

University Senate Annual Committee Reports – 2018 - 19

	16 - Standing Committees	Chairperson	Suggestions	Recomm.
✓	Academic Integrity	Dan Folkinshteyn	✓	
✓	Academic Policies & Procedures	Erick Guerra	✓	✓
✓	Campus Aesthetics & Environmental Concerns	Diane Garyantes	✓	✓
✓	Curriculum	Marci Carrasquillo	✓	✓
✓	Diversity	JT Mills	✓	✓
✓	Graduate Education & Global Learning Partnerships	Monica Kerrigan		
✓	Intercollegiate Athletics	Erin Hannah	✓	
✓	Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee	Carla Lewandowski	✓	
✓	Professional Ethics & Welfare	McKenzie Suber-Robinson		
✓	Promotion	Jess Everett		✓
✓	Recruitment, Admissions & Retention	Doug Cleary	✓	
✓	Research	Gustavo Moura-Letts	✓	
✓	Rowan Core	Nathan Bauer	✓	✓
✓	Sabbatical Leave	Subash Jonnalagadda	✓	✓
✓	Student Relations	Eileen Stutzbach	✓	✓
✓	Tenure & Recontracting	Kevin Dahm	✓	✓
✓	University Budget & Planning	Chris Simons	✓	

	5 - All-University Committees	Chairperson	Suggestions	Recomm.
✓	Awards	Stephen Royek	✓	✓
✓	Awards/Medallion Awards	Esther Mas Serna/ Asadeh Nia-Schoenstein		
✓	International Education Council	Shan An	✓	✓
✓	Library Committee	Sara Borden	✓	
✓	University Scholarship	Jennifer Espinosa	✓	✓

Committee Name: Academic Integrity

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 2 (via email)

Committee Chair: Daniel Folkinshteyn

Committee Members: (list here)

Nia-Schoenstein, Asadeh	Madero, Roberto	Matthews, Jennifer
Sam, Cecile	Durosette, Dirk	Travis, Matthew
Lomboy, Gilson	Morschauser, Scott	Maria Hernandez

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

This committee's charge is to work with the Provost's Office on the matter of academic integrity by offering workshops and seminars to students who have committed violations.

Summary of Activities this Year:

For the fall semester, the committee has conducted 5 seminars and 6 workshops.

For the spring semester, the committee has conducted/plans to conduct 5 workshops and 4 seminars.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS:

We suggest to move the workshops and/or seminars to an online training format, to give students more flexibility and time in completing these requirements. The materials we use are already digital and online, at ruaic.org.

RECOMMENDATIONS: none

Committee Name: Academic Policies & Procedure

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 1

Committee Chair: Eddie Guerra

Committee Members: (list here)

Barbro, Patrick	Mosher, Stephanie	
Behling, Kathryn	Poolos, Kimberly	
Fortunato, Tiffany	Shen, Yide	
Gallant, Mary	Sung, Kenzo	
Guerra, Eddie	Whitfield, Sharon	
Hostetter, Elisabeth	Winkler, Christopher	
Lindman, Janet		
Mason, Cristine		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

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

Summary of Activities this Year:

1. Reviewed changes proposed by the administration for the following policies:
 - a. Credit by Examination for Life Experience, External Examination:
New language on credits limits from military service that allows departments to determine the credit limit.
 - b. Academic Standing Policy
Inclusion of the new stage before Academic Probation called Academic Warning.
 - c. Assignment of Credit Hour
Changes to ensure compliance with the Middle States Credit Hour Policy and associated State and Federal regulations.
2. Revisited attendance policy changes from academic year.
3. Discussed incorporating aspects of Incomplete Grade "procedures" implemented by the Colleges of Science & Mathematics and Communication & Creative Arts.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS:

Accept changes to the Academic Standing Policy with the following friendly amendment:

Add text similar to subsection 3.c. somewhere under section 2. Academic Warning -

“Full-time students must attempt 12 or more credits during the spring while under academic warning.

An attempted credit is defined as credit for any courses in which a student receives a grade of A, B, C, D, F, P, S, W, WP, or WF, or IN.”

Query administration regarding section 2 of the proposed Academic Standing Policy:

1. What is the role (if any) of Dean’s offices regarding Academic Warning? If there is no role, we believe it is a good idea for the Dean’s offices to be provided a list of students (if they are not already).
2. The policy does not state explicitly that the student MUST attend/complete. It just states “enrolled”. Is this language chosen purposely to only require enrollment?

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Accept the proposed changes to the following policies:

1. Credit by Examination for Life Experience, External Examination
2. Assignment of Credit Hour

Committee Name: Campus Aesthetics & Environmental ConcernsNumber of Meetings Held this Year: 5Committee Chair: Dianne Garyantes

Committee Members: (list here)

Dianne Garyantes, Chair	Faculty
Brush, Denise	Faculty
Crumrine, Patrick	Faculty
Rezaeetazangi, Maaman	Faculty
Gendreau, Mathieu	Faculty
Hristescu, Gabriela	Faculty
Romeo, George	Faculty
Hasse, John	Faculty
Klein, Dylan	Health & Exercise Sciences
Calio, Brian	Professional Staff
Britt, Ruben	Professional Staff
Chu, Mike	Faculty or Professional Staff
Foley, Ray	Faculty or Professional Staff
Saracco, Benjamin	Faculty or Professional Staff
Thomas, Skeff	Art
Arijit De, Assistant Vice President for Facilities, Planning & Operations	Administrator
Tighe, Karla	AFT Representative
Dodge, Cordell	CWA Representative
Jillian Schley	Rowan Art Gallery
Gedeon, Arielle	SGA Representative
Rodriguez, Stephanie	SGA Representative

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

The Committee makes possible communication among the campus community and primary facilities users and the Rowan Division of Facilities, Planning and Operations on matters related to the aesthetic quality and environmental integrity of the campus. It reviews and recommends proposed changes that affect the aesthetic quality of the built and natural campus environment and the impacts these changes may have; reviews existing aesthetic qualities and environmental impacts 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:

In October 2018, committee members met with Joseph Campbell, Divisional Vice President of Facilities Planning and Operations, and other Facilities staff, and toured the Glassboro campus.

In November 2018, the committee met to discuss the tour, the status of ongoing construction and development at Rowan's Glassboro's campus including the new Academic Building, as

well as ongoing issues such as the committee's proposed mission statement. New business discussions included a decision to seek information about bicycle share programs on college campuses and seeking student input on lighting issues on Glassboro's campus. The possibility of a tour of the Camden campus was discussed.

In February 2019, the committee met to discuss ongoing facilities projects such as the air quality issue at the South Jersey Tech Park and the move of offices from Bunce to Oak and Laurel. Bike Share info was shared and discussed, and SGA representatives provided a list of eight different areas on campus that students believe need better lighting. The possibility of call boxes or cameras at those sites also was discussed. A second review of the proposed mission statement was conducted, and no changes were made.

Facilities staff noted several projects on campus that would need committee input, including the housing for a stained glass with the RCA logo that will be hung at Campbell Library, and two art projects - one at Hawthorne Hall and one funded by SGA. Those items will be taken up at future meetings. The possibility of a new CHSS building and the Angora project proposal also were discussed.

