
   - Biological Sciences
   - Chemistry and Biochemistry
   - Computer Science
   - Mathematics

- Nursing
- Physics and Astronomy
- Psychology

3. The College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences shall contain the following departments:
   - English
   - Foreign Languages and Literature
   - Geography and the Environment
   - History
   - Law/Justice Studies
   - Philosophy and Religion
   - Political Science and Economics
   - Sociology and Anthropology

   All current interdisciplinary programs housed with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences shall remain with the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences.

4. A new entity, The School of Biomedical Sciences, shall be formed and contain the following departments:
   - Biomedical Engineering and Sciences

   This school shall serve as a collaborative entity between the College of Engineering and the College of Science and Mathematics and will be expected to work closely in research with colleagues from the Medical School, the Coriell Institute, and other partners. Many faculty members will have joint appointments between department within the school and departments within the colleges. The School is expected to grow significantly as new health-science related initiatives emerge.

5. The School of Biomedical Sciences will be administered by the Dean of the College of Sciences and Mathematics.

6. The reorganization will take effect on July 1, 2012

SUMMARY STATEMENT

This resolution authorizes the University to implement these changes.

RESOLUTION

REORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE OF FINE AND PERFORMING ARTS AND THE COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION INTO THE COLLEGE OF PERFORMING ARTS AND THE COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATION AND CREATIVE ARTS

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees passed a resolution on February 17, 2010, calling for all departments and units to seek ways to operate more efficiently, and

WHEREAS, the role of visual arts in Public Relations/Advertising and in New Media is growing in importance and is largely unaddressed in our current structure, and

WHEREAS, the relocation of the Department of Art to the current College of Communication will facilitate development in these areas without negatively impacting the existing program, and

WHEREAS, the resulting College of Performing Arts would be more streamlined, efficient, and focused, and

WHEREAS, the inclusion of visual arts within a College of Communication and the Creative Arts is consistent with other major universities, and

WHEREAS, a task force of faculty and staff from all impacted was convened by the Provost to examine potential reorganization and recommend best practices and to explore issues involved in the transition,

WHEREAS, this resolution reflects a reorganization plan supported by the task force, by the dean's council, and by the President's Cabinet,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Department of Art move from the current college of Fine and Performing Arts to the current College of Communication and the resulting colleges be renamed the College of Performing Arts and the College of Communication and Creative Arts beginning on July 1, 2012.

SUMMARY STATEMENT

This resolution authorizes the University to implement these changes.

April 18, 2012

Duplicating

Mike Lukasavage retired recently, leaving Duplicating short-handed. Administration had to decide whether or not to replace him. At this point, the answer seems to be no: They have a job lined up for everyone who works in Duplicating in case the entire operation is outsourced—and they've communicated with them and with the CWA president on this— and for now they are using Bellia's in Glassboro to help manage the flow of work. Most likely, faculty have not noticed a difference

An RFP will probably be going out soon so that we can make a final decision, and research is being done on how other campuses handle their duplicating needs.

Advantages of outsourcing:
1.   Our equipment is antiquated; we would not have to update equipment.
2.   We can probably provide better service, although at this point we don't know if we would have another company use the current Duplicating space or just have a pick up and delivery service.
3.   It will save the university money, since a large part of the Duplicating budget went to salaries. (Yet no one will lose a job; it just means we're not replacing Lukasavage.)

New Software Acquisition Policy:

Its primary aim to eliminate divisions from purchasing large scale software programs that require enormous levels of support from EIS to integrate and maintain without EIS knowing about it. For example, both SEM and CGCE need CRM software, yet each wanted to purchase a different program (double the cost and twice as much personnel required) or a few years back, student affairs attempted to purchase an e-portfolio system that was not compatible with banner.

The overwhelming majority of faculty requests to purchase software for research or teaching purchases will be approved without issue as they require little ongoing IT support. However, there are cases where three different departments independently purchase 10 site licenses for the same software program and we could have gotten a much lower price by pulling the licenses into a single request, but no one knew what the others were doing.

OPSCAN Issue

The OPSCAN situation was not a revelation. The Provost met with the Union President in the fall semester to discuss the idea that IT would no longer be supporting OPSCAN after this year.

IT had no role in academics and faculty were free to test as they saw fit, but that we could no longer afford to support a system that was used by only a handful of faculty (almost all in the college of business, with a few exceptions) and would cost more money in both direct costs and personnel costs to support it than its usage merited.

