

University Senate Committee Reports 2019-20

16 Policy Committees	Chairperson	Suggestions	Recommendations
Academic Integrity	Dan Folkinshteyn		
Academic Policies & Procedures	Eddie Guerra	✓	✓
Campus Aesthetics & Environmental Concerns	Diane Garyantes	✓	✓
Curriculum	Marci Carrasquillo	✓	✓
Diversity	J.T. Mills	✓	✓
Global Education & Global Learning Partnerships	Mike Schillo	✓	✓
Learning Outcomes Assessment	Carla Lewandowski		
Professional Ethics & Welfare	Alicia Monroe	✓	
Promotion	Ted Schoen	✓	
Recruitment, Admissions & Retention	Doug Cleary	✓	
Research	James Grinias	✓	✓
Rowan Core	Nathan Bauer	✓	✓
Sabbatical Leave	Gustavo Moura	✓	✓
Student Relations	Jennifer Savage	✓	✓
Technological Resources	Kimberly Poolos	✓	✓
4 All-University Committees	Chairperson	Suggestions	Recommendations
Awards	Stephen Royek	✓	✓
Awards/Medallions	Maria Esther MasSerna/ Asadeh Nia Schoenstein		
International Education Council	Shan An/ Lupeng Li	✓	✓
University Scholarship	Jennifer Espinosa	✓	✓

Policy Committees

Academic Integrity Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 2 (via email)

Committee Chair: Daniel Folkinshteyn

Committee Members: (list here)

Lomboy, Gilson

Luther, Jason

Wilcoxson, Catherine

Chien, Chia

McCandless, Bret

Gregory, Eric

Sam, Cecile

Nia-Schoenstein, Asadeh

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 3 seminars and 3 workshops.

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

Suggestions:

Recommendations:

Academic Policies & Procedures 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 2

Committee Chair: Eddie Guerra

Committee Members: Tejinder Billing, Douglas Cleary, Tiffany Fortunato, Eddie Guerra, Erin Herberg, Michelle Kowalsky, Kimberly Poolos, Margaret Shuff, Cindy Vitto

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

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

Summary of Activities this Year:

Reviewed the Incomplete portion of the Grade Policy with regard to limit on incompletes and the existence of College-level policies. Discussed the addition of the DEI statement to the Syllabus Policy. Created a draft Emeritus Faculty Policy with Associate Provost, Mariano Savelski. Reviewed addition of Academic Warning to the Undergraduate Academic Standing Policy. Met with members of DEI council to discuss how to apply Critical Policy Analysis. Reviewed interim changes to Academic Integrity Policy regarding online resources and altering forms.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

Suggestions:

Begin a systematic review of academic policies and procedures applying tools from DEI council such as Critical Policy Analysis.

Continue development of Emeritus Faculty Policy with Provost Office.

Review interim changes to Academic Integrity Policy.

Recommendations:

Amend Syllabus Policy to include formally include DEI statement.

Amend the Grade Policy to include specific policies and procedures for incomplete grades.

Campus Aesthetics & Environmental Concerns 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: **2 (several other planned meetings were cancelled)**

Committee Chair: **Dianne Garyantes**

Committee Members:

Campus Aesthetics & Environmental Concerns	Total 22 - including Chair
Dianne Garyantes, Chair	Faculty
Brand, Keith	Faculty
Duran, Daniel	Faculty
Morschauser, Scott	Faculty
Barbro, Patrick	Faculty
Conradi, Jan	Faculty
Everett, Jess	Faculty
Falck, Claire	Faculty
Crumrine, Patrick	Faculty
Hristescu, Gabriela	Faculty
Dashefsky, Patricia	Professional Staff
Finer, Cindy	Professional Staff
Rick Hunt, Division Planning & Real Estate Planning & Operations	Administrator, Facilities, Planning & Operations
Arijit De, Assistant Vice President for Facilities, Planning & Operations	Administrator, Facilities, Planning & Operations
Benson, Mike	Faculty and/or Professional Staff
Calio, Brian	Faculty and/or Professional Staff
Foley, Ray	Faculty and/or Professional Staff
Tighe, Karla	AFT Representative
Robert Emmanuel	SGA Representative
Jason Fisch	SGA Representative
Fiona Hughes	SGA Representative
Skeff Thomas	Ad-Hoc Rep.

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

The Committee facilitates communication among the campus community and primary facilities users, as well as 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 and safety concerns that affect the health and well-being of the university community and the natural environment.

Summary of Activities this Year:

I. The committee's first meeting of the year was held on Nov. 15, 2019, where we discussed several ongoing and new subjects relevant for the committee's work. Ongoing issues included:

- Lighting issues on Glassboro Campus,
- Art with new School of Earth and Environment, Hawthorne and a new SGA art project

- highlighting diversity on campus,
- Placement of the RCA logo on stained glass at Campbell Library (the committee would weigh in on the design of the frame),
- Proposals for new CHSS building and Agora Project, and
- Traffic and pedestrian safety on campus.

New business included:

- An SGA proposal on the use of scooters by students to get around the Glassboro campus,
- Sustainability on campus, including progress of the news Sustainability Committee on campus.
 - Idea was discussed to make sustainability the fifth pillar of the university's mission in South Jersey.
 - Another idea was adding signage near stream and environmental interesting areas and ID'ing trees on campus.

II. The committee scheduled 3 dates for tours of the Glassboro campus during the fall semester (with a committee meeting scheduled before the tour), but each tour was cancelled because a member of the Facilities & Operations was not available for the tour. The last tour date was scheduled for Dec. 20. We decided to reschedule the tour for the spring semester, possibly in May when the weather would be nicer.

III. The next meeting took place on March 6, where we discussed the following:

- Proposed bench outside of the engineering building (the committee unanimously approved the bench)
- Agora project
- Discovery Hall
- South Jersey Tech Park
- West Campus fields

We also created subcommittee for the committee because some of the concerns of the committee, and the expertise of the members, are specialized. Three subcommittee were formed:

- Art and Aesthetics
- Environmental Concerns
- Safety Concerns

The list of the members of **the subcommittees** follows:

Mike Benson	Art & Aesthetics
Patricia Dashefsky	Art & Aesthetics
Keith Brand	Art & Aesthetics
Jan Conradi	Art & Aesthetics
Arijit De	Art & Aesthetics
Patrick Crumrine	Environmental Concerns
Dan Duran	Environmental Concerns
Jess Everett	Environmental Concerns
Pat Barbro	Environmental Concerns
Brian Calio	Environmental Concerns
Gabriela Hristesa	Environmental Concerns

Skeff Thomas	Environmental Concerns
Rick Hunt	Environmental Concerns
Karla Tighe	Safety Concerns
Ray Foley	Safety Concerns
Dianne Garyantes	Safety Concerns
Cindy Finer	Safety Concerns

IV. A fourth meeting was scheduled for April 17 and we were planning a Glassboro campus tour for May, but the closing of the campus due to the coronavirus forced us to cancel the meetings.

V. In addition, the committee chair attended bi-monthly meetings with Joe Campbell, Divisional Vice President of Facilities Planning & Operations, Senate President Bill Friend, and Committee Member Skeff Thomas. The meetings provided updates of ongoing and planned construction projects on campus.

Suggestions:

- To continue to provide input into aesthetic, environmental, and safety matters on all of Rowan’s campuses.
- To continue the use of subcommittees for this committee. Some of the areas the committee addresses, according to its mission statement, are distinct. For example, concerns over traffic safety are much different than feedback needed on public art projects on the new buildings on campus.
- To hold Facilities staff and administration more accountable for attending meetings and scheduled tours of the campus. Having to reschedule the Glassboro campus tour three times this fall because Facilities staff could not attend was a bit frustrating. I also had to contact our Facilities representative before our committee meetings to ensure attendance.

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.
- To maintain the committee’s subcommittees so that committee members with expertise and interest in particular areas can make recommendations to the full committee on the distinct matters of aesthetics, environmental concerns, and safety.