In March 2019, representatives from the committee toured the Camden Campus, including Cooper Medical School and the new Academic Building in Camden. We also saw the construction site for the new Joint Health Sciences Center.

In April 2019, the committee will hold its last meeting of the academic year to discuss ongoing construction projects in Glassboro, including projects for which the committee will need to provide input. The committee also will vote on the proposed mission statement.

In addition to the committee meeting, Dianne Garyantes, Bill Freind, and Skeff Thomas meet bi-monthly with Joseph Campbell, Divisional Vice President of Facilities Planning and Operations, to receive updates about ongoing facilities projects at Rowan.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS:

- To follow up with Facilities staff and administration on the lighting issues identified by students on the Glassboro Campus.
- To continue to provide input on art and signage projects on all of Rowan's campuses.
- To make environmental concerns on all of Rowan's campuses a priority for the committee. This could include a review of Rowan's efforts to address climate change.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

- To continue to maintain a collaborative relationship with Facilities staff and administration to make Rowan's campuses as safe and aesthetically pleasing as possible.

Committee Name: Curriculum 2018-2019

Number of Meetings Held this Year: Ten 150-minute open hearings

Committee Chair: Marci Carrasquillo

Committee Members: (list here)

Ozge Uygur	Phillip Lewis	Joy Cypher
Daniel Strasser	Jiyeon Lee	Tyrone McCombs
Robert Hesketh	Ravi Ramachandran	Michelle Pich
Maria Rosado	Claire Falck	Adam Kolek
Leslie Elkins	Shari Willis	Nancy Tinkham
Jennifer Matthews	David Vaccaro	Joel Rudin
Ravi Dhruv (SGA)		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Reviews proposals for title and credit changes, minors, concentrations, specializations, major programs, courses, certifications, reorganization of academic department/college offerings, and new or revised University-wide curricular patterns; reviews proposals to create, dissolve, or significantly reconstitute academic departments or colleges; forwards recommendations to the Senate and then to the executive vice president/provost.

Summary of Activities this Year:

1. As of this writing*, 431 curriculum proposals were submitted for review during AY 2018-19. 424 proposals were processed (seven proposals were withdrawn by sponsors during the college level review). The full committee convened to review major proposal process types D, E, F, and Q (97 proposals or 24% of the total submissions). Process types A, B, and C were reviewed by the committee's Chair (327 proposals or 76% of the total submissions). A breakdown of proposals submitted by process type follows:

<u>Process Type</u>	<u># Proposals</u>
A – new courses; minor changes to existing, non-general education courses:	254
B – new general education courses; minor changes to existing gen ed courses:	**16
C – minor changes to an existing degree or degree-related program:	57
D – major changes to an existing degree or degree-related program:	35
D – new 4 + 1 undergraduate/graduate dual degree:	5
E – new degree-related program (Minor, Concentration, CUGS, COGS, CAGS, Post-Baccalaureate Certificate):	42
F – new degree program (BA, BS, MA, MS, PhD):	7
Q – quasi-curricular:	8

*Numbers are subject to change due to very late proposal submissions.

** Refer to the Rowan Core Committee's report for more information on general education-related proposals submitted in AY 2018-19. The number presented in this report represents the number of "B" proposals in the AY 2018-19 SCC database at the time of this writing. The number does not account for any proposals that may have been submitted directly/solely to the RCC and that have not been presented yet to the SCC for consideration.

2. Between May 2018 and March 2019, the SCC Chair attended a number of meetings with Senate President Bill Freind, representatives from the Provost's Office, and other members of the university community to obtain a new system for processing curriculum proposals that is appropriate for a research university of this size. Rather than purchase off-the-shelf software, the university administration elected to work with the vendor Hyland Global to create a custom solution for managing the curriculum review process. Beginning in Fall 2019, all curriculum proposals, including general education proposals, will be submitted and reviewed through the new *OnBase* system. In collaboration with the SCC, the RCC, Senate office staff, the Senate President, original project team members from IRT, and the Provost's Office, the SCC Chair will update all process guidelines as well as the SCC webpage to align everything with the new system. The university community should expect to see these updates in advance of the Fall 2019 curriculum cycle.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

2019-2020

- The SCC suggests re-thinking submission deadlines for curriculum proposals; rolling deadlines may be more suitable for some proposal types.
- The SCC suggests revising the committee description that is posted on the Senate website (to remove outmoded language and to update committee responsibilities).
- As of this writing, 431 curriculum proposals were submitted for review during AY 2018-19; this is a 13% increase from last year and a 43% increase from AY 2015-16. The previous committee chair did not file a report for AY 2016-17 but a trendline from the available data predicts that the SCC will receive and process approximately 470 submissions in AY 2019-20. With such a heavy workload, the SCC Chair needs adequate release time to fulfill this service obligation. The committee suggests a minimum of 6 s.h. automatic release time per term.
- The SCC very strongly recommends Information Resources and Technology's Training Services offer a series of training opportunities over the course of AY 2019-20 (perhaps two or three per semester) to assist the university community with learning to use the new OnBase curriculum system. Providing additional training opportunities surely will make for a smoother transition to the new curriculum review process.

Committee Name: Senate Diversity Committee

- Number of Meetings Held this Year: 5
- Committee Chair: JT Mills
- Committee Members: (list here)

Adrian Barnes	Christine Davidan	Alicia Groatman
Aiguo Han	Patrice Henry-Thatcher	Joseph Higgins
Tiffany Samsel	Rachel Shapiro	Karen Stesis
MaryBeth Walpole	Denise Williams	
Yasmine Abed (SGA)	Riccardo Dale (SGA)	Kyle Perez (SGA)

•

Purpose of/Charge to Committee: Monitors diversity throughout all areas and for all members of the Rowan University community, with special attention to issues of social justice; recommends practices and policies that will enhance diversity at Rowan; and assists in the development and establishment of such practices and policies.

•

Summary of Activities this Year:

Revisited and discussed the achievement gap which led to the committee drafting a resolution: *The Resolution to Recommend the adoption of Diversity & Inclusion Councils across all Disciplines and Departments at Rowan University* which was passed by the Senate Executive Committee on April 7th, 2019.

Supported programming within the Office of Social Justice, Inclusion & Conflict Resolution

Invited Soumitra Ghosh, AVP for Student Recruitment to a special Dining for Diversity where he detailed the Office of Admissions strategies to increase diversity at Rowan.

Sponsored the 6th Annual Excellence in Diversity Awards Ceremony for faculty, staff, and students as part of the SJICR Diversity and Inclusion Week.

Excellence in Diversity for Scholarship RECIPIENT: Ruben Britt

Excellence in Diversity for Social Activism RECIPIENT: Kate Kedley

Excellence in Diversity for Social Activism Group RECIPIENTS: Katie Barillas and Steve Fernandez

Excellence in Diversity for Scholarship RECIPIENT: Stephen Cobb

Excellence in Diversity for Social Activism RECIPIENT: Rbrey Singleton

Excellence in Diversity for Social Activism Group RECIPIENTS: Madison Roberts, Pascale Molina, and Caitlin McElwee

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- **SUGGESTIONS:**
- Each year, the Committee continues to be concerned about the data gathered indicating problems in Rowan's graduating and retaining students of color. A suggestion is to hold at

least one joint meeting during FY19-20 with the Senate Retention Committee to review progress, and brainstorming additional strategies necessary to decreasing the gap.