The global issue will always be there. IT has a finite budget. As demands grow for newer technology, Tony has to make decisions based on sound cost-benefit analysis about which technologies they can continue to devote limited resources to supporting and which no longer can justify diversion of resources from other more pressing projects. There is not enough use of OPSCAN on our campus to warrant forcing IT to cover its costs, especially when there are other options available.

The choices that are left are as follows:

1. Choose one of the options from the list and fund the use of OPSCAN outside of IT.
2. The cost of maintaining SCANTRON is about the same (in the cheapest case) as the difference in salary between two ¾-time temps and the equivalent adjunct replacements. If the college of business would prefer to have academic resources for the college spent on SCANTRON rather than temps, they may request it.
3. Individual faculty could choose to adapt their testing to online or any other method that does not require optical scanning of multiple choice answers. Well over 90% of our faculty already do this.
4. Continue to use the exact same testing protocol but grade them manually.

PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, in December 2010, the New Jersey Higher Education Task Force report, discussed combining "the existing higher education institutions in South Jersey … to create a credible research university in South Jersey," and more specifically offered, "The essential ingredients of this university would be the merger of Rowan University and Rutgers-Camden into a single university." (Appendix Q);

WHEREAS, the search for a new president of Rowan University was begun in April 2011, and this search was undertaken with full knowledge of the task force report;

WHEREAS, the candidates were informed about this potential merger and they moved forward with their candidacies with this information in mind;

WHEREAS, the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey Advisory Committee report released in January 2012 did not change the parameters under which the presidential search was undertaken;

WHEREAS, the search committee identified candidates who met—and exceeded—the desired characteristics and qualifications for the president's position;

WHEREAS, the search was not concluded in a timely manner, leading all candidates to withdraw;

WHEREAS, at this critical juncture in its history, Rowan University requires leadership at all levels—including from the Board of Trustees as well as the presidency—that can bring together the two universities in productive, innovative and propitious ways;

WHEREAS, the search process was very costly to the University, including the fee paid to the search firm (up to $143,000); the expenses of travel and accommodations for candidates and search committee functions; and the time invested by University representatives who participated in the search process;

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has stated that the search for a new President will be reengaged upon clarity of the proposed reorganization of higher education throughout the state,

WHEREAS, regardless of whether the proposed merger or an alternative such as a consortium is enacted, Rowan is likely to continue to operate within a climate lacking clarity for the next several years;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT the University Senate expresses its desire for the Board of Trustees to allow for stable presidential leadership for the near term by not beginning the tenure of a new president prior to Fall 2014, and that the Board initiate and share with the University a plan of action for a successful search.

Additional Revisions to Academic Integrity Policy

After the Senate approved changes to the Academic Integrity Policy at the meeting of 3/2, the Provost's office recommended some additional changes to the policy.

Blue font indicates language that had been present in the Academic Integrity Policy prior to May, 2011.

Orange font indicates new language approved by the Senate on 3/2; italicized orange font indicates language just added at the request of the Provost.

Page 3

Current language, approved May 2011:

Level 2 violations involve incidents of a more serious nature and affect a significant aspect or portion of the course. Any violation that involves repeat offenses at Level 1 is considered a Level 2 violation. A sanction for a Level 2 violation will not exceed a failing grade in the course.

Changes approved by Senate, 3/2/11:

Level 2 violations involve incidents of a more serious nature and affect a significant aspect or portion of the course. ~~Any violation that involves repeat offenses at Level 1 is considered a Level 2 violation.~~ A second Level 1 violation will automatically become a Level 2 violation. A sanction for a Level 2 violation will not exceed a failing grade in the course.

[The Provost recommends no additional changes.]

Page 4

Current language, approved May 2011:

Level 3 offenses are even more serious in nature and involve dishonesty on a more significant portion of course work, such as a major paper, hourly or final examination. Any violation that is premeditated or involves repeat offenses below Level 3 is considered a Level 3 violation. A sanction for a level 3 violation will not exceed suspension from the University.

Changes approved by Senate, 3/2/11:

Level 3 offenses are even more serious in nature and involve dishonesty on a more significant portion of course work, such as a major paper, hourly or final examination. Any violation that is premeditated ~~or involves repeat offenses below Level 3~~ is considered a Level 3 violation. If the student had previously been found guilty either of one or more violations at Level 2 or higher, or of two Level 1 violations, an additional violation will automatically become at least a Level 3 violation.