Curriculum Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: Eleven

Committee Chair: Marci Carrasquillo

Committee Members: Ozge Uygur, Phil Lewis, Joy Cypher, Dan Strasser, Jiyeon Lee, Susan Browne, Will Riddell, Iman Noshadi, Kate Slater, Maria Rosado, Jim Abbott, Leslie Elkins, Adam Kolek, Nancy Tinkham, Shari Willis, Paul Ullmann, David Vaccaro, Jennifer Matthews, Joel Rudin, Sam Mardini, Kevin McCarthy, Santino D'Agostino, Arielle Gideon

Purpose of/Charge to Committee: "Reviews proposals for title and credit changes, minors, concentrations, major programs, courses, certifications, reorganization of academic/department 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: The full committee met in person or virtually eleven times to review major proposals (quasi-curricular, new degree/program, new degree-related program, and major changes to existing program proposals). The remaining proposals (new courses, changes to existing courses, minor changes to existing programs) were reviewed by the committee's chair.

565 proposals were submitted for review in AY 2019-20 but the total number for processing is 513, as 52 were withdrawn prior to reaching the Senate-level review. Several dozen active proposals also remain in department, dean, and college review queues. The following numbers thus represent what has been reviewed by the SCC or what is in the SCC review queue as of this writing.

- Quasi-Curricular: 13
- New Degrees / Programs: 59
- New (Non-Rowan Core) Courses: 234
- Changes to Existing Courses: 98
- Changes to Existing Degrees / Programs: 79

Suggestions: The committee suggests revising the committee description that is posted to the Senate website (to remove outmoded language and to update committee responsibilities).

Recommendations: With such a heavy workload, the SCC Chair requires adequate release time to fulfill this service obligation. The committee suggests a minimum of 6 s.h. automatic release time per term.

Diversity Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 4

Committee Chair: JT Mills

Committee Members: (list here)

Barnes, Adrian	Faculty or Professional Staff
Budmen, Rachel	Faculty or Professional Staff
Farrar, Shirley	Faculty or Professional Staff
Han, Ai Guo	Faculty or Professional Staff
Dusk, Chie	Faculty or Professional Staff
Higgins, Joseph	Faculty or Professional Staff
Lierman, Ashley	Faculty or Professional Staff
Monroe, Alicia	Faculty or Professional Staff
Shapiro, Rachel	Faculty or Professional Staff
Stesis, Karen	Faculty or Professional Staff
Walpole, Marybeth	Faculty or Professional Staff

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:

The resolution: Diversity & Inclusion Councils across all Disciplines and Departments at Rowan University - Passed

The resolution: Expansion of Lactation Stations across the main campus of Rowan University. Passed.

The Resolution: to have the university officially/publicly acknowledge Indigenous Peoples' Day 2020-Passed

Conducted the 7th 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-Dr. Deneen Hendrick; Nominator Rueben Britt and Dr. Alicia Monroe

Excellence in Diversity for Group Project-Rosa Parks Luncheon Committee; Nominator Dr. Alicia Monroe and Julie Peterson

Excellence in Diversity for Social Activism-Ricardo Dale; Nominator Dr. Alicia Monroe

Invited Dr. Michael Kantner to discuss student and campus issues surrounding policing (the October 1st stop of a Rowan student on our campus by Glassboro Police Department).

Invited Dr. Jocelyn Mitchell-Williams who discussed the diversity initiatives at the Cooper Medical School.

Invited Dr. William Friend to discuss the proposed Search Advocates that would include faculty and staff.

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

Suggestions:

The Diversity Committee suggests that the university develop and market a comprehensive Transgender Student Services plan that includes changing rooms at various sites on all campuses.

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.

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.

Recommendations:

The Diversity Committee recommends that the preferred name policy be expanded to include a *Preferred Title Policy*.

- "A married student may wish to be known as "Mrs." instead of "Ms.", for example, and nonbinary students sometimes prefer the title "Mx." (pronounced "mix"), as they do not feel that either "Mr." or "Ms." suits them.
- As the university has adopted a Preferred Name Policy, I believe we should also adopt a Preferred Title Policy, which students can be set on a web form when students filling out their information, and which could be included on class lists, so they don't feel like they have to fight an uphill battle every day being recognized for who they are. It would make the university more inclusive, and students who don't fit the usual categories wouldn't feel left out."

The Diversity Committee recommends that a *Preferred Title* clause be included in all academic syllabi.

The Diversity Committee recommends that all new constructions include lactation stations and gender-neutral bathrooms.

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.

Graduate Education & Global Learning Partnerships 19-20

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 2

Committee Chair: Michael Schillo

Committee Members: (list here)

Blanck, Emily Vanessa	Pratt, Brittain Morgan
Courtney, Jennifer E	Schillo, Michael B.
Joppa, Meredith Cerian	SGA Advancement: Jenna Day
Kerrigan, Monica Reid	SGA Secretary: Ayala Gedeon
Lanza-Gladney, Maria E	
Lee, Jooh	
Li, Jie	
Mason, Cristine M.	

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Graduate Education & Global Learning Partnerships reviews and recommends academic policies and procedures in the Division of Global Learning and Partnerships, including the development of online and hybrid courses, as well as traditional courses offered by Division of Global Learning and Partnerships. Committee 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:

Discussed potential changes to Graduate Education and organization of Global Learning & Partnerships and overall impact.

Assessed a plan for an organization for Graduate Students. Critical elements of plan include ways to ensure that organization will endure and effectively meet the needs of the graduate student population. Organization will initially be limited to Glassboro campus and then expand to the other campuses in coming years.

Addressed issues of mental diversity among graduate student population and issues that students were encountering at Rowan.

Committee acknowledged changing role as new Graduate School and Professional School were announced and approved and Rowan Global undergoing changes. In order to answer to the issues of programming, pedagogy, student organization and other services, committee needs to have an expanded role in the new schools. Committee is developing an outline of a number of past and present issues, as well as future ideas for the new schools and will share this outline as a living document so that all graduate issues can be addressed with shared collaboration among senate, faculty, staff, students, and the leadership of the new schools.

Committee also discussed the impact of the COVID-19 virus, quarantine and campus closure. Possible scenarios were discussed including the possible increase in enrollment in certain program and decrease in others using previous data as a loose comparison. Included in this, is the possible decrease in international student enrollment, issues with remote graduate education, and possible expansion on Rowan Success Network to graduate students for the purpose of remote outreach.

SUGGESTIONS:

Committee suggestions for new schools will be shared in document mentioned above via Google Drive and will be ongoing.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Committee recommendations for new schools will be shared in document mentioned above via Google Drive and will be ongoing.

Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 0

Committee Chair: Carla Lewandowski

Committee Members: (list here)

Baer, Andrea Patricia

Hill, Jane A

Kowalsky, Michelle A

Lewandowski, Carla Isabel

Nicholson, Jennifer Ann;

Novak, Alison Nicole

Phadtare, Sangita Uday

Savage, Jennifer

Gedeon, Arielle

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: The committee did not meet this year. At the end of the year, the Senate voted to combine the Learning Outcomes Assessment Committee with the Rowan Core Committee.

Suggestions:

Recommendations:

Professional Ethics and Welfare Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 5

Committee Chair: Alicia Monroe

Committee Members: (list here)

Sarah Bauer

Kyhna Bryant

Nicole Edwards

Shirley Farrar

Jonathan Jiras

Erin O'Neill

Mildred Rodriguez

James Roh

Lauren Shryock

William Freind (Ex-officio member)

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

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

Summary of Activities this Year:

The committee closed an ethics complaint that was pending from 2 years ago. The employee left the university and thus, general counsel advised the committee that the complaint was officially closed.

The current and former committee chairs provided support for a complaint that was lodged and withdrawn 1 ½ years ago. The complaint resurfaced via the Whistleblower Hotline.

Through extensive discussions, committee members recognized the need to revisit and re-engineer the Code of Ethics for Faculty/Professional Staff. The document, originally approved by the Senate 1/22/93, was last amended 5/15/02. With the development of university touch points for ethical issues, re-branding and positioning the Senate Professional Ethics and Welfare Committee as a relevant and vital university entity is imperative.

As a committee, we reached out to Rowan faculty/staff and departments that handle and process ethical concerns. Our work included:

1. Research the focus of ethics committees at New Jersey AFT-affiliated universities.
2. Committee discussion with the current and former Ombuds.
3. Meeting with the Title IX Coordinator.
4. Discussions with the AFT Grievance Chair.
5. Review of the IRB process.
6. Review of the role of the University Ethics Liaison and the Whistleblower Hotline process.