- The Diversity Committee should revisit the 2010 and 2016 Educational Trust Fund reports that highlight the achievement gap at public four-year institutions for which Rowan is in the higher percentile. The committee can be a force in developing practices and collaborations to reduce the gap.
- A budget should be developed for the Senate Diversity Committee to support the annual sponsorship of a diversity topic selected by the committee, as well as the Excellence in the Diversity Awards and the celebratory dinner, and various other functions or activities, i.e. guest lecturers and speakers.
- The Diversity Committee should engage in research on developing ways to promote listening, acknowledgement, and understanding by administration, faculty, staff, and students, regarding issues related to discrimination, marginalization and safety.
- The Diversity Committee should develop and maintain a diversity calendar of campus events and activities that encompasses all of Rowan's campuses.
- The Diversity Committee should develop an "open voice" opportunities for the LGBTQIA+ faculty/staff to discuss concerns and issues.
- The Diversity Committee should revisit the "Voices of International Students Panel (2017)" to gauge that populations needs and develop practices in conjunction with the Office of International Student Affairs and the Multicultural Center-SJICR.

- **RECOMMENDATIONS:**

- The Diversity Committee recommends the development of an *SJICR Fellow* who would complete a relevant scholarly/creative project centered on social justice and equity that will support a special honors course and also benefit the Rowan community.
-
- The Diversity Committee partner/support the committee that is developing the certificate program, Teaching the New Jersey Mandates.
-
- The Diversity Committee should be more aggressive in their efforts to address/support diversity, inclusion, equity and social justice practices on all of Rowan's campuses.
-
- The Diversity Committee should promote the expansion of lactation centers on Rowan's campuses.

Committee Name: Graduate Education and Global Learning Partnerships

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 2

Committee Chair: Monica Reid Kerrigan

Committee Members: (list here)

Banutu-Gomez, Michael	Lee, Jooh	Savage, Jennifer
Hristescu, Gabriela	Lenz, Jeff	Stanzione, Joseph
Buono, Russell	McCann, Sharon	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

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

Summary of Activities this Year:

The committee reviewed and provided input on the following Global policies this year:

Student Verification of Identity Policy

Standardization of semester start date for Global programs

Time Limit Extension

Graduate Academic Leave of Absence

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS: None

RECOMMENDATIONS: None

Committee Name: Intercollegiate Athletics

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 2

Committee Chair: Erin Hannah

Committee Members: (list here)

Brian Calio	Michael DiSanto	Jeanine Dowd
Kara Ieva	Adam Kolek	Tiffany Tillman
Shari Willis	Yang Yang	JoAnne Bullard
Dan Gilmore		

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. Total 19 members

Summary of Activities this Year:

We met twice during the year, once each semester.

10/26/2019

Athletic Director, Dan Gilmore provided an update on West Campus Facilities. While something is expected to be known in January, the timeline has been repeatedly pushed back.

We also discussed the upcoming events the athletic department is hosting, and how we, as a committee could potentially help promote them

4/11/2019

Dave Naphy, Assistant Athletic Director updated the committee on the status of the investigations in the athletic department. There was one HR investigation that already concluded, and now there is another. The University also hired a consultant to come in to evaluate the department and provide recommendations to the University. The athletic department has faced a lot of scrutiny and has people saying really terrible things about them. Dave also updated us on Student-Athlete Day. 272 students had above a 3.0 cum GPA, and 42 were inducted into the Athletic Honors Society.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS: None

RECOMMENDATIONS: None

Committee Name: Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee 2018-2019

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 1 plus time on ad-hoc committees for Rowan Core

Committee Chair: Carla Lewandowski

Committee Members: (list here)

Catherine Baxter	Carmelo Callueng	Mary Ellen Santucci
Alison Novak	Sangita Phadtare	Jane Hill
Jennifer Savage	Jennifer Nicholson	

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 assessment plans from academic programs, general education, and student development; assists in the establishment of a process for the systematic review of assessment information collected each year. Eligibility: (Committee Chair is not calculated in the committee total) 6 Faculty (one from each College), 1 Curriculum Committee Rep, 1 Institutional Research Rep (non-voting), 1 AFT rep, 1 Professional Staff, 1 Academic Policies/Procedures Rep, 2 SGA Reps

Summary of Activities this Year:

Last year, the chair of the LOAC, Carla Lewandowski, met with Jeff Bonfield, the Director of Assessment and Nathan Bauer, the chair of the Rowan Core, to discuss the role of the LOAC in the future with the adoption of the Rowan Core in the 2018-2019 school year. It was decided at the meeting that the LOAC could take on a greater role. The range of possible student scores on the assessment methods are translated to a standardized scale that represents the students' level of attainment of the Rowan Core outcomes(s) that are aligned to the assessment method. While there is a standardized scale for Rowan Outcome ratings, the *translations* of the course scores to the standardized ratings are not *themselves* standardized. It is possible that for the same Rowan Core outcome, students would have to perform significantly better in one course than they would in another course to earn the same rating on the Rowan Core outcome. The LOAC could eliminate this shortcoming in the assessment process.

The plan was for the LOAC to evaluate representative samples of student work from Rowan Core assessment methods that are aligned to a common Rowan Core outcome. The Committee would rate the students' performance using the standardized scale for the Rowan Core outcome. Reviewing a range of student work

from various courses would make it possible for the LOAC to apply the standardized scale evenly both within and across disciplines. In instances when objective questions are the course assessment method, the Committee would determine what number correct correlates with what rating on the standardized scale. The committee met once this year with Jeff Bonfield in order to figure out how to do this process. We had planned to find out more about the process from Jane Hill who was going to be doing it in her own department with Anthropology.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

2018-2019

The Committee is still trying to figure out a smooth process for the evaluation of the Rowan Core assessment methods. If it is possible, Jeff Bonfield may need to co-chair the committee in order to help oversee the process.

Committee Name: Professional Ethics and Welfare 2018-2019

Number of Meetings Held this Year: ____1____

Committee Chair: __McKenzie Suber-Robinson_____

Committee Members: (list here)

Maria Sudeck	Ashley Pattwell	Wei Xue
Alicia Groatman	Ryan McNulla	Rachel Budman
Mary Gallant	Amanda Almon	Denise Brush
Patrice Henry-Thatcher		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

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

Summary of Activities this Year:

The committee received a total of two (2) ethics violation inquiries during the 2018-2019 academic year.

The complainant in one inquiry decided not to pursue a formal ethics complaint; the committee will be meeting with the complainant in the second inquiry soon.

The committee met in December to discuss a pending ethics complaint and the chair is currently scheduling interviews with the individuals named.

The committee will meet at the conclusion of the interviews to determine recommendations.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS: None

RECOMMENDATIONS: None

Committee Name: University Senate Promotion

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 1

Committee Chair: Jess W. Everett

Committee Members: (list here)

Edward Schoen	Jennifer Courtney	Xiufang Chen
Bonnie Angelone		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Facilitate election of college committees. Provide guidance to candidates. Collect all applications and send to Provost. Identify candidates receiving unanimous favorable votes at the department and college levels and provide their names to the Provost. REVIEW portfolios of applicants who received mixed votes or who request a review. For those candidates, determine if approved and established procedures were followed and transmit the findings to the Provost.