Additional changes suggested by Provost:

Level 3 offenses are even more serious in nature and involve dishonesty on a more significant portion of course work, such as a major paper, hourly or final examination. Any violation that is premeditated ~~or involves repeat offenses below Level 3~~ is considered a Level 3 violation. If ~~the~~ *a* student had previously been found guilty either of one or more violations at Level 2 or higher, or of two Level 1 violations, an additional violation *at any level* will automatically become at least a Level 3 violation.

Page 4

Current language, approved May 2011:

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

Changes approved by Senate, 3/2/11:

Reporting Mechanisms: Matters involving Level 3 violations are adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Review Board and the hearings will be recorded. A record of this violation will be retained in the Office of the Provost in accordance with State record retention guidelines. The student can appeal the determination and/or the sanction in accordance with policy.

Additional changes suggested by Provost:

Reporting Mechanisms: Matters involving Level 3 violations are adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Review Board ~~and the hearings will be recorded.~~ A record of this violation will be retained in the Office of the Provost in accordance with State record retention guidelines. ~~The student can appeal the determination and/or the sanction in accordance with policy.~~

The university's recently hired counsel advises against audio recording. Additionally, because the Provost makes the final decision on all academic integrity violations, an appeal is essentially redundant. Therefore, the Provost asks that the language in the May 2011 policy remain in place.

Page 4

May 2011:

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

Changes approved by Senate, 3/2/11:

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

State record retention guidelines. The student can appeal the determination and/or the sanction in accordance with policy.

Additional changes suggested by Provost:

Reporting Mechanisms: Matters involving Level 4 violations are adjudicated by the Academic Integrity Review Board ~~and the hearings will be recorded.~~ A record of this violation will be retained in the Office of the Provost in accordance with State record retention guidelines. ~~The student can appeal the determination and/or the sanction in accordance with policy.~~

The university's recently hired counsel advises against audio recording. Additionally, because the Provost makes the final decision on all academic integrity violations, an appeal is essentially redundant. Therefore, the Provost asks that the language in the May 2011 policy remain in place.

Page 6

Current language, approved May 2011:

Level 3 and 4 violations: The Office of the Provost will refer the matter to the Academic
Integrity Review Board for adjudication at a hearing. Final decisions are made by the
Provost.

Changes approved by Senate, 3/2/11:

Level 3 and 4 violations: The Office of the Provost will refer the matter to the Academic
Integrity Review Board for adjudication at a hearing. The Board will issue a ruling to the Office of the Provost, which will make the final decisions on both rulings and appeals. Final decisions are made by the Provost.

Additional changes suggested by Provost:

Level 3 and 4 violations: The Office of the Provost will refer the matter to the Academic
Integrity Review Board for adjudication at a hearing. The Board will issue a ~~ruling~~ *finding and recommendation* to the Office of the Provost, which will make the final decisions on both rulings and appeals. ~~Final decisions are made by the Provost.~~

Counsel suggests that if the language appears to suggest that the Board makes the final ruling, the Board could be subject to legal action for any disputed decisions.

<h1 align="center">Attendance Policy – Faculty & Students Responsibilities</h1>

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

Responsibilities of Students
1) Students are expected to be present at each meeting of each scheduled class for which they are officially registered. Students are responsible for knowing the instructor's attendance policy as stated in the syllabus.
2) Students absent for any of the following reasons:
   - ~~Religious observances,~~
   - Official University activities,
   - Documented illness,
   - Death of a family member or loved one,
   - Inclement weather,

   must inform their instructor with official or written documentation before the fact ~~in cases of religious observances and~~ in the case of official University activities, or as soon as possible thereafter in cases of illness, death of a family member or loved one, and inclement weather. Students should consult with their instructor regarding acceptable documentation.
3) **Rowan respects the diversity of faiths and spiritual practices in the university community. Students who wish to observe religious holidays which occur when classes are scheduled must inform their instructors before the fact, and preferably within the first two weeks of each semester, even when the exact date of the holiday will not be known until later. Students who make such arrangements will not be required to attend classes or take examinations on the designated days, and faculty must provide reasonable opportunities for students to make up missed work and examinations.**
4) In the case of rare and compelling circumstances not listed in #2 above, students should make every effort to discuss reasonable accommodations with the instructor in advance if feasible or as soon as possible afterward.