At the request of the committee, the President of the Senate has joined with us in order to provide historical background, insight, and guidance for amending the Code of Ethics in order to meet the current needs of Rowan University faculty and professional staff.

Suggestions:

Keep the committee intact, so that we can complete the work that we started; which is reframing the Code of Ethics. The committee endeavors to review the Procedures for the Senate Ethics Committee next.

Recommendations:

None

Senate Promotion Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: one

Committee Chair: Edward J. Schoen

Committee Members: (list here)

Bonnie L. Angelone

Xiufang Chen

Jennifer E. Courtney

Jess W. Everett

Paul Grossman

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

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

Summary of Activities this Year:

Provided oversight in the election of college promotion committees; made one presentation on the promotion process to candidates; responded to numerous inquiries from faculty applying for promotion and members of department and college promotion committees; reviewed promotion application folders of two faculty members who received a negative vote from a department or college promotion committee; and certified to the provost that the promotion procedures outlined in the 2019 Faculty Promotion MOA (“the Promotion MOA”) were followed in the case of one candidate for promotion but were not followed in the case of another candidate for promotion.

Suggestions:

The University Senate Promotion Committee suggests that the University and the Rowan AFT 2373 address or clarify the following issues in negotiating the 2020 Faculty Promotion MOA:

1. The Promotion MOA provides in ¶5.644 that, in the case of a negative vote at either the department or college promotion committee level, the University Senate Promotion Committee will send its report on adherence to Promotion MOA procedures to the Provost. This is not the case in applications for promotions submitted by faculty in the Cooper Medical School of Rowan University. Those reports are sent to Senior Vice President for Medical Initiatives and Affiliated Campuses.
2. The Cooper Medical School at Rowan University Advisory Committee on Appointments and Promotions suspended its deliberations to confirm that the candidate for promotion met the “time in rank” requirement for promotion. The Promotion MOA does not explicitly address the authority of a department or college promotion committee to suspend its deliberations to investigate whether the candidate meets a requirement for promotion.
3. The chair of a college promotion committee asked to see a copy of prior college committee promotion recommendations that she might use as a template for her committee’s recommendation. Fortunately, Bonnie Angelone, a member of the University Senate Promotion Committee, was able to provide two letters from sample files for people who were successfully promoted and who agreed to their use as sample letters. Sample letters for use by department and college promotion committee members might be included in the “Promotion Forms or Formats” section of the MOA.

4. The chair of a department promotion committee also served as a member of the three person college promotion committee and was recused from the college promotion committee deliberations in accordance with ¶5.3313. The remaining two members voted to promote the candidate, and a minority report explaining the recusal was provided in accordance with ¶5.4231. The Promotion MOU addresses the possibility of a majority vote against promotion in ¶5.4233, but does not address the possibility of a tie vote in the case of a two member promotion committee.
5. The chair of a college promotion committee encountered serious difficulties in finding a suitable time to schedule the meeting of the college promotion committee. The Promotion MOA does not address how the college promotion committee should proceed in the event it is impossible to arrange a meeting in which all members can attend, *i.e.*, proceed with the members who actually are able to attend the meeting or schedule two meeting of the committee.
6. The Humanities and Social Sciences Promotion Committee had six members; the College of Education Promotion Committee had four members. The Promotion MOA contemplates college promotion committees having three members (¶5.4132) or five members (¶5.4133), but does not address the issue of college promotion committees having a different membership.
7. The College of Education Promotion Committee experienced difficulties in assembling a sufficient number of candidates for election, put together a three-member ballot containing the name of a faculty member who planned to retire before the committee initiated its work, and obtained two additional volunteers whose names were placed on the ballot. This occurred the weekend before the promotion applications were to be delivered to the college committee. The Promotion MOU does not address how the college or the University Senate Promotion Committee should proceed when it discovers that a candidate for the college promotion committee may not be able to serve and there are fewer than three candidates on the college committee.
8. ¶5.424 provides that, in the case of unanimous votes by the college committee, the college committee recommendation is routed to the college dean and the Provost, and that, in the case of nonunanimous votes by the college committee, the college committee recommendation is routed to college dean and the University Senate Promotion Committee. Because ¶5.424 does not specify who is responsible for to route the recommendation, the chair of a college committee requested clarification on whether the chair of the college committee or the candidate was responsible to route the recommendation. The Chair of the University Senate advised her that the chair of the college committee was responsible to do so. If that advice was correct, ¶5.424 should be clarified accordingly.
9. ¶3.143 provides: "Recommendations from evaluators outside the institution must attest to the appropriateness of the individual's research and scholarly activities to the rank of professor. Evidence for this body of work must reflect a consistent pattern of scholarly accomplishments since the date of application for promotion to associate professor." The chair of a department promotion committee asked for clarification of the term "date of application for promotion to associate professor." The Chair of the University Senate advised her that he interpreted the text to mean research and scholarly activities that came into existence after promotion to Associate Professor, *i.e.*, research and scholarly activities that were included in the application for promotion to Associate Professor cannot be considered, and hence only research and scholarly activities that accrue after promotion to Associate Professor are reviewed and assessed by the external evaluator. If that advice was correct, ¶3.143 should be clarified accordingly.
10. There is uncertainty among instructors who were recently tenured about the scope or period of review, more specifically whether it starts from the time they were hired as instructors or from the time they received tenure. While the Promotion MOU addresses the period of review for candidates seeking promotion to Professor, the Promotion MOU does not address the period of review for candidates seeking promotion to Assistant Professor. The Chair of the University Senate Promotion Committee advised one candidate for promotion to Assistant Professor that the review period is measured from the time the candidate was hired at the rank of Instructor. If that advice was correct, ¶3.12, which defines the rank of Assistant Professor, should be clarified accordingly.

11. The Promotion MOU specifies that certain materials may be included in the Supplemental folder. ¶1.32 provides: "Letters of testimony attesting to the quality of the service may be referenced in the document and placed in the supplemental folder." ¶4.112342 provides that additional classroom observations may be included in the Supplemental folder. ¶4.11241 provides that additional student evaluations may be included in the Supplemental Folder. ¶5.22 provides: "Complete documentation (e.g., chapter or book) supporting an individual's request for promotion may be incorporated by reference in the portfolio and included as supplementary documentation in the Supplemental folder." There are no other directions given to candidates for what materials may be included in the supplemental folder. One candidate for promotion to Professor asked whether or not copies of his "grants and papers" should be included in the Supplemental folder. A member of the University Senate Promotion Committee advised him not to include copies of his grants and papers in the supplementary folder, to reference his grants and papers in his application for promotion, and to be prepared to provide copies of his grants and papers if the department or college committee requested them. Information on what materials, in addition to the four references noted above, should be included in the Promotion MOU.
12. Appendix A of the Promotion MOU delineates the materials that should be provided in the promotion packet to document teaching effectiveness, scholarly and creative activity, contribution to the university community, and contribution to the wider and professional community. Contributions to the University community (¶1.3) refers to second, third, fourth and fifth year of service reviews and hence seems to have been incorrectly appropriated from the Recontracting MOU. Contributions to the Wider and Professional Community (¶1.4) also refers to second, third, fourth and fifth year of service reviews and hence seems to have been incorrectly appropriated from the Recontracting MOU).
13. ¶5.24 provides: "All letters soliciting external reviews should contain common language describing Rowan University, the promotion process, and the parameters of the requested evaluation." This language implies that the "common language" exists somewhere, but the University Senate Promotion Committee was unable to locate it. Greater guidance should be provided in the content of the letters soliciting external reviews, e.g., whether to include the institution's, or the college's, or the department's criteria or expectations for faculty research.
14. ¶1.5 provides: "Standards [for promotion] are updated regularly to provide appropriate guidance to faculty. A faculty member applying for promotion must be evaluated based on the approved promotion document in effect when they were last promoted (or hired if they have yet to receive a promotion)." The first quoted sentence implies that the faculty member is judged by the promotion criteria in place at the time of the candidate's application for promotion. The second sentence states the candidate for promotion is judged by the promotion document in place at the time the candidate applies for promotion. Clarifying language should be provided.
15. ¶4.11241 directs the candidate to provide "student evaluations from at least two (2) sections within two (2) academic years of the time of applying for promotion." That directive is contradicted by Appendix A Section 1.13, which says: "student responses . . . collected in at least 50% of the sections taught by the candidate (of the candidate's choice) . . . two academic years preceding the promotion application." This contradiction should be corrected.
16. Item 5 on the Faculty Promotion Checklist requires the submission of "Job Description (from initial job posting)." This is the only mention of the original job description appearing the Promotion MOU. Either the Promotion MOU should be amended to require the original job description or Item 5 should be removed from the Checklist.
17. Two paragraphs of the Promotion MOU address the selection of the external reviewer in applications for Professor:

¶5.24 "For only applicants to the rank of Professor: An external university faculty member or university official will be identified to review the applicant's Scholarly and Creative Activities and accomplishments (only) and to comment in writing on the significance of such accomplishments. Consensus among the

applicant for promotion, the Department Promotion Committee, and the College Dean must be reached on who the external reviewer will be, with the Dean having final approval of the external reviewer

5.341 The Departmental Committee will verify the qualifications and eligibility of three or more proposed external reviewers for Promotion candidates for the rank of Professor, notify the candidate of any individuals who are not acceptable for replacement, and provide the list of vetted candidates (with CVs) to the Dean for selection and approval of the external reviewer.