Summary of Activities this Year:

- The Chair gave one presentation on the promotion process to candidates.
- The Chair & Bonnie Angelone helped candidates interpret the application process.
- The Chair and Senate Office facilitated the Election of College Committees
- The Chair reviewed all candidate packets and identified those candidate receiving unanimous favorable votes at the department and college levels.
- The committee reviewed the portfolios of one candidate that received 2 favorable votes, zero negative votes, and one abstention.
- The committee discussed recommendations for improving the application process. The approved recommendations given below.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS: NONE

RECOMMENDATIONS: See next page

Lecturer Promotion Criteria Recommendation

As departments develop their criteria for recontracting and/or promotion of Lecturers we want to be sure there is as much clarity as possible. Here are our comments and questions.

- 1) On the front cover of the current Promotion MOA it states one of the major changes made was “Added Lecturers (NTTF) to Instructor section for Professional Development (Appendix A: 1.2B)”, indicating that Lecturers will be evaluated on Teaching, Service, and Professional Development. However, in the current NTTF Letter of Agreement within the section of Professional Responsibilities only 2 areas are stated (1. Teaching Load and 2. Service) – as such, this could be confusing. Is the professional development part of promotion and not part of recontracting? Assuming professional development is expected for both, it should be narrowly defined, e.g., maintenance of teaching excellence (pedagogy and content mastery).
- 2) In the current Promotion MOA there is no information on the movement through the levels of Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Master Lecturer) – are these considered Promotion levels and if so, should they be included in the Promotion MOA? Should departments include this movement in their document development?

We recommend that MOAs relevant to Lecturers all specify evaluation based on Teaching, Service, and Professional Development (PD), that PD be narrowly defined, and that the three levels of Lecturer (Lecturer, Senior Lecturer, Master Lecturer) be described in the Promotion MOA only.

Sending paper copies to Senate or Provost Recommendation

This year some college committees sent paper copies of candidate applications to the Senate Office and others to the Provost. The confusion was caused by the Promotion MOA, where page 2 indicates:

College Committee concludes work and transmits folders to Senate office and to College Deans in cases of split or negative college votes (*including candidate response to evaluation if provided*). Unanimous positive assessments from Department and College are transmitted directly to the Provost.

But if you look into the MOA, it still says the college committee:

5.424 Routes recommendations to the College Dean and the University Senate Promotion Committee unless the candidate withdraws the application. The chair of the committee will ensure that, for each applicant forwarded, the portfolio containing supplemental materials is in the hands of the Dean.

And the Senate committee shall:

5.64 RECEIVE, RETAIN, AND REVIEW the portfolios of applicants who received negative recommendations or mixed votes, and/or who request a review. A mixed vote can occur within a Department or College Promotion Committee when there is less than unanimous agreement, or between the two promotion committees when they fail to reach the same conclusion regarding a portfolio.

We recommend that the Union make ‘Page 2’ consistent with 5.424 and 5.64.

Committee Name: Recruitment, Admissions, Retention

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 4

Committee Chair: Douglas Cleary

Committee Members: (list here)

Doug Cleary	Charissa Burgos	Amanda Kuster
Joe Cassidy	Amanda Cox	Celeste Del Russo
Dustin Fife	Lore Getler	Patrice Henry-Thatcher
LuAnne Maslanik	Allison Novak	Lauren Pollara
Jessica Syed	Cass Sherman	Matthew Travis
Dan Drutz	Eric Mann (SGA)	Michael Viola (SGA)

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:

1. First meeting - Dr. Rory McElwee an update on University retention and graduation rates. She discussed Rowan's formal retention system and the Student Success Center. She noted we are moving toward more significant data mining. There is a large amount of data available to the success center such as how often students access the library, swipe into dorms, etc. They want to develop early intervention systems based on that data and are currently studying what is available working to get a handle on how to use. Also discussed the university move toward a mix of merit and need-based aid and made us aware of the emergency financial aid available to students. Also discussed factors leading to students dropping out. Finances is likely number one. The committee chair and committee members have copies of the data she provided.
2. Second meeting – Dr. Soumitra Ghosh, Assistant VP of Student Recruitment was guest. The committee discussed the low yield numbers the university is experiencing with academically prepared female students compared to similar male students. Deeper analysis of the data was discussed and meeting minutes are available from the committee chair. There was discussion of the need to better market our student outcomes to attract these students because we do not have the financial aid to compete

with private schools for these students. There was discussion of the efforts going on to brand Rowan for recruiting purposes. Financial aid was also discussed and noted that the university is slowly shifting from an SAT to a GPA based process for accepting students. Institutional aid needs to be repositioned with money moving from merit based to need based. Merit aid is usually reflective of SAT scores which are reflective of socio-economic status. If we want a more diverse student body we need more need based aid. There is also a large split in how aid is distributed. Currently about \$6 million goes to 2684 freshman admits. We have about the same number of transfers arriving each year with only \$350,000 of aid going to a group about the same size. The meeting minutes have a lot of additional good information and are available from the committee chair.

3. Third meeting – Luci Nurkowski, Associate Director, Transfer Admissions was the guest. The previous meetings made it clear that transfer students will be key to maintaining enrollment on campus. She described the processes Rowan uses to attract transfer students and the recruitment resources available. She noted the importance of the program guides at NJtransfer.org which are used to guide transfer students in course selection related to the degree they later wish to pursue at Rowan. Meeting minutes can be obtained from the committee chair.
4. Fourth meeting – (occurring after deadline for this report). The guest will be Mayra Arroyo – Coordinator of University Transfer Services. She will discuss the services available to the transfer students once they become Rowan students. This meeting is focused on the transfer student experience and retention of the transfer students.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS:

Speakers at Senate meetings, Board of Trustees Meetings, and committee meetings have been very clear that high school enrollments are dropping and transfer students are key to maintaining enrollment numbers at Rowan. Transfer students can also have a large impact in increasing our campus diversity. The Senate needs to stay on top of the changing processes for awarding student aid (merit and need based) and may want to weigh in on the relative distribution of the aid or at least understand the administration's justification for those decisions.

RECOMMENDATIONS: None

Committee Name: Research Committee,

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 2 – 04/02/2019 and 04/04/2019, and several e-mail discussions

Committee Chair: Gustavo Moura-Letts, Chemistry and Biochemistry, CSM

Committee Members: (list here)

1	Gustavo Moura-Letts	Chair, Faculty - CSM
2	Jannelle Alexander	Professional Staff
3	Jeff Lenz	IRB rep - Professional Staff
4	Eduard Dedkov	Faculty - CMSRU / AFT
5	Samantha Kennedy	Professional Staff / Librarian
6	Davide Ceriani	Faculty - CPA
7	Yusuf Mehta	Faculty - RCE
8	James Grinias	Faculty - CSM
9	Matthew Pittman	Faculty - CCCA
10	Erin Pletcher	Faculty - SHP
11	Christine Poteau	Faculty - CHSS
12	Gregory Hecht	IBC rep - CSM
13	Vahid Rahmani	Faculty - RCB
14	Shilpa Rele	Professional Staff / Librarian
15	Benjamin Saracco	Librarian - CMSRU
16	Qian Sun	Faculty - CEd

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 ensure that the faculty, staff, students, and administration are aware of current research efforts, resources, and challenges.