Responsibilities of Faculty
1) Faculty are expected to keep accurate attendance records.
2) Attendance requirements must be part of the syllabus provided to students prior to the end of the drop/add period.
3) In the case of #2 under Student Responsibilities, faculty must make reasonable accommodation to provide these students the opportunity to make up their written work, tests, or other assignments at the earliest possible convenient time. In cases where graded classroom activities cannot be repeated and the student has not exceeded the maximum number of allowable absences (as explained below under #6), the faculty member will either provide an alternative graded exercise to replace the missed activity or remove the activity from the calculation of the student's final grade.
4) Faculty are under no obligation to make special provisions for students that are absent for reasons other than those listed above. However, faculty are encouraged to consider accommodations for rare and compelling circumstances.
5) If a student develops a pattern of excessive and/or unexplained absences, the faculty should advise the student to request assistance from the Dean of Students.
6) Faculty (singularly or as part of a department or program) may establish additional reasonable attendance criteria that are consistent with the above. This may include setting a maximum number of absences for a course---whether excused or unexcused---after which a student should withdraw from the class with a WF. If the Dean of Students determines, in consultation with the faculty member, that excused absences were a significant factor, the withdrawal may be altered to a simple W.

Rationale: Currently, university policy stipulates that instructors using anti-plagiarism software in their classes must allow students to the "right to refuse either to submit [their] work to Turnitin or have the university do so." The policy also states that if students decline to submit or have their work submitted to Turnitin, it will not "impact [their] success in the course."

To this date, there has not been a successful legal challenge to the required use of Turnitin. Allowing students to refuse to submit their papers gives students who use plagiarized materials a way to avoid detection. Additionally, Turnitin and other similar software help not only to detect plagiarism, but also to prevent it. For instance, Florida International University claims that their implementation of Turnitin has reduced the submission of unoriginal work by 82%. http://online.fiu.edu/faculty/tools/turnitin

Consequently, the Academic Policies and Procedures committee recommends that the requirement that faculty allow students to refuse to submit to Turnitin be removed.

The proposed revisions to the policy are in bold italics.

University Policy: ~~Rowan University has a license agreement with Turnitin, an online service that can be used to detect and prevent plagiarism in student assignments.~~ ***Because of serious and continuing problems with academic dishonesty, faculty at Rowan have the option of utilizing plagiarism detection websites.*** Student papers are protected by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) as they are educational records that may contain personally identifiable information. The following policy should be in effect to be compliant with FERPA.

The use of ~~Turnitin~~ ***plagiarism detection websites*** by faculty is entirely voluntary. If a faculty member chooses to use ~~Turnitin~~ ***one or more plagiarism detection websites***:

> a. The faculty member must notify students on the official syllabus of the following:
>
> > 1) the use and purpose of ~~Turnitin~~ ***the plagiarism detection website(s).***
> > 2) the rights of the student to not submit personally identifiable information to ~~Turnitin~~ ***the plagiarism detection website(s)***. Students must be informed that this will have no impact on their success in the class.
> > 3) ~~the options that the faculty member and student have with respect to the students' right to privacy and the faculty member's right to evaluate student work for academic honesty.~~
>
> ~~c~~ b. If a faculty member ~~personally~~ submits student work to ~~Turnitin or other~~ ***a plagiarism detection website***, the faculty member must remove all personally identifying information from the work. This includes the student's name, social security number, and/ or Rowan ID number.
>
> ~~d~~ c. If a faculty member receives information from ~~Turnitin or other~~ ***a plagiarism detection website*** that leads the faculty to judge that a student has plagiarized, the faculty member must follow the University policy for Academic Integrity.
>
> ***d. Faculty may only use plagiarism detection websites that have been licensed or approved by the University.***

e. Faculty may not give out any information about student work to a faculty member from any other institution than Rowan University. All requests from faculty at other institutions should be forwarded to the Provost's Office.