Both ¶ 5.24 and ¶5.341 reference the external reviewer in the singular, *i.e.*, implying that only one external reviewer is ultimately selected.

Both the Provost, the Dean of the College of Business, and members of the Accounting and Finance Department promotion committee have opined that it would be useful to have more than one external reviewer. Jerry Hough, the former AFT negotiator, has opined that the Promotion MOU limits the candidates for promotion to Professor to one external reviewer. The Promotion MOU should address whether or not the candidate for promotion to professor may obtain evaluations of their research by more than one external reviewer.

Recommendations: None.

Recruitment, Admissions, Retention Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 2

Committee Chair: Doug Cleary

Committee Members: (list here) Doug Cleary, Ashley Lierman, Luann Maslanik, Jessica Syed, Christopher Thomas, Julius Grayson, Kim Wilson, Amanda Cox, Tiffany Fortunato, Karen Brager, Celeste Del Russo, Patrice Henry-Thatcher, Michael Morgan, Cass Sherman, Cindy Finer, Mayra Arroyo, Yasmine Abel, Kyle Perez, Jason Fisch,

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:

The first meeting was organizational and the committee generated questions that could be pursued. Many of the questions were answered during the meeting by committee members.

In the second meeting Soumitra Ghosh was the guest and the following items were discussed.

Soumitra Ghosh, Ph.D. Vice President, Strategic Enrollment Management presented to the committee.

1. Freshman recruitment – we are seeing some challenges with applications down about 150 from the same point last year. This seems to be primarily due to declines in the number of applications from specific schools or zip codes. Dr. Ghosh thinks this is mostly related to the declining student populations at these schools or in these zip codes. There has also been more restriction on access to these schools compared to the past.
2. The number of accepts is stable or ahead of last year and quality of the applicants is stable. Deposits are ahead for now. The goal is 2700 new first year students (2695 was the number we had last year).
3. We are ahead in transfer student applications so far.
4. Financial aid in the form of reduced tuition is still heavily skewed toward first-year admits with little going to transfer students. The way to get more financial support to transfer students (who may have more financial need than the typical first-year admit) is through targeted gifts toward scholarships during fundraising campaigns.
5. When considering the declining high school population and how Rowan University can maintain its undergraduate student population Dr. Ghosh felt improvements in retention would provide more benefit per dollar spent than improvements in recruitment and admissions. It costs much more to recruit a new student than it does to improve the student experience or support students in other ways to keep them on track toward a degree.
6. Recruitment/admission of female students continues to be a trouble spot. We admit approximately a 50:50 split by gender but the split of those that ultimately attend is approximately 40F:60M.

7. There has been some brand confusion w/ RCSJ, RCBC and Rowan University. Bad experiences at one of the RC institutions reflects badly on Rowan University as the general population does not recognize these are separate entities.

Suggestions:

Keep a watch on initiatives to improve retention. These will be critical as high school enrollments drop. Transfer students will also be critical. May also want to look at impact of dropping SAT and ACT for admissions into programs that previously required them. The change is an outcome of Covid-19. The evaluation won't play out immediately.

Chris Thomas has expressed interest in chairing next year.

Recommendations:

Research Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 1 – November 4, 2019

Committee Chair: James Grinias, Chemistry & Biochemistry, CSM

Committee Members:

James Grinias	Faculty- Science/Math
Vahid Rahmani	Faculty - Business
Seoyeon (Celine) Hong	Faculty-Communication/Creative Art
Anna (Qian) Sun	Faculty-Education
Francis Haas	Faculty- Engineering
Michele Pich	Faculty-Humanities/Social Sciences
Davide Ceriani	Faculty - Performing Arts
Zachary Christman	Faculty - Earth and Environment
Erin Pletcher	Faculty - Health Professions
DJ Angelone	Faculty
Sarah Ferguson	Faculty
James Holaska	Faculty
Edward Dedkov	Faculty - CMSRU
Chuck Linderman	Professional Staff
<i>Open Seat</i>	Professional Staff
<i>Open Seat</i>	Professional Staff
Rele Shilpa	Librarian
<i>Open Seat</i>	IRB Representative
<i>Open Seat</i>	IACUC Representative
Gregory Hecht	IBC Representative
Benjamin Saracco	AFT Representative
Jason Fisch	SGA Representative

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:

The research committee activities were based on two key driving factors this year: (1) the suggestions and recommendations from the previous year's committee, and (2) Rowan's move to a "R2: High Research Activity" classification under the guidelines set by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Many of the previous year's recommendations focused on working with the Division of University Research to expand funding and collaboration opportunities for members of the Rowan community. A number of new on-line and in-person workshops were held by the Division to educate members of the community of pursuing research funding. New opportunities related to the Camden Health Research Initiative encouraged collaborative efforts across all three Rowan University campuses as well.

During the committee's major planning meeting in November 2019, a number of key research-related issues that need to be resolved on campus were identified with the move to "R2", including identifying the ultimate goals for both the research and educational cultures of Rowan. Key concerns related to procurement and technology needs for active researchers were expressed by members of colleges across campus. To help resolve some of these issues, the Research Committee Chair and the President of the Senate met with representatives from the Purchasing Office and Information Resources & Technology to better understand their processes and provide suggestions that would make research-related efforts on campus easier to perform. Communication from these offices to research-active faculty members was still identified as a challenge to overcome.

One of the committee's key responsibilities is to coordinate the review of grants to Rowan's SEED internal funding mechanism. Unfortunately, due to issues related to the COVID-19 crisis, no SEED awards will be granted during the 2020 cycle. When funding is reinstated with this program, new methods for reporting the outcomes of funded SEED grants will be developed in collaboration with the Division of University Research.

Members of the committee from the Rowan University Library community pursued additional work related to determining the needs that academic libraries have at major research institutions. Additional meetings were held to identify best practices in the area of open-access publishing. Other members of the committee have also found that new parking policies may be needed for PIs with laboratory research space on multiple campuses to ensure they have access to all sites as needed. Finally, PIs with human subject research identified a need for more activity by Rowan's Institutional Review Board to make sure that delays in protocol review for grant-funded research are avoided.

Suggestions:

1. Improvements should be made to communicate procurement and IRT policy changes directly to Rowan University PIs that are affected by these changes.
2. Explore potential parking policies that ensure spaces for faculty members with research space on multiple campuses.
3. Work with the Division of University Research to find ways to better streamline the IRB approval process.

Recommendations:

1. Determine communication methods for research-related policy changes beyond the Rowan Daily Mail. Utilize the identified methods to directly communicate with PIs.

Rowan Core Committee 19-20

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 3

Committee Chair: Nathan Bauer

Committee Members: (list here)

Rudin, Joel	Daniels, Benjamin	Kennedy, Samantha
Fillenwarth, Gracemarie	Keenan, Kevin	Turley, Cheryl
Accardo, Amy	Hill, Jane	Larsen-Britt, Christine
Hernandez, Maria	Dickerson, Catharine	Fischetti, Jessica
Hostetter, Tony		

Purpose of / Charge to Committee:

The Rowan Core Committee has the following responsibilities:

- 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. (The Rowan Core Committee is responsible for reviewing the proposal to add a Rowan Core literacy; all other aspects of the course are reviewed by the Curriculum Committee.)
- Revoking courses from Rowan Core if departments fail to do the approved student assessment.
- Developing and approving changes to Rowan Core policy. Significant changes will need full Senate approval.
- Reviewing alignments of non-Rowan Core courses with Rowan Core literacy outcomes.
- Revising existing Rowan Core learning outcomes (or adding new ones) as needed.