Summary of Activities this Year:

Research committee members worked together and consulted with members from the Colleges, professional staff, students, and the Office of Research throughout the academic year. The committee participated in the following activities:

1. **Basic Research Support** Issues were discussed with Office of Research personnel: Stephen Robishaw.
2. Provided feedback on the **RU Seed Funding** proposal guidelines for 2019 with particular emphasis on deadlines and review process.
3. Provided feedback on future internal funding mechanisms and their potential guidelines.
4. Reviewing **RU Seed Funding** application materials. The committee is in the middle of the RU Seed Funding review process and will provide reviews and feedback to the Office of Research. Awards will be announced in May 2019.

SUGGESTIONS:

1. Given the recent university-wide research status changes, the committee recommends further strengthening the dialogue regarding basic research support issues between the faculty from all campuses and the Office of Research.
2. The committee in collaboration with the Office of Research should facilitate and encourage efforts to foster new inter-disciplinary and cross-disciplinary partnerships so as to advance Rowan University's research efforts.
3. The committee is invested in discussing the development of better mechanisms to engage and enhance undergraduate/graduate student research funding opportunities on all the campuses.
4. Work collaboratively with Technological Resources Committee and discuss efforts to improve research support especially in terms of technology and computing.
5. Explore the possibility of updating the RU Seed Funding program guidelines – with particular focus on reporting requirements for the deliverables and outcomes of successfully funded proposals and program timelines as new mechanism become available

Committee Name: Rowan Core Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 11 total (4 full committee, 7 sub-group review sessions)

Committee Chair: Nathan Bauer

Committee Members: (list here)

Accardo, Amy	Gregory, Eric	Miller, Jude
Budmen, Rachel	Hostetter, Anthony	Provine, Darren
Dickerson, Catharine	Kipnis, Dan	Rudin, Joel
Eisberg, Bob	Larsen-Britt, Christine	Shen, Yide
Fillenwarth, Gracemarie	Lindman, Janet	Ullmann, Paul
Finer, Cynthia		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

- Reviewing proposals to add a Rowan Core literacy to an existing course—or to modify the literacy of an existing Rowan Core course.
- Coordinating with the Curriculum Committee to review proposals for new Rowan Core courses.
- Revoking courses from Rowan Core if departments fail to do the approved student assessment.
- Developing and approving changes to Rowan Core policy.
- Review alignments of non-Rowan Core courses with Rowan Core literacy outcomes.
- Revise existing Rowan Core learning outcomes (or add new ones) as needed.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The Rowan Core Committee had a busy year. In a series of policy meetings, we developed and approved a revised Rowan Core policy proposal—based on changes that were made during the implementation process. This proposal is now being considered by the Full Senate. The Committee also served as the foundation of the ongoing Task Force on the Future of the WI and LIT Requirements, which met twice this year. We agreed that both requirements should be kept, but that they need clearer guidelines and a manageable assessment plan. We have already developed the new LIT guidelines, and we will continue working on both requirements next year. Sub-groups of approximately 4 or 5 committee members met to review proposals to add new courses to Rowan Core. Some proposals are still under review, but we expect to have 29 courses added to Rowan Core by Fall 2019. The committee chair has done additional work managing and continuing the implementation of the Rowan Core general education program.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Suggestions & Recommendations for 2019-20:

- Continue including the Rowan Core Committee in the ongoing Task Force on the Future of the WI / LIT requirements.
- Begin revising the Rowan Core learning outcomes for each Literacy. (The committee chair has been collecting feedback from faculty on how to improve these outcomes.)
- Continue working with the Curriculum Committee to improve coordination of the process for reviewing proposals to create new Rowan Core courses (Process B).
- In coordination with Rowan Administration and our partner county colleges, develop a plan and timeline to implement the Rowan Core general education requirements for transfer students.
- Work with departments and Rowan Global to add Rowan Core assessment to online courses.

Committee Name: Sabbatical Committee,

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 5, several e-mail discussions

Committee Chair: Subash Jonnalagadda, Chemistry and Biochemistry, CSM

Committee Members: (list here)

1	Subash Jonnalagadda	Chair, Faculty - Math/Science
2	Julie Haynes	Faculty-Humanities/SS
3	Nicole Edwards	Faculty-Education
4	James Roh	Faculty-Business
5	Joe Johnson	Faculty-Comm/Creative Arts
6	Davide Ceriani	Faculty-Performing Arts
7	Iman Noshadi	Faculty- Engineering
8	DJ Angelone	Faculty-Math/Science
9	Elizabeth Tenison	Faculty-School of Health Professions
10	Christine Davidian	Faculty or Librarian
11	Carol Thompson	Faculty or Librarian
12	Phil LaPorta	Faculty or Librarian
13	Amanda Adams	AFT (non-voting)

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

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

Summary of Activities this Year:

- The committee met five times on 11/01/2018, 11/15/2018, 12/06/2018 (met twice), and 12/12/2018.
- 36 semesters of sabbatical leave were requested by 24 applicants.
- The senate committee recommended 23 applicants for sabbatical and following is the college-wise breakdown of sabbatical leaves recommended by the senate committee
 - COB (3)
 - CCCA (5)
 - COEd (2)
 - COEng (2)

- CHSS (4)
 - CSM (4)
 - CPA (2)
 - SEE (1)
- After the review at the Provost level, 17 of the 24 applicants were recommended for sabbatical leave (26 semesters of sabbatical leave). All the applicants were notified by the Provost's office in writing on 01/22/2019.
 - The Board of Trustees approved all the sabbatical recommendations at their meeting on 04/10/2019.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS:

One of the suggestions by the peer evaluators from the Middle States Commission on Higher Education during the decennial site visit to the university in Spring 2019 was to encourage more faculty members to apply for sabbatical in light of the new research-based focus of the university and its curriculum. The senate in coordination with AFT should try to make efforts towards increasing the number of applications by raising awareness about the sabbatical process and informing the applicants about their eligibility.

RECOMMENDATIONS: none

Committee Name: Student Relations

Number of Meetings Held this Year: ____1

Committee Chair: Eileen Stutzbach

Committee Members: (list here)

Cahn, Stacey	Shryock, Lauren	Tremoulet, Polly
Dashefsky, Patricia	Tighe, Karla	Simmons, Christina
Dowd, Jeanine	An, Sharon	Stutzbach, Eileen
Jiras, Jonathan	Jimenez, Henry	Drutz, Daniel

Purpose of/Charge to Committee: Evaluates existing and proposed relations and procedures and initiates recommendations for changes.

Summary of Activities this Year:

Met once to discuss police activity on campus.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS: None

RECOMMENDATIONS: None

Committee Name: Tenure and Recontracting

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 24

Committee Chair: Kevin Dahm

Committee Members: (list here)

Buono, Russell	Poolos, Kimberly	Willett, Holly
Casper, Camron	Riddell, William	Mason, Jonathan
Dolbow, Heather	Robinson, Faye (AFT REP)	Lee, Valarie
Fusco, Thomas	Thomas, Christopher	Wilcoxson, Catherine
Haines, Laurie	Vilceanu, Olga	Wang, Jia
Iftode, Cristina		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Review Tenure and Recontracting applications, provide detailed feedback and a formal recommendation on each.