An instructor using ~~Turnitin should offer students either an opt-in or opt-out option. See below for recommended syllabus statements~~ *one or more plagiarism detection websites should offer a statement that specifies how that software will be employed in the course.* ~~Note: this~~ *The statements included below* should be modified according the ~~professor's~~ *faculty member's* specific use of ~~Turnitin in a class~~ *the anti-plagiarism service(s).*

Recommended statement for the syllabus with the opt out option: ~~Rowan University has a licensing agreement with Turnitin, an online service to help prevent student plagiarism. As part of this course I will be using Turnitin at my discretion to determine the originality of your work. If your work is submitted to Turnitin, it will be stored in the Turnitin database. You have the right to refuse either to submit your work to Turnitin or have the university do so; availing yourself of this right will not negatively impact your success in the course. If you do not wish to use Turnitin you must notify me by e-mail within two weeks of today's date. If you object to the use of Turnitin I will use other procedures to assess originality.~~

Recommended statement for the syllabus with the opt in option: ~~Rowan University has a licensing agreement with Turnitin, an online service to help prevent student plagiarism. As part of this course I will be using Turnitin at my discretion to determine the originality of your work. If your work is submitted to Turnitin, it will be stored in the Turnitin database. You have the right to refuse either to submit your work to Turnitin or have the university do so; availing yourself of this right will not negatively impact your success in the course. If you object to the use of Turnitin I will use other procedures to assess originality.~~

Recommended statement for ~~the syllabus~~ *instructors who may use plagiarism detection website(s) to check individual student papers*: As part of this course I will be using *[name(s) of website(s)]* at my discretion to determine the originality of your work. If your work is submitted to ~~Turnitin~~ *[name of website(s)]*, it will be stored in ~~the Turnitin~~ *that service's/those services'* database*(s)*. *Before I submit your work, I will remove all personally identifying information. This includes your name, social security number, and/ or Rowan ID number.*

Recommended statement for ~~the syllabus~~ *instructors who will require their students to submit their work to a plagiarism detection website:* As part of this course *you will be required to submit your work to [name of website]* to determine the originality of that work. If your work is submitted to ~~Turnitin~~ *[name of website],* it will be stored in ~~the Turnitin~~ *that service's* database. *You have the right to remove all personally identifying information, including your name, social security number, and/ or Rowan ID number. If you do so,* this will have no impact on their success in the class. *However, if you do not submit your work, I reserve the right to give you a lowered or failing grade for the assignment.*

Revision 1: 4/4/2012

Approved Curriculum Proposals March 26, 2011

Process A Proposals Approved by College Curriculum Committees and Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee

SCC# (Process A)	College	Department	Proposal title	U/G	Change requested
11-12-102	Business	Management/Entrepreneurship	Human Resource Management Electives	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-110	Business	Marketing/BIS	MIS Major	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-116	Business	Accounting/Finance	Risk Management	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-205	Comm	Writing Arts	Professions in Writing Arts: Post-Graduate Options	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-206	Comm	Writing Arts	Professions in Writing Arts: Post-Graduate Options	U	New Non-Gen F
11-12-207	Comm	Comm. Studies	Communication Studies Major	U	New Non-Gen F
11-12-208	Comm	PR/Advertising	Integrated Marketing Communicaiton COGS	G	COG Deleted
11-12-209	Comm	PR/Advertising	COGS in Integrated Marketing Comm	G	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-210	Comm	PR/Advertising	Integrated Marketing Communicaiton COGS	G	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-301	Education	ESAHE	Counseling in Educational Settings	G	New Course
11-12-302	Education	ESAHE	Counseling in Educational Settings Program	G	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-303	Education	ESAHE	MA in Higher Education Administration	G	Minor Curriculum Changes

SCC# (Process A)	College	Department	Proposal title	U/G	Change requested
11-12-304	Education	ESAHE	College Admission and Transition	G	New Course
11-12-305	Education	ESAHE	Diversity in Higher Education	G	New Course
11-12-306	Education	Teacher Education	Music Education Revisions (Clinical Practice)	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-307	Education	Teacher Education	Clinical Practice in Music: Secondary	U	New Non-Gen F
11-12-308	Education	Teacher Education	Clinical Practice: Elementary Music	U	New Non-Gen F
11-12-309	Education	Special Ed	Reading Research Seminar	G	Minor Curriculum