Summary of Activities this Year:

The Rowan Core Committee had a busy year. It continued its ongoing work of reviewing proposals to add courses to Rowan Core – and to revise existing Rowan Core courses. We also met to review and revise Rowan Core policy. The two most substantial policy changes were the following:

- Approval of a complete rewrite of the Rowan Core learning outcomes for each literacy.
- Creation of a new Rowan Core transfer credit policy (to be voted on by the Senate on April 24)

In addition, our committee also forms the core (so to speak) of the broader Task Force on the Future of the WI and LIT Requirements. This task force prepared a draft of a full proposal for these requirements, which we discussed at our most recent meeting. Based on this feedback, we will be preparing a final draft which we hope to bring to the Senate in Fall 2020.

SUGGESTIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

This is the final end-of-year report for the Rowan Core Committee. Starting in Fall 2020, we will be merging with the Learning Outcomes and Assessment Committee to form the new Learning Assessment and Rowan Core (LARC) Committee. As the final Rowan Core Chair, I offer the following recommendations to the new committee.

- As the new committee name suggests, there will be a shift in focus to broader issues related to assessment, beyond those specific to Rowan Core. I recommend that the LARC Committee continue working closely with

Jeff Bonfield, the Director of Assessment, to employ the Rowan Core assessment structure for WI, LIT and program assessment.

- I recommend that the new LARC Committee include Jeff Bonfield—and possibly a staff member from the Registrar's Office—as non-voting members.
- With the approval of the Senate, I (Nathan Bauer) hope to be the inaugural chair of the new LARC Committee. However, I am approved for sabbatical in Spring 2021, and it is my intention to step down from this position at that time. We are currently seeking nominations for the position of LARC Chair, starting Spring 2021. It's a great opportunity to shape the direction of general education at Rowan. If you are interested in the position, please contact Nathan Bauer (bauer@rowan.edu) to learn more about it.

Sabbatical Committee, 2019-2020

Number of meetings held this year: 10 meetings

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

CSM Committee Members:

Gustavo Moura-Letts Chair, Faculty-CSM
Olcay Fatma Ilicasu Faculty-CSM
Philip R. Laporta Faculty or Librarian
Brianna W. Morettini - Faculty or Librarian
Andrea P. Baer - Librarian
Joseph F. Stanzione - Faculty-Engineering

Leslie A. Elkins Faculty-Performing Arts
Joseph D. Johnson Faculty-Creative Arts
Kathryn M. Luet - Faculty or Librarian
Manuel Pontes Faculty-College of Business
Carol C. Thompson Faculty-Education
Christine Davidian - Librarian-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 10 times on 10/24/19, 10/28/19, 11/7/19, 11/11/19, 11/14/19, 11/18/19, 11/21/19, 11/25/19, 12/2/19 and 12/6/19.

50 Semesters of sabbatical leave were requested by 33 applicants.

The senate committee recommended 32 applicants for sabbatical and following is the college breakdown of sabbatical leave recommendations by the senate committee:

COB (6), CCCA(6), COEd(3), COEng(2), CHSS (5), CSM(8), CPA(1), (LIS (1)

After the review at the provost office level, 22 out of 33 applicants were recommended for sabbatical leave (34 semesters of sabbatical leave). The college breakdown of sabbatical leave final recommendations by the Provost office is the following:

COB (3), CCCA(5), COEd(1), COEng(2), CHSS (5), CSM(5)*, (LIS (1)

*One recommendation is contingent.

All the applicants were notified by the provost office in writing by 02/28/2020.

Suggestions:

It is becoming more and more challenging to schedule the committee meetings due to the diverse members' schedules and increased volume of applications. The committee would like to suggest a more detailed drafting process to allow for the selection of members that have schedules suitable for the demands of the committee.

Recommendations:

As the number of awards and applications continues to increase, the committee would like to recommend the scheduling of sabbatical leave workshops (one in the spring and one in the summer) that allow the potential applicants to fully grasp the requirements for a successful proposal. As the sabbatical proposal merit review process continues to evolve, the committee also recommends that each department's sabbatical leave committee chairs are also invited to attend these workshops, thus allowing their review process to fully align with the senate review.

Student Relations Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 6

Committee Chair: Jennifer Savage

Committee Members:

Arielle Gedeon,
SGA President

Kevin McCarthy,
SGA Government Relations

Ayala Gedeon, SGA Secretary

Shan An, Cataloging Librarian, Campbell Library

Jenna Day, SGA Advancement

Karen Brager, Lecturer, Communication Studies,
Ric Edelman College of Communication
& Creative Arts

Jason Brooks, SGA Student Affairs

Christina Davidson-Tucci, Advisor, College of
Science and Math

Melanie Alverio, Assistant Director,
Marketing, Member Service &
Business Operations, Campus Recreation

Jeanine Dowd, Advisor, School of
Health Professions

Valerie Carabetta, Assistant Professor,
Dept. Biomedical Sciences, CMSRU

Daniel Drutz, Events & Public Relations Coordinator
Offices of the Dean, Henry M. Rowan College of Engineering

Alison Novak, Assistant Professor,
Dept. of Public Relations & Advertising,
Ric Edelman, College of Communication
& Creative Arts

Mildred Rodriguez, Assistant Director,
Financial Aid & Special Programs

Daniel Kipnis, Life Sciences Librarian,
Campbell Library

Henry Jimenez, Supervisor, Print Center

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

Summary of Activities this Year:

During our first meetings, we identified the following areas to concentrate on:

- Affordability Task Force (ATF) Collaboration
 - Alison Novak is on our committee plus the Affordability Task Force and we discussed ways to collaborate with that group.
 - We were given the list of ATF events and we were asked to promote within our departments and several of us attended a few
- Election Day
 - We discussed recommending no school on Election Day to promote voting.
- Food Insecurity
 - This was identified as a major issue and we learned how SGA is working with the University to promote Gourmet Dining's swipe donations.

- Wellness Center
 - We discussed the concerns of the Wellness Center having a bad reputation for wait lists/no access and how we could help to support and promote them
 - Discussed difficulty in communicating deaths/tragedies
 - We talked about collaborating with programs at CMSRU for suicide awareness programs and mental health check-ins.
- Student Wellness/Suicide
 - As the semester progressed, the tragic suicides on campus became the main focus of our group. We made the following Recommendations to the Senate President to submit to the newly organized Campus Wellness Task Force:

Recommendations to the Rowan University Senate from the Student Relations Committee

One of the most critical areas that we see as needing improvement is communication.

- Email is not the mode of communication most students engage in; but it is the #1 mode the University uses to communicate important information.
- Students are not getting accurate information about existing resources, and therefore their knowledge about these resources is limited.
- There is a need for a communication liaison.
- We believe there are five individuals who work in the media relations office, but many departments have internal communications officers. That ratio is low for a University of this size.
- **Recommendation: All divisions have an established communication contact for external media relations, and an established communication director for internal communications. These contacts should be clearly articulated in one place on the Rowan University website.**
- **Recommendation: Need more proactive social media communication/liaison**

There have been concerns raised at the Town Hall Meeting and our last committee meeting regarding warning flags.

- If a student has been absent x amount of times, the university is notified to check on them; however, not all professors take attendance.
- Starfish is configured to alert the system of a problem only after three flags have been raised.
- **Recommendation: Ensure attendance policies are up-to-date and enforced.**
- **Recommendation: Investigate if Starfish can be reconfigured (either the amount of flags or prioritize flags for emergent issues).**

The Wellness Center physical space is limited.

- **Recommendation: The Wellness Center space needs to be expanded, improved upon, starting with converting back the classroom space in Winans Hall to the Wellness Center.**

Another major area of concern is that parents/families are not being adequately informed and communicated with.

- We do not believe there is a direct parent email to receive the Daily Announcers with this important information. Are students forwarding such information or discussing it with them? Or, are they getting information (often times rumors) from social media?
- There are two Facebook groups (one in correlation with University, one private),
- We know there are FERPA regulations; but there needs to be a better communication channel with families.