Summary of Activities this Year:

Reviewed 70 candidates for Recontracting or Tenure.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS: The next T&R MOA does not yet exist but will be negotiated this summer. Department T&R Committees, please be careful to follow the deadlines listed in the MOA. There were cases during the last couple of years in which candidates were given wrong information regarding deadlines by members of their Department T&R Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS: Add an assistant Tenure and Recontracting Chair as a new role (with ½ as much release time as the Chair receives). This will both help manage the workload associated with the growing number of candidates (110 anticipated next year) and also allow for a smoother transition from one committee Chair to another.

Committee Name: University Budget and Planning

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 4

Committee Chair: Christopher Simons

Committee Members: (list here)

Joe Scully (CFO)	Michael Blake (Budget)	Demond Miller (Senate VP)
Robert Scarpa (Business)	Jeff Maxson (CCA)	Joy Xin (Education)
Jennifer Kadlowec (Engineering)	Bruce Plourde (HSS)	Denis Diblasio (Performing Arts)
O'Leary, Rob (SGA)	Plourde, Bruce (Humanities & Social Sciences)	Scarpa, Robert (Business)
Trevor Smith (Science & Math)	Skeff Thomas	David Manley (Professional Staff)
Lorenzo Mathews (Professional Staff)	Kathy O'Leary (Professional Staff)	Sharon An (Library)
Michelle Kowalsky (AFT)	Denise Williams (CWA)	Rob O'Leary (SGA)
Christopher Simons (UBP Chair)	Manoj Pandey (Cooper)	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Maintains a meaningful dialogue on budget and planning decisions between the University Administration and the University Senate.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The University Budget and Planning Committee met with President Ali Houshmand in Fall 2018 to discuss long-term planning and challenges for the University. In Spring 2019 we met with Senior vice President of Student Affairs Jeff Hand to discuss long-term planning and enrollment issues. We also had meetings with University CFO Joseph Scully and Assistant Vice President of Budget Michael Blake. Committee chair Christopher Simons regularly attended all of the Board of Trustees Budget and Finance Committee meetings. Christopher Simons represented the University Budget and Planning Committee on the Fiscal Management and Stewardship Committee for the Middle States accreditation. The University Budget and Planning Committee also discussed budget documents electronically.

As reported to the University Senate the University's finances are strong and the University has recorded significant surpluses for the past several years. While there are real challenges, Rowan University has been successful in meeting them.

The University Budget and Planning Committee will continue to monitor budget results and developments over the summer and will meet during the summer as necessary.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS: None

RECOMMENDATIONS: None

University Committees

2018-19

Committee Name: Awards Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: One

Committee Chair: Stephen A. Royek, M.A.

Committee Members: (list here)

Amanda Adams	Lori Block	Melissa Klapper
John Quinesso	Natalie Schell-Busey	Robert Wieman
Kelly Young		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

The task of the Faculty Senate Awards Committee is to solicit nominations for, coordinate the selection of, and facilitate the presentation of three Graduating Senior Awards: The Dr. Robert D. Bole Humanitarian Award, the Dr. James M. Lynch, Jr., Courage in Adversity Award, and the Dr. Thomas E. Robinson Leadership Award. The Committee also facilitates the presentation of the Dr. Lawson J. Brown Senior Scholarship Award, which is an academic performance honor.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The 2018-2019 academic year for the Faculty Senate Awards Committee was routine, calm, and peaceful for all but the final two weeks or so of our selections process. Our year began with a reorganization meeting on October 11 in a conference room on the fifth floor of Victoria Hall, the home of the Writing Arts Department (just down the hall from my office). As I did last year, I volunteered to host the meeting.

The first item of business for the meeting was to select a chair, and I was chosen by unanimous acclamation. Next up was the selection of a submission deadline for nominations, which we discussed based on the schedules and obligations of our members. We settled on Friday, February 22 at 5 p.m.

I then volunteered to take care of updating the various materials the committee uses to solicit and accept nominations:

- *Our Call for Nominations that appears every six business days in the Rowan Announcer from mid-October to late February*
- *Our Electronic Nomination Forms through which members of the campus community – students, faculty, and staff – can nominate individuals for the three awards. These nominations are based on specific criteria included on the nomination form.*
- *We also discussed a new way to publicize the nomination process: Sending a letter to all department chairs on campus encouraging them to share the reminder with their faculty members and staff. This letter was sent out on February 6, 2019, about three weeks before the nomination submission deadline.*

With the website up and running, successfully accepting applications, and with our weekly Announcer items running as scheduled, we settled in to wait for the Feb. 22 deadline when we would meet again to review the nominations and make our selections.

This is when the angst and excitement began.

I sat down on Saturday morning, February 23 to download the nomination forms from the three sites and put them in a shared Google Drive to share with the committee. They were going to read each document in the three categories and make their selections. We then planned to meet about a week later to discuss our thoughts on the nominations as a group and decide on the winners.

When I went into the site, I found out I only was able to see the names of the seniors that were nominated, but was not able to download the accompanying files. This revelation set off a series of email exchanges over the next two weeks with current and former committee members, the university IRT office, and eventually with Faculty Senate President Bill Friend, who helped bring the problem to resolution.

The problem ended up being that a former member of the committee – the person who set up the automated system to collect nominations a few years ago – did not make the Google Drive public, meaning only she could access the data stored within.

This two-week delay caused us to cancel our in-person meeting for discussion and selection of our winners and I created a new group Google Drive as soon as the files were accessible. We received nine nominations for the Lynch Award, eight for the Robinson Award, and one for the Bole Award.

Now that everyone could read and evaluate the nominations, we held an online vote where committee members sent me their top three selections for the two awards being contested. (After reviewing the one Bole Award nominations, we agreed this person was deserving of the honor and his “win” was confirmed.)

As the committee ballots began hitting my inbox, the results could not have been clearer. Both votes were 7-1 in favor of the eventual winners. I shared the results with the full committee and thanked the members for their service.

One additional point on the nominations and voting: One student nominated one of her professors, on separate electronic forms, for each of the three student awards. We discussed this via email among the committee and decided no change was needed to the verbiage of our materials. It was obvious, in our opinion, that the awards were designed for students only and we chalked this up as an isolated event.

Once we had our winners, the process calmed down; the Medallions were ordered and presented as scheduled at the Celebrating Leadership Awards Ceremony on Sunday, April 14.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- *First of all, the committee as a whole strongly recommends we stay together as a group, and the members said they would like me to remain as chairman. We believe this will bring consistency and continuity to the committee and that it's important to have people in place who have gone through the process before and have encountered problems they then went on to solve.*
- *We plan to meet maybe a week or two earlier in October (maybe even late September) to open the nomination process a bit earlier and begin getting the word out about the awards.*

- *We will redesign, and open to all committee members, the websites and Google Drive files that are used to collect and distribute the nominations.*
- *In addition to using Rowan Announcer, we want to get publicity on campus through The Whit and on WGLS. This would be accomplished with a fall and a spring feature article and various announcements in the newspaper along with several Rowan News Minute and Campus Calendar items on the radio station.*
- *We also plan to send out the solicitation letter to department chairs twice instead of just once. The first missive should go out in the fall, followed by a second one, a reminder, when we all return to campus after winter break.*

We welcome comments and suggestions from the Senate as we understand we serve at your pleasure. Please feel free to contact me for any additional information and to offer any feedback. Thank you.