SCC# (Process A)	College	Department	Proposal title	U/G	Change requested
					Changes
11-12-310	Education	Special Ed	COGS in Reading	G	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-311	Education	Special Ed	COGS in Autism Spectrum Disorder	G	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-324	Education	Health/Exercise	Introduction to Athletic Training	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-504	FPA	Theatre/Dance	Colloquium in Theatre	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-505	FPA	Theatre/Dance	Senior Project in Theatre Arts	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-507	FPA	Theatre/Dance	Dance Theatre Workshop	U	New Non-Gen E
11-12-508	FPA	Theatre/Dance	Voice for the Stage	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
SCC# (Process A)	**College**	**Department**	**Proposal title**	**U/G**	**Change requested**
11-12-511	FPA	Theatre/Dance	Speech & Dialects	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-700	LAS: SBS	Law/Justice	White Collar Crime	G	New Non-Gen E
11-12-701	LAS: SBS	Psychology	ABCs of Applied Behavior Analysis	G	New Non-Gen E
11-12-703	LAS: SBS	Psychology	Applied Behavior Analysis	G	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-706	LAS: SBS	Geography/Environ Studies	Web-base GIS Mapping	U	New Non-Gen E
11-12-707	LAS: SBS	Geography/Environ Studies	Land Use and Resource Development	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-708	LAS: SBS	Geography/Environ Studies	Planning BS	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-709	LAS: SBS	Geography/Environ Studies	Geology I	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-710	LAS: SBS	Geography/Environ Studies	Geology II	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-711	LAS: SBS	Geography/Environ Studies	GIS BS Degree Program	U	Minor Curriculum Changes
11-12-712	LAS: SBS	Geography/Environ Studies	Environmental Studies Degree	U	Minor

					Curriculum Changes
11-12-802	LAS: M/S	Computer Sci	Human-Computer Interaction	U	New Non-Gen E
11-12-812	LAS: M/S	Biology	Integrated Information Technology	G	New Non-Gen E

Process B Proposals Approved by College Curriculum Committees and Chair of the Senate Curriculum Committee

SCC# (Process B)	College	Department	Proposal title	U/G	Change requested
11-12-605	LAS:H	Foreign Language	Masterpieces of German Literature in Translation	U	New Gen Ed
11-12-606	LAS:H	Foreign Language	Masterpieces of French Literature in Translation	U	New Gen Ed
11-12-612	LAS:H	Foreign Language	Final Grade of C- for Spanish Majors in their Second Foreign Language	U	Minor Curriculum C

University Budget and Planning Committee Report
March 30, 2012
submitted by Bruce Caswell

The UBPC met on March 5 and March 26. Co-Chair Bruce Caswell attended the Board of Trustees Budget and Finance Committee meetings on November 16, 2011, and January 25 and March 21, 2012. The administration has provided a great deal of detail and analysis of both FY 2011-2012 revenues and expenses as well as the priorities and the projected FY 2012-2013 budget. A summary of these discussions follows.

FY 2012-2013 State Budget Appropriation

The Governor's proposed budget calls for a 6% increase in state funding for higher education with a 12% increase for Rowan University. The 6% increase for higher education is entirely in fringe benefits paid by the state. The base budgets of higher education institutions does not change. Furthermore, the 12% increase for Rowan also includes a transfer of $5.69 million previously allocated to Robert Wood Medical School to be paid to Cooper University Hospital. The base budget for Rowan University does not change.

FY 2011-2012 Budget Status

In June 2011 the Board of Trustees adopted a budget that called for a $1.5 million deficit in the Regular University Budget and a $1.1 million surplus in the Consolidated Budget (Regular University, Auxiliary Operations, CGCE, Medical School, and Special Program) The budget was approved with a commitment to seek cost savings to balance the regular university budget.

As of January 29, 2012, the Consolidated Budget projects a surplus of $8.7 million. (There is no comparable data available on the Regular University Budget.) Many variances from the original budget are contributing to the growing surplus. Among the largest variances are:

● An additional state appropriation of $2.8 million
● An increase in student tuition and fees of $3.9 million due to unanticipated undergraduate enrollment growth
● $0.7 million in savings from the freeze in AFT increments
● $0.5 unanticipated increase in rental income due to higher than budgeted housing occupancy
● Vacant positions representing $1.00 million
● Non-salary operating expenditures are under budget by $1.3 million ($0.2 of which is utilities)

The above unanticipated revenues and saving are partially off-set by a $0.8 million shortfall in CGCE revenues. CGCG credit hours are below budget for Summer (-5.3%), undergraduate (-33.7%), and graduate non-doctoral (-12.9%). Only doctoral graduate hours (+9.8%) increased. The current surplus may also be reduced before the end of the fiscal year by a restoration of AFT benefits and an acceleration in Academic Affairs Division spending.

As previously reported, the FY12 budget allocated $2.25 million for deferred maintenance. Some of these projects have already been undertaken. The administration has asked the BOT to earmark some of the FY12 surplus for an increase in institutional aid, deferred maintenance, enrollment management, and library support.