- **Recommendation: Involve the Rowan University Family Group to improve the communication with families.**

There is an urgent need for training for the entire Rowan community.

- We know that the Deans are sending communications to their faculty and some are providing on-site training, but there does not seem to be an organized, standardized University-wide initiative.
- Professional staff/non-academic departments should be included in this initiative, in addition to faculty.
- We researched how some other Universities handle this training.
 - University of California: <https://www.ucop.edu/student-mental-health-resources/suicide-prevention/certified-training.html>
 - Prevention programs, evidenced-based training and awareness campaigns
 - Rutgers University: <https://afsp.org/our-work/advocacy/public-policy-priorities/suicide-prevention-university-college-campuses/>
 - Awareness, prevention and postvention
 - In person, online and social media resources, The AFSP-produced film *It's Real: College Students and Mental Health* (an 18-minute documentary designed to raise awareness about mental health issues commonly experienced by college students)
- **Recommendation: Develop robust training/awareness initiative for faculty, administration and staff.**
- **Recommendation: Need more than one forum (face-to-face, online)**
- **Recommendation: Include this as Professional Development for tenure/recontracting**
- **Recommendation: Create a comprehensive website with all mental health resources in one place**

Of additional concern is that multiple students have reported to SGA Advancement difficulties in finding resources on/reporting sexual assault on Rowan University campuses.

- **Recommendation: Reach out to the Office of Student Equity & Compliance (OSEC) to ensure that students are made aware of their website, which does include extensive resources, as well as the correct procedures to follow in identifying and reporting of sexual assault on campus.**

Suggestions:

- Due to the unprecedented transformation to online instruction/business practices for the end of Spring 2020 semester, we suggest that our group be contacted with any information that has come up in the Task Force meetings in regards to our recommendations plus the additional stresses being encountered with the COVID-19 outbreak and the transition to online learning.

Recommendations:

- Moving forward, we recommend that this committee continue to build strong collaborative relationships with various task forces within the Rowan Community, including the Affordability Task Force and the Campus Wellness Task Force. Important work is being done within these groups and we want to be able to support the work being done, as well as communicate it to our larger community.

Technological Resources Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 2 in-person meetings + online collaboration via email, phone, and GoogleDocs.

Committee Chair: Kimberly Poolos

Committee Members:

Gerald Hough
Nadia Rahin
Xiufang Chen
Mohammad Jalayer
Amanda Almon
Christine Davidian
Lori Ann Getler,
Arthur McKenzie
Eileen Stutzbach
Christopher Winkler
Rachl King
Yasmine Abed

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

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

Summary of Activities this Year:

The Technological Resources Committee met two times in person during the Fall 2019 semester. During the in-person committee meetings, previous reports were reviewed, and multiple issues and areas of concern were discussed. The Technological Resources Committee narrowed down our focus to three major areas of concern. The larger committee broke up into three subcommittees and worked virtually in the Spring 2020 semester. The three subcommittees comprised the three major areas of concern, which are listed below.

THREE AREAS OF CONCERN

1. Online Course Development
2. Online/virtual forms
3. Website Updates

Suggestions:

A. Online Course Development

- The University Senate should be involved with the transition of all online courses and materials to Canvas.
- Content should be managed by faculty and the faculty should be involved in the transition.

B. Online/Virtual Forms

- Many important forms for students, faculty, and staff still require multiple, physical signatures. These forms are cumbersome and especially cause stress for students needing multiple signatures from people across campus. Additionally, physical forms may become lost or damaged.
- Some forms that were identified by the committee are: Change of Major Forms, Travel Forms, Registrar Forms (Late Add/Drop, Withdrawal, Late Withdrawal).

C. Website Updates

- The committee identified a need for a formal process for updating website.
- This requires an identification of a “chain of command” and clear steps for who to contact and how to get permission to update website.
- Additionally, who to contact when incorrect information is found.

Recommendations:

A. Online Course Development

- The committee is concerned that there is not a lot of academic oversight into any of the decision making for online courses. The committee recommends that someone from Academic Affairs should be involved in the process/ for academic input.

B. Online/Virtual Forms

- The need to develop accessible, virtual forms has been highlighted even more with the COVID-19 Pandemic forcing students, faculty, and staff to work from home.
- The committee recommends working with the Office of the Registrar to transition all registration-adjustment forms to virtual.

C. Website Updates

- The committee recommends IRT identifies a clear “chain of command” for all University webpages so that information can be quickly updated.

Tenure and Recontracting Committee 19-20

Number of meetings held this year: 34

Committee Chair: Kevin Dahm

Committee Members:

JoAnne Bullard	Russell Buono	Cam Casper	Jennifer Courtney
Heather Dolbow	Tom Fusco	Laurie Haines	Anthony Hostetter
Cristina Iftode	Ane Johnson	Bob Krchnavek	Valarie Lee
Phyllis Meredith	Kim Poolos	Tim Vaden	Joy Wiltenburg
Mei Zhang	Faye Robinson (AFT Rep)		

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Review applicants for Tenure and Recontracting, make recommendations, and provide detailed feedback.

Summary of Activities this Year:

Reviewed over 100 applicants for Tenure and Recontracting.

Suggestions:

Recommendations:

Consider adding an Assistant Chair position, as the number of candidates has increased dramatically in recent years while reassigned time for the Chair has remained unchanged at 6 s.h.

University Committee Reports

Awards Committee – 19-20

Number of meetings held this year:

One in-person meeting was held

Committee Chair:

Stephen A. Royek

Committee Members:

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 just-completed 2019-2020 academic year for the Faculty Senate Awards Committee was strangely like the 2018-2019 year in the chaotic way the term ended. Last year it was due to an unforeseen technical issue with Google; this year it was an unforeseen health issue with COVID-19.

As you can read in last year's Annual Report, we worked our way through the computer problem to make our selections. This year, the selection process went well, but the announcement of the winners was postponed until early May and the distribution of the Rowan Medallions still (as of this writing) has not been completed.

First, though, let's go back to the beginning of this term, back to the fall semester.

With the same committee members as last year, we held our organizational meeting on Friday, November 8. We discussed the updated nomination selection process we would employ for the coming year, using new Google Docs forms to which all committee members would have access. We also discussed ways we would get the word out about the call for nominations, and decided we would, to start, use the same distribution channels we used in the previous year.

We also chose a submission deadline for nominations, based on the schedules and obligations of our members. We settled on Friday, February 20 at 4:30 p.m.

I then volunteered to update the 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 decided to once again this year publicize the nomination process by sending a letter to all department chairs on campus encouraging them to share the reminder with their faculty members and staff. As recommended in last year's annual report, we sent out two of these reminders, one in early December and another in late January, about three weeks before the nomination submission deadline.

- At this meeting, committee member Kelly Young volunteered to create a digital graphic touting the nomination submission process that would run on video boards in common areas across the campus as part of ProfLink. This, we believe, helped boost the number of entries we received, which was a total of 28 across the three categories.

Unlike last year, this process went quite smoothly and we were able to select our winners by early March, in more than enough time for the Medallions to be struck for the mid-April awards ceremony at which they would be announced and awarded.

At this point, as we all know, the COVID-19 crisis closed the campus and cancelled the awards ceremony.

All of our efforts then were focused on the shift from in-person to remote instruction during the two-week-long spring break period as we prepared for classes to begin again on Google Meet and other online programs on Monday, March 30. During this period, there were discussions via email of the possibility of holding an online awards ceremony for the Medallion recipients and of creating a video presentation that could be posted online and sent to the winners in place of an actual in-person event.

These two options were ruled out just about as the semester was ending in late April and a decision was made to announce the winners through the Rowan Daily Mail/Rowan Announcer and to leave it to the department chairs overseeing the course of study in which the graduating seniors received their degrees. This announcement was scheduled to begin appearing in early May.

I also want to thank committee member Natalie Schell-Busey for her help in collecting the information for, and – in concert with the Registrar's Office – selecting the winner of the Lawson Brown Academic Award. This honor is awarded to the graduating senior with the highest grade point average, with the number of credit hours taken at Rowan University as a tiebreaker if necessary.