Faithfully submitted,
Stephen A. Royek
Chair, Faculty Senate Awards Committee

Committee Name: Medallion Awards 2018-19

Number of Meetings Held this Year: at least five in-person meetings as well as countless email dialog

Committee Co-Chairs: Esther Mas and Asadeh (Asi) Nia-Schoenstein

Committee Members:

Esther Mas Serna	Asadeh Nia-Schoenstein	
------------------	------------------------	--

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

NOTE: Since activities were still ongoing by the submission deadline of this report, it is written in present rather than past tense.

As co-coordinators, for the academic year 2018-2019, Esther and I continue to serve on the Medallion Awards committee charged with processing and production of the annual Medallion Awards. We solicited, are processing and delivering 90 Medallion Awards, which *recognize "graduating students' academic excellence and service."* These include Medallions for all colleges, the five recognition Awards and the Awards by Nomination. This year, we have created five new Medallions, per request of different colleges.

Summary of Activities this Year:

First, Esther and I would like to thank Donna Ennis who is handling the Medallion payments and ensuring Pitman Jewelers will be paid in a timely manner. Thanks to Jeff and his team at Pitman Jewelers who are doing a marvelous job again this year and remain true professionals!

- We began to communicate with our points of contacts at colleges and departments in November 2018 to ensure a smooth and efficient process. We communicated to them the deadline of March 1, 2019, to make sure every department had sufficient time. Esther and I distributed information and forms, resolved budgetary concerns, ordered the medallions as the selection forms came in, proofread medallion recipients' names, and served as a delivery service between Pitman Jewelers and colleges.
- In the process, departments were reminded of the following:
 - Departments are responsible for notifying their Medallion recipients and sponsors.
 - Those departments that wish to award a certificate along with the Medallion need to use the Medallion Certificate template approved by Lori Marshall.
- Our spreadsheet was updated as selection forms were submitted. All names were checked and confirmed for eligibility against the graduation list.

- Lori Marshall received the Medallion Award Recipient names and corresponding Medallion names for the commencement booklet in a timely manner on March 13, 2019.
 - We are delivering the Medallions in a timely manner.
- Esther Mas and Asi Nia-Schoenstein (April 11, 2019)

Committee Name: _International Education Council

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 4

Committee Chair: Sharon An

Committee Members: (list here)

Sharon An (Chair)	Hajime Mitani	Keir Andreas Politz
Nasrine Bendjilali	Huan-Tang Lu	Edward C. Smith
Ai Guo Han	Courtney E. Richmond	Jan. M. Smolarski
Nina Krey	Heng Yi Michael Chu	
Yupeng Li	Xia Liu	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

“Improve the internationalization of Rowan University; plans and presents programs related to Education in all countries; recommends practices and policies that will enhance the internationalization at Rowan; and assists in the development and establishment of such practices and policies.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The International Education Council held four meetings this year, focused on promoting new services and exploring retention strategies for the international students at Rowan University. The council discussed some barriers to internationalization at Rowan and what kinds of strategies to be implemented to overcome those barriers. The council met with the director of the International Center Dr. Gokhan Alkanat and assistant director Ms. Ghina Mahmoud, and the assistant director of International Recruitment and Admissions Ms. Kesiane String. They were invited to attend the IEC meetings and made presentations on their efforts and activities for recruiting and providing services to the international students. The council members investigated the current status of the international students and were pleased by Dr. Alkanat’s report that there has been about a 20% increase in the number of international students at Rowan; about 50% undergraduate students and 50% graduate students. The International Center would like to have about 5% of all Rowan Students be international students, which would be about 1000 students. Currently, our percentage of students who are international students is still very low, compared to other comparable institutions.

Most of our international students come from India, China and Saudi Arabia. There are students from 42 other countries, but significantly fewer students come from each individual country after these top three.

To have more international students for diversity on Rowan campus, a lot more efforts need to be made. The council discussed with these directors about the current barriers and challenges, such as unusual requirements that make it difficult for international students to apply and come to Rowan. The key is to break down barriers and make the pathway much easier for international students to apply and successfully come to Rowan. The goal is to make Rowan University one of the best universities in the country for the international students.

The IEC investigated the current practices and services provided to the international students and the findings show that brief orientations from different areas or offices are offered when students first arrive, and some peer mentoring activities are provided. During the year, there are some social events, trips to cities and shopping, employment workshops offered to the international students. Currently there is one active international student club with about 30 active members. It is organized by students who run the club and events, as well as supported by the International Center.

This year the council also had some discussion on the Study Abroad program based on the presentation from Dr. Alkanat, regarding the issues that there is no funding available for low-income students to study abroad and fewer than 2% of Rowan students study abroad. The council members thought that more information is needed to understand barriers in this area.

The International Education council also examined some newly created internationally-focused academic programs, such as Area Studies which includes Latin American Study, Asian Study, European Study, and the fast growing International Studies Program which now has about 70 majors and more than one hundred minors. The council strongly supports these programs as they really help to promote internationalization at Rowan university.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS (See next page)

SUGGESTIONS:

The council members deem that in spite of a lot of efforts have been made in the past year, the percentage of international students at Rowan is still very low. Therefore, much more resources are needed to develop more efficient strategies to recruit much more international students. It was suggested that some Asian faculty members at Rowan have a lot of connections with the universities in their own countries and they could be good resources for recruiting much more international students. At the same time, more special programs and new services for the international students need to be established on campus to help the international students adapt well to the American educational learning environment. The frequency of those existing events, trips, programs offered to the international students should be increased in order to help further assimilate the international students and help them adjust to the new cultural and social environment.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

In coordination with International Center, explore the development of resources, organize and promote more internationally-focused events, clubs, programs for the international students. These students, when they first arrive from foreign countries, come across culture shock, language barriers, research difficulties. Currently, there is a special writing program for the international students. The library instruction programs for the international students which were successfully conducted in the previous years should be resumed as many international students benefitted a lot from learning how to use scholarly resources for their academic courses and class projects through the library instruction sessions which were specially designed to accommodate their various levels of language proficiency and different learning needs. The council members deem that retention of the existing international students is equally important as recruiting. For this purpose, to outreach and offer special support to the international students are critically important to retain them and attract more international students to Rowan University. Reestablishing faculty guided mentor program is recommended as we did it before. The goal is to make Rowan University one of the best universities in the country for international students.

The IEC members also suggested that the scholarship for Study Aboard program, especially for low-income students should be considered and developed, if possible.

The IEC members also recommended that ESL program could be relocated to Glassboro campus if space is available, so that those students will be able to participate in the international events, special programs, clubs for the international students on campus and it will also be more convenient for the International Center to oversee the ESL program.