FY 2012-2013 Preliminary Budget

The Preliminary FY13 Budget calls for Regular University expenditures of $190.9 million against $192.1 million in revenues for a $1.2 million surplus. The Consolidated Budget projects $283.6 million in expenditures against projected revenues of $286.4 for a surplus of $2.8 million.   There are many priorities and assumptions in this budget that warrant attention. Among the more notable assumptions:

» The budget makes no provision for merger costs
» Governor's proposed appropriation will become law
» No across-the-board increases in salary
» Level undergraduate enrollment
» 3.0% tuition increase
» Level CGCE summer and graduate enrollments and 7% increase in extension program enrollments (representing a $3.4 million distribution to Academic Affairs and a total distribution to the Consolidated Budget of $11.9 million)
» The Medical School will require $6.9 million in the earmarked University reserve funds

Priorities:

○ Increase in financial aid of $2 million
○ Deferred maintenance budget of $2.25 in operating budget to be combined with $4.875 million from reserves to budget a total of $7.125 million for deferred maintenance
○ Add $1.6 million to library to cover increased electronic subscription costs
○ Add $0.430 million for new enrollment marketing and data management software

South Jersey Technological Park at Rowan University

This last year the UBPC (and the BOT) has received the first really clear documentation of Tech Park finances. The SJTP has a projected year to date surplus of $52,128. The SJTP building current has two tenants, EIRC on the second floor and Rowan University on the first floor. EIRC has a seven-year lease for $18.03 per square foot ($34,768 per month), about the market rate for such space. The SJTP paid $1.5 million for the outfitting of ERIC's space, a slightly unusual arrangement given the monthly rent. Rowan has a 30-year lease and currently pays $24.60 per square foot ($40,894 per month), well above market rate. Rowan also paid $1.8 million for outfitting. The SJTP leases the land upon which the Tech Park sits from Rowan University for $1,000 per year through a lease that runs through 2012. After 2012, the SJTP will pay a market rate for the land.

The Tech Park has a "balanced" budget because the University subsidizes the SJTP directly and indirectly. When the land lease expires next year, some of that subsidy will shift to the SJTP account sheet. The SJTP is a separately incorporated legal entity, however, under New Jersey law the University is still responsible for the finances of the Tech Park. The Tech Park projects to lose money indefinitely, several years at least, and Rowan University will be responsible for these losses.

Comments
.

● If the Preliminary Budget holds, the budgetary prospects for the Regular University are pretty sound for the next several years. The planning for next year's budget builds upon a structural surplus for the last several years. Salary costs, the largest item in the budget, will be relatively flat for the duration of the collective bargaining agreements. If the University continues the practice of increasing tuition at the rate of inflation, the operating budget should be easy to balance for the next three years.

● The UBPC has not received any information on the cost or other consequences of the proposed merger. Any such costs are likely to be considerable and, if not funded by the state, will have to be taken out of University operating and reserve revenues.

● The UBPC has received conflicting information on the Medical School. The BOT Committee was told that the Medical School is exceeding its five-year budget. The UBPC was told that the Medical School budget appears on-course. This is important because the Medical School is running a deficit at an unsustainable rate. The current deficit is being covered by $6.9 million of University reserve funds which would exhaust the reserve funds earmarked for this purpose in less than three years. Furthermore, the state has only approved 47 of the 97 Medical School positions for fringe benefit coverage at a projected cost to the University of $0.6 million.

● The University currently has no capacity to borrow and therefore has to fund facility maintenance and capital improvements from operating revenues or the reserve fund. Last year the BOT earmarked $20 million of reserve funds for deferred maintenance of which $4.875 million is to be spent in FY 2012-2013.

● If the University must use reserve funds to cover reoccurring expense such as the Medical School, major maintenance, and possibly the proposed merger, the reserve funds will be exhausted within a few years, with consequences for both the University's operating budget and bond rating.

● The Interim President refers to 20 new faculty hires and an increase in the academic budget which the committee is having difficulty locating in the budget. The Committee will be looking more closely at this.

● The University's fiscal soundness depends on the ability to sustain and grow CGCE revenues. The Committee is skeptical of the reliability of this revenue source given this year's experience.

● The University has been meeting a significant portion of its budget needs through incremental increases in undergraduate enrollment. At the BOT Budget and Finance Committee meeting, the point was made that the University does not have the facilities to continue to increase enrollments without compromising academic quality.