2019-2020 Committee Suggestions & Recommendations

- Our committee is functioning very well and all members would like to continue serving, This will, as it did this past year, add 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.

- In addition to using Rowan Announcer, we increased our marketing efforts through a series of Rowan News Minute and Campus Calendar items on WGLS. For the second year in a row, however, we were unable to secure publicity through *The Whit*. For the 2020-2021 academic year, we feel we need to at some point in the fall, reach out to the editors of the student newspaper in a more forceful manner to see what we need to do to publicize these awards in their pages.

- We will continue to send out two notices to the deans and department chair, in the same time frame we used this year.

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

International Education Council 2019-2020

Number of meetings held this year: 4

Committee Chairs: Sharon An, Yupeng Li (Co-Chair)

Committee Members:

Sharon An	Yupeng Li	Yong Chen
Ping Lu	Ben Wu	Ning Wang
Kul Kapri	Stuti Jha	Bo Sun
Thanh Trung Nguyen	Heng Yi Chu	Xia Liu
Huang-Tang Lu	Hajime Mitani	Yuhui Li

Purpose of/Charge to Committee:

Improves 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 academic year. Due to the COV19 outbreak, the last meeting was held online through Webex. The meetings were designed for the committee members to discuss the current practices and policies and resources at Rowan University for promoting the international related education including the recruiting, enrollment and engagement for the international students. The committee discussed some barriers in promoting internationalization at Rowan and possible strategies that could be implemented to resolve those issues.

The council reached out to the stakeholders related to international education across the university and was able to invite representatives and leaders from the International Center, International admission, and International Studies program for discussions and presentations. Dr. Duke-Bryant from the International Studies program attended the IEC meeting and gave presentations on the current status and trend of the program. The International Studies program has been growing very fast, and has a lot of exciting developments in the past year. The committee was also pleased to know there are some financial supports that could help some students to participate in the study abroad program as promoted by the International Studies program and the International Center. Lauren Pollara, the International Admission specialist and

Ghina Mahmoud, the associate director of the International Center also joined one of the committee meetings, and they provided valuable information on the current data statistics of Rowan University's international students. The number of F-1 students, including OPT, is now totaling 276, which demonstrates a big jump compared with the past years. Most of the students are from India, in total 77 students, both undergraduate and graduate students. Then the students from China and Saudi Arabia are 21 and 19 respectively. There are students from 39 other countries or regions, including Nigeria (11), Pakistan (9), Iran (9), Tunisia (8), etc. The International Education Council strongly supports these programs as they really help to promote internationalization and bring in diversity at Rowan University.

The council also discussed with the leaders from the International Center and the International Admission about the current barriers and challenges in recruiting and admission, and helped to figure out strategies on how to make the recruitment process more competitive and attractive to international students. The International Education Council fully supports all the efforts to make Rowan University one of the best universities in the country for the international students.

Suggestions:

The number of international students has increased dramatically compared to the previous years, and this demonstrates a steady upward trend for enrollment in the past years. The council members are very impressed by this achievement. Meanwhile, in spite of the efforts and the promising data, the percentage of international students at Rowan is still relatively low compared to the other comparable universities. Therefore, the committee hopes that more resources can be devoted to help recruit international students in the future. It is also suggested that some of our Asian faculty members have connections with universities in their home countries, and this could be good resources for recruiting purposes. In the meantime, some more special programs or services for international students need to be established or promoted further, so that our enrolled international students could adapt well into the Rowan community. The numbers of the events and the programs offered to the international students and the visibility of these events should be increased along with our increased numbers of international students. This is very important for retention of the existing international students.

Recommendations:

Considering the current COV-19 pandemic situation, the council members would like to make the followings recommendation:

- (i) Provide online education programs to allow international students to study online from abroad. International students could have options: study online for two years and then come to Rowan University to study on site for another two years to complete some degree programs. They could also study online only for the whole degree programs. These programs may not have any restricted location requirement, and such options could open doors to international students who wish to come yet are blocked by the travel bans or discouraged by the pandemic concern. In the meantime, it can help the university to keep generating some revenue when international traveling is impeded by the epidemic.
- (ii) Look into the situation of our current international students, to find out what help and support they need during this pandemic period. Develop new strategies to support them during this trying time.

Under normal situation, when the concern of COV19 is alleviated, the IEC would like to recommend the following:

- (i) In coordination with the International Center, explore the development of resources, organize and promote more internationally-focused events, clubs, programs for the international students. The council members believe that it is critically important to offer special support to the existing international students in order to retain them and attract more international students to Rowan University from their home countries in the future. Rowan University has a tradition to hold foreign cultural week or cultural month to get together student groups and promote diversity. The council members recommend an International Cultural Day convention, as a once-in-a-year event, which will allow the international students to join for sharing their cultures, such as food fair, gift exchange, etc. This would be helpful for international students to adapt to the community, and promote communication between the international students and the domestic students.
- (ii) Launch a faculty guided mentoring program for the international students since Rowan has a large proportion of international based faculty.
 - a) Field a faculty survey, regarding the faculty involvement of the mentor program. This could include the perception of support offered by the faculty members, interest of faculty members across different programs to support students via mentor programs, and possible suggestions that faculty members may have.
 - b) The International Center could send out the list of contacts for the available faculty members who are willing to join the mentor program and allow students to register for the program. The one-on-one mentoring program could have a large impact on student incentives in adapting to the Rowan community academically and socially, and also could help to promote the university worldwide through the wonderful international student services.

Medallion Awards Committee 2019-20

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

Committee Co-Coordinators: 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 2019-2020, 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 -- depending on the Coronavirus social distancing initiative -- will eventually deliver 93 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. As we are facing challenges due to the ongoing Covid-19 crisis, we would like to thank Joanne Connor, Bill Friend, Sara Freeman, Dianne DiGennaro and Kevin Koett for their support in this year's project implementation.*

Summary of Activities this Year:

First, we would like to note, while writing this summary, the below mentioned activities were still ongoing in this volatile environment.

- We began to communicate with our points of contacts at colleges and departments in November 2019 to ensure a smooth and efficient process. We communicated to them the deadline of March 2, 2020, to make sure every department had enough 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 20, 2020.
- As the university remains closed and all related events including graduation have been cancelled, we have sent an email to all contacts in the colleges asking them to have access to their winners' addresses, should they have to mail them in a timely manner.
- We are in contact with the jeweler whose store remains closed until the State of New Jersey allows businesses to open. He continues to work on engraving the Medallions.
- The process remains fluid. We can begin the pickup and delivery process once the University opens again.

Esther Mas and Asi Nia-Schoenstein (April 14, 2020)

University Scholarship Committee 19-20

Number of Meetings Held this Year: 4

Committee Chair: Jennifer A. Espinosa

Committee Members:

Melanie Alverio	Nadia Rahin	
Normal Beil	Jeremy Russell	
Ruben Britt		
Aimee Burgin		
Christina Davidson-Tucci		
DeLithea Davis		
Heather Dolbow		
Bethany Gummo		

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:

- Some committee members never received formal notification from the Senate they were serving on the committee. The Financial Aid Office was slow to respond throughout the academic year, often missing important deadlines for the committee's timeline.
- November 2018: USC members voted through email to elect the committee chair due to the Financial Aid's office refusal to offer members training on Scholarship Universe until a chair had been selected.
- December 5th, 2019: The USC met for the first time and discussed the criteria used to evaluate student applications. Committee members were supposed to receive training in Scholarship Universe during this meeting, but Financial Aid could not attend to offer training. We collaborated on solutions to improve our grading criteria for the upcoming scholarship applications we would review.