Committee Name: Library Senate Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 1

Committee Chair: Sara Borden and Shilpa Rele

Committee Members: (list here)

Janet Iles	Zalphia Wilson-Hill	Jiyeon Lee
Michael Dominik	Xia Liu	Shilpa Rele
Jane Hill	Riley Shea (SGA Rep)	Kevin McCarthy (SGA Rep)

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

This committee facilitates communication regarding the research needs of faculty and students and reviews policies on the support for, management, and use of the libraries' facilities and resources. Additionally, the committee makes recommendations to the University Senate to ensure library resources are of high quality and utilized appropriately to further the educational and research mission of the University.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The Committee met once Monday, November 19, 2018. In attendance were Shilpa Rele, Michael Dominick, and Sara Borden. We briefly discussed the new circulation policy that the Library has put in place, as well as the new space that University Archives and Special Collections now occupies on the 3rd floor. Sara Borden and Shilpa Rele agreed to co-chair the Committee.

-

Committee Name: University Scholarship Committee

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 3

Committee Chair: Jennifer Espinosa

Committee Members: (list here)

Melanie Alverio	Douglas Mann	Bethany Gummo
Aimee Burgin	DeLithea Davis	Laurie Haines
Heather Dolbow	Shirley Farrar	Daniel Kipnis
Michelle Kowalsky		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

The University Scholarship Committee (USC) is responsible for reviewing the scholarship application process for University-awarded scholarships and generating criteria to evaluate student applications. After thoroughly reviewing the submitted applications, the committee selects recipients for University-awarded scholarships based on the specific requirements for each scholarship, such as academic achievement, financial need, and involvement with the university community.

Summary of Activities this Year:

- September 2018: USC members elected the committee chair
- December 5th, 2018: The USC met for the first time and discussed the criteria used to evaluate student applications. We identified many issues with how the criteria had been operationalized in previous years, so we collaborated on solutions to improve the criteria.
 - We improved the criteria for evaluating student essays by separating points awarded for the content of the essay from points awarded for the grammatical quality of the essay.
 - We extended the GPA criteria to 2 decimal points so reviewers can more accurately award points for GPA.
 - We revised the criteria for extra-curricular activities and college activities to better differentiate the levels of points.
 - We revised the criteria for letters of recommendation to identify how many letter students obtained. Many University-awarded scholarships do not require letters of recommendation, so we scored based upon how many were obtained, and then went back to evaluate the content of the letters as we were selecting the recipient(s) for scholarships requiring letters of recommendation.

- January 2019 – March 2019: USC members reviewed scholarship applications, and scored the application according to the criteria agreed upon at our December meeting. 100% of applications were reviewed by committee members prior to our first deliberation meeting.
- March 29th and April 5th, 2019: USC members met to evaluate the applicants for each scholarship, and selected the recipients. The committee evaluated 91 scholarships, and selected recipients for 90 scholarships. Unfortunately, we were unable to award the Charles & Joyce Moore for Urban Excellence Scholarship because there were no applicants that met the criteria of having a “significant break” in their educational pursuits.

COMMITTEE SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

SUGGESTIONS:

1. As the software system students use to apply for scholarships is changing in AY 2019-20, the USC has several suggestions on improvements that are needed to the elements of the student application and/or software:
 - a. The software system needs a better search function, that will allow the USC to search a student’s name during our deliberation meetings to see what scholarships they have applied for.
 - b. The student application needs to have clearer criteria on the Essay students write. In AY 2018-19, the Essay component was originally marked as “optional” in Awardspring. The USC identified this problem at our first meeting, but it is unclear how many students had already completed their applications at this point and opted not to complete the Essay.
 - i. There also needs to be a clearer definition of what the Essay on the application should look like in terms of the number of paragraphs, substance, etc.
 - c. A few scholarships require an applicant to be a “non-traditional” student. Clearer definitions are needed of a “non-traditional” student on the student application. Many applicants identified themselves as “non-traditional” because they work full-time and go to school at the same time.

- d. The extra-curricular and college-activities component either needs clearer definitions or to be combined into one field on the student application, where students list all of their activities in one spot. Students are unclear on which types of activities are considered “extra-curricular” and “college-activities,” which makes reviewing the applications difficult for USC members.
 - e. Scholarships requiring a specific class-standing should specify whether the required class standing is for when students complete their application, or if that class standing is required for the following AY when they would receive the scholarship.
 - f. The software system should separate dependent applicants out completely or clearly identify them to assist the USC during deliberations.
 - g. The software system should auto-populate fields of information from the student application relevant to each specific scholarship.
 - h. For scholarships with multiple criteria, it would be helpful for the donors to express the importance of each criteria. Some donors do this already by specifying first preference, second preference, etc.
 - i. Before the USC meets to award University-awarded scholarships, all dependent student and merit-based scholarships should be identified in the system. This will prevent the USC from awarding scholarships to students who have already received funding from other sources, and enable more students to benefit for the University-awarded scholarships.
2. A list of scholarships by monetary value is needed. The USC should award scholarships by decreasing monetary value, to avoid over-awarding scholarships to individual students. The USC has been informed, that in some cases, applicants end up receiving too much aid between merit-based, dependent, department and University-awarded aid, so some scholarships end up being awarded to a recipient other than who the USC selected. In these cases, the USC should be given the opportunity to re-review the scholarships to select a new recipient.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. It is recommended that as many of the AY 2018-19 committee members be assigned to the USC for AY 2019-20 as possible. Financial Aid is transitioning to a new software system for University-awarded scholarships in AY 2019-20, so returning several committee members knowledgeable of the USC processes will help the committee run smoothly and allow members to focus on learning the new software system.

2. It is recommended that the USC continue to include a member from the College of Education to assist with awarding the education-based scholarships.
3. It is recommended that the application period for students to apply for University-awarded scholarships close on January 15th. The close of applications for AY 2018-19 was originally on 12/23/18. This deadline was four days after the end of the semester and fell close to the Christmas holiday, so many students may not have been able to complete their applications before the deadline. The deadline was extended to 1/1/19 after discussion at the USC's first meeting, however, it is unclear how many students knew about the extension. Committee members do not typically start reviewing applications until the start of the Spring semester, so it would be fine from the committee's standpoint to close applications on 1/15, so students have the opportunity to apply for scholarships after the semester and holidays have ended.
4. It is recommended that the scholarship application deadlines be better communicated to students. The USC was unable to exhaust 3 scholarships because multiple awards were available, but there were not enough applicants to award the scholarships to. While some announcements were made in the Rowan Daily Mail Announcer, it may be better to title these announcements more clearly. In most of the announcements, the headline appeared as "Apply Now for Rowan Foundation Scholarships." Students may not know that Rowan Foundation Scholarships are the University-awarded scholarships for continuing students. Instead something along the lines of, "Continuing Students: Apply Now for University Scholarships" or "Continuing Students: The Deadline to Apply for University Scholarships in 1/15." College and department-based communications would also better inform Rowan students of University scholarship availability
5. USC members request a final report of the scholarships awarded based on the committee's recommendations, and which were changed for AY 2018-19. The USC has been informed, that in some cases, applicants end up receiving too much aid between merit-based, dependent, department and University-awarded aid, so some scholarships end up being awarded to a recipient other than who the USC selected.
 - a. Starting in AY 2019-20, the USC should have an opportunity to select the new recipients for scholarships that need to be re-assigned due to over-awards, since committee members review student applications and have established criteria for evaluating them.
6. It is recommended that members of the USC be able to assist in the development of the new software system that will be used to review scholarships. It would be helpful if USC

members could see a demonstration of the new software and offer suggestions for improving it.