Resolution/Recommendation to include Learning Outcomes in Curriculum Proposals

WHEREAS, 57 of 58 academic programs at Rowan have currently completed their phase I Academic Assessment Frameworks and submitted them to Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning;

WHEREAS, these programmatic assessments include Program Goals, Student Learning Goals, and Student Learning Outcomes;

BE IT RESOLVED THAT beginning in Fall 2012, all curriculum proposals must include the appropriate outcomes for any new course, program, major, minor, concentration, specialization, track, CAGS, or COGS.

FURTHER, as Program Goals, Student Learning Goals, and Student Learning Outcomes change, there is no need to redo already approved curriculum proposals.

FURTHER, changes in assessment goals do not require curricular approval.

Resolution to include Learning Outcomes in New Curriculum Proposals

WHEREAS, Rowan University is committed to integrating assessment within a continuous feedback loop that begins with curriculum design;

WHEREAS, Rowan University is required to complete a Periodic Review Report for the Middle States Commission on Higher Education in 2014;

WHEREAS, the Periodic Review Report must explicitly respond to the following recommendation made by the site evaluation team during our 2009 accreditation review with respect to Standard 14, Assessment of Student Learning:

> *The University should establish goals related to the assessment of student learning outcomes, incorporate those goals into its strategic plan, and communicate both the goals and the assessment findings across the institution.*

WHEREAS, 57 of 58 academic programs at Rowan have currently completed Outcomes Assessment Frameworks and submitted them to Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning (IERP), which is step 1 of the teaching-learning-assessment cycle;

WHEREAS, these Outcomes Assessment Frameworks include Program Goals, Student Learning Goals, and Student Learning Outcomes;

AND WHEREAS, Middle States' *Characteristics of Excellence in Higher Education* also maintains that, as part of step 2 of the teaching-learning-assessment cycle, "[e]ducational programs and curricula should demonstrate . . . clear linkages between the design of specific courses, programs, and learning activities and the articulated goals of the specific programs of which they are part and to the overarching mission of the institution" (41-42);

BE IT RESOLVED THAT beginning in Fall 2012, the curriculum proposal format will be changed to include categories that address the alignment of the proposal with the goals and outcomes identified in the Outcomes Assessment Frameworks.

***

CLARIFICATION 1: Although Outcomes Assessment Frameworks and their constituent parts—such as Program Goals, Student Learning Goals, and Student Learning Outcomes—are subject to change, already-approved curriculum proposals will not be required to be revised.

CLARIFICATION 2: Changes in Outcomes Assessment Frameworks do not require curricular approval.

DISCUSSION: The goal of this resolution is to fulfill Middle States' expectations for the Periodic Review Report by making explicit the already implied alignment between curriculum and assessment processes. Nearly every academic unit has created what the IERP is calling Phase I Outcomes Assessment Frameworks, with Phase II due soon. By asking that curriculum proposals use the assessment information and terminology already established by a department or program, this alignment will not require additional work on the part of the curriculum proposers. This resolution only asks that proposals draw upon the work done in those planning documents so that new curriculum clearly aligns with existing student learning goals.

More specifically, curriculum proposal guidelines will need to be amended to reflect the requirement of this additional information:

Process A: New Course Proposals

Section IV: Essence of the Course.

From: a: Objectives of the course in relation to student outcomes. These are statements of what a student is to learn as a result of completing the course.

To: a: Objectives of the course in relation to student outcomes. These are statements of what a student is to learn as a result of completing the course and how these course objectives fulfill student learning goals and outcomes, as articulated in the Outcomes Assessment Frameworks for the relevant academic department or program. Frameworks can be found at http://www.rowan.edu/president/ierp/assessment/.

Process C: New program (including bachelor's/master's dual degrees), minor, specialization, concentration, achievement certificate, certification program track, COGS, or CAGS.

Section IV: Essence of the Course.

From   a. Major goals of the program.
        b. Specific objectives of the program.

To: a. Using the appropriate Outcomes Assessment Framework, articulate the expected Program Goals, Student Learning Goals, and Student Learning Outcomes. Proposals to be housed within existing programs should use the relevant Outcomes Assessment Framework to inform the discussion. Approved Frameworks can be found at http://www.rowan.edu/president/ierp/assessment/.

Proposals to be housed outside of existing programs will need to create an Outcomes Assessment Framework. Templates for Outcomes Assessment Framework can be found at http://www.rowan.edu/president/ierp/assessment/academic.html.

[Delete b.]