- January 31st, 2020: USC members met with the chair for training on how to review applications in Scholarship Universe. No representative from the Financial Aid Office attended this meeting.
- February 2020 – March 2020: 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. We only reviewed 9 total scholarships during this period. According to the Financial Aid Office, many scholarships from last year were no longer being funded and several scholarships had no applicants.
- March 25th, 2020: USC members met to evaluate the applicants for each scholarship, and selected the recipients. The committee evaluated 9 scholarships (down from 91 in the 2018-19 academic year) and selected recipients for each scholarship.
- April 4th, 2020: After repeated inquiries from the chair, the Financial Aid office identified 29 additional scholarships for the USC to review. No information or communication was sent to the committee. Instead members only received notifications from Scholarship Universe.
- April 6th, 2020: The chair reached out to the Financial Aid office for clarification on the emails from April 4th, and was informed these were additional scholarships the USC should review.
- April 6th – April 21st, 2020: USC members reviewed the additional scholarship applications, despite the Financial Aid office repeatedly ignoring our pre-planned schedule and enquires in March about missing scholarships.
- April 22nd, 2020: USC members attempted to meet to evaluate the applicants for the 29 new scholarships, but the chair did not have access to the correct pools to complete this process. Instead we only had access to the pools in Scholarship Universe for the 9 previously decided scholarships and a list of 18 other scholarships, several of which were for incoming freshman or already decided by other entities. We were able to award 3 of those 18 scholarships.
- April 24th – April 29th, 2020: USC members reviewed the 29 new scholarships and selected recipients for them remotely. Four scholarships did not have applicants, and one scholarship did not have any applicants meeting the donor's criteria (these scholarships are crossed off in the following list).

Scholarships Reviewed & Awarded:

1. AAA South Jersey
2. AFT - MLK Scholarship
3. AFT Retirees (FORCE)
4. AFT Retirees Scholarship (FORCE) Camden Campus student
5. Alumni Scholarship (2 Awards)
6. Amelia & Peter Kressler Scholarship
7. Charles Showers Memorial
8. Clifford V & Jane Gullet
9. Darlene S Nardine
10. Denofio Scholarship
11. Doris V Broome (5 Awards)
12. Dr. Bruce Caswell Scholars
13. Dr. Melvin Kramer Scholarship (2 Awards)

- ~~14. Edward and Stella Michals Memorial Scholarship~~
15. Elizabeth Callaghan and Mary Manion Memorial Scholarship
16. Fasulo Family Scholarship in Business
17. Foundation Continuing Student Scholarship
- ~~18. Governor's Scholarship~~
19. HV and Florence P. Lewis Scholarship
20. James & Agnes Shornock Scholarship
21. James John Shornock Jr Scholarship
- ~~22. James John Shornock Sr Scholarship~~
- ~~23. John Sooy Math Education Award~~
24. Lawrence Ward Bromall Memorial Endowed Scholarship
25. Mabel Spencer Warner Scholarship
26. Marie Ann Gemmell (continuing) Memorial Scholarship
- ~~27. Marion Fulginiti-Draceni Memorial Scholarship~~
28. Matt Hoffman Courage Scholarship
29. Matteo Family Scholarship (2 Awards)
30. Meda "Sandy" Maxwell Education Scholarship (2 Awards)
31. N. Jeanne Hartman Art Scholarship
32. Nicholas Yovnello Scholarship
33. Paul A Hilton Memorial Scholarship
34. Pauline Boykin Endowed Scholarship
35. Peter and Susan Hibbard Scholarship
36. Piazza Stubbs Family Scholarship
37. Robert A. Harris Memorial Scholarship (2 Awards)
38. Robert Collard Memorial Scholarship (2 Awards)
39. South Jersey Gas Scholarship (2 Awards)
40. Stanley and Betty Jane LaBruna Education Scholarship
41. Trymaine Lee Diversity in Media Scholarship

REVISITING PROGRESS ON THE COMMITTEE'S 2018-2019 RECOMMENDATIONS& SUGESSTIONS

2018-2019 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. **This feature is available in Scholarship Universe.**
 - 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.

- ii. **Instead of listening to the committee's requests regarding the essay, the general application limited student's essays to 500 characters. No upload link was provided on the general application for students to provide more information. This was a severe limitation on the committee this year, as we were very restricted in how we could evaluate student essays. The Financial Aid Office has indicated we will meet in July to improve this component of the student application.**
- 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.
No progress made on this.
 - i. 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. **This issue became worse this cycle, because Scholarship Universe contains generic lists of activities that are not matched to the activities and clubs offered at Rowan University. Several clubs and activities offered at Rowan did not appear in the lists, and several clubs and activities not offered at Rowan were available for students to select. The Financial Aid Office has indicated we will meet in July to improve this component of the student application.**
- d. 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. **No progress made on this.**
- e. The software system should separate dependent applicants out completely or clearly identify them to assist the USC during deliberations. **As far as we could tell, Scholarship Universe does do this.**
- f. The software system should auto-populate fields of information from the student application relevant to each specific scholarship. **During our first round of reviewing and scoring applications, the USC asked for additional fields to be added to our reviewing pane that appeared in the Scholarship Universe. These requests were ignored and no changes made.**
- g. 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. **No progress made on this.**
- h. 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. **Scholarship Universe appears to take care of this.**

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. **The Financial Aid Office refused to provide a list of changed scholarships, or provide a list of all of the scholarships the USC needed to review this year.**

2018-2019 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. **We were able to return several committee members this academic year, which has been extremely beneficial to the committee.**
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. **We were able to retain several members from the College of Education this academic year.**
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. **The Financial Aid Office completely ignored the schedule of the USC in regards to when applications closed. Further, the only way the chair was able to find out that application cycles had changed was through notifications from Scholarship Universe or through multiple emails to the Financial Aid Office for further clarification. The Financial Aid Office ended up changing the deadline for application submissions 5 times. The original deadline of January 23rd was pushed back to February 2nd, then February 14th, then February 28th, then March 15th, and finally to April 3rd.**

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 **No progress appears to have been made on communicating information to students about available scholarships, considering the application deadline was pushed back 5 times due to a lack of applicants for many scholarships.**
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. **The Financial Aid Office refused to provide this information when requested.**
 - 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. **The Financial Aid Office did give the USC the opportunity to select recipients for the 29 scholarships first (which was an extra cycle for the USC).**
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. **The USC was not consulted or included at all in the development of the application for this scholarship cycle, despite repeated requests to review the application before it went live with students.**

2019-2020 Committee Recommendations:

1. In the next scholarship cycle, communication and cooperation from the Financial Aid Office needs to be improved significantly. USC committee members routinely felt ignored and that the Financial Aid Office did not care about the work they put in to review student applications and award scholarships. After intervention from the University Senate, the Financial Aid Office has indicated they are willing to meet with available committee members and/or the chair of the USC in July to review the student scholarship application and look for changes that need to be made to Scholarship Universe.
2. A representative from the Financial Aid Office should attend USC committee meetings. No representative from Financial Aid attended any of the committee meetings this cycle.

3. The Financial Aid Office should be considerate of the USC committee's established schedule and processes. The USC has an established scoring rubric used to evaluate applicants for all scholarships. The Financial Aid Office made the decision to allow Scholarship Universe to auto select students who are eligible for some scholarships, and then asked the USC to make final decisions on these scholarships. This was extremely difficult to do, since the USC tries to evaluate the overall strengths and weaknesses of a candidate's full application, but in many cases students never completed an application due to "smart matching" in the system.
 - a. The USC follows a similar schedule every cycle. Meetings in the fall semester focus on reviewing scoring rubrics and updating them. The committee reviews student applications between January-March, and makes scholarship decisions in late March or early April. This schedule has worked very well for committee members in the past, and helps members know how to allot their time in the spring so that each student's application can be fully and fairly evaluated. The multiple extensions and lack of communication from the Financial Aid Office in the 2019-2020 cycle has impeded the committee's ability to do this.
4. The USC would like to review the application students will complete prior to the start of the application cycle for the 2020-21 continuing scholarships. There were several issues that need to be corrected in the application, particularly:
 - a. Giving students enough space to write a 300-500 word essay in the application. If that is not possible, then all students should be given the ability to upload a word document containing their essay.
 - b. Matching the lists of activities, clubs, sports, etc. to better match the offerings at Rowan University.
 - c. Adding a question to find out if students are involved in Rowan Athletics.
 - d. The Financial Aid Office has indicated we will meet in July to improve the student application.
5. The USC continues to ask for modifications to the reviewing pane in Scholarship Universe, so that the activities, clubs, sports, etc. that students select will show to reviewers while we evaluate applications.
6. The USC continues to request a report of any changes made to the recipient of scholarships selected by the committee, and the ability to submit a runner-up selection for the scholarship if the original recipient is ineligible to receive the scholarship for some reason.
7. It is recommended that as many committee members who are willing and able, be returned to the USC for the upcoming cycle, considering committee work for next cycle will start in July with reviewing the Scholarship Universe application and setup.