Present: (Professors) Aroian, Aslam, Bansil, Cokely, Daynard, Fitzgerald, Fountain, Fox, Gaffney, Herman, Katula, Lee, Lefkovitz, Muftu, Nelson, Ondrechen, Peterfreund, Poriss, Sherman, Stepanyants, Strauss, Zgarrick

(Administrators) Costa, Courtney, Director, Gibson, Loeffelholz, Poiger, Ronkin


The Senate was convened at 11:48 AM

I. The minutes of 10 April were approved as amended.

II. Professor Daynard reported that next week’s agenda will not be long and that lunch will be available.

SAC met once in regular session since the last Senate meeting.

Faculty senators who are continuing on the 2013-2014 Senate should arrive at 10:00 AM next Wednesday to elect the Senate Agenda Committee for next year. The last meeting of the 2012-2013 Senate begins at 11:00 AM next week.

The BS in Architectural Studies scheduled on today's agenda is postponed to next week’s agenda, 24 April.

The Faculty Senate observed a minute of silence for the victims of Monday’s Boston Marathon bombing.

III. Professor Herman read the following and it was seconded.

**BE IT RESOLVED That the University establish the MA in Homeland Security in the College of Professional Studies as approved by the Graduate Council on 13 March 2013. (6-0-0)**

Dean LaBrie was recognized and reported that the proposal serves a sector not yet served and is aligned with the University’s three foci of research. The market consists of those interested in the operational side of homeland security in preparing for and mitigating disasters and emergencies. A partnership with Naval Postgraduate School has been established.

Professor Daynard proposed that the current title is misleading and suggested that a Master of Homeland Security is more representative of the degree. Dean LaBrie noted that there is no degree offered with that designation and that the Naval Postgraduate School has designated their own program a Master of Arts.
Professor Muftu questioned the curriculum and Dean LaBrie reported that it is being developed with the Naval Postgraduate School with specializations in both the public and private sector. Kostas Institute Co-Director Flynn added that the Naval Postgraduate School had been tasked to develop a curriculum following 9/11 and had made it openly available.

Professor Ondrechen noted that page two lists faculty, some of whom were simply told that the program was being developed but were not involved beyond that. Dean LaBrie responded that the intent was not to create a list of endorsers but list of faculty who were informed of the proposal.

Professor Gaffney asked for projected enrollments and questioned whether Criminal Justice was consulted. Dean LaBrie responded that Dean Britt had been consulted and that twenty to thirty students on an annual basis were expected but the full scope of enrollments is not known at this time. Professor Fox added that the MS in Criminal Justice had offered a similar component but had experienced difficulty staffing it at the time [20+ years ago] and so it was discontinued. The subject has become much more relevant.

Professor Fitzgerald noted the importance of the program remaining a Master of Arts to recognize the distinction between it and the MS in Security and Resilience Studies approved last week as well as to maintain academic integrity. Professor Daynard was persuaded.

**VOTE to establish the Masters of Arts in Homeland Security: PASSED, 27-0-0.**

IV. The following Academic Policy Committee recommendations were considered in seriatim.

Professor Zgarrick read the following and it was seconded:

*Academic Policy Committee (APC) Resolution #1*

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate support in principle the plan of the Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution (OSCCR) to implement a new sanction structure ranging from probation to expulsion for any violation of the Academic Integrity (AI) policy. Typical sanctions will include probation for a first offense, deferred suspension for a second offense, and expulsion for a third offense. OSCR will be given discretion in assigning a sanction according to severity of the current incident and the student’s prior conduct history. Three violations of the AI policy will result in expulsion.

Professor Rickles, chair of APC, was recognized and acknowledged the Committee members. The Committee worked with students and with the Office of Student Conduct and Conflict Resolution (OSCCR) as well as reviewed the policies of peer institutions.

Professor Strauss spoke in support of the recommendation as faculty members have been reluctant to make use of OSCCR due to the harshness of current policies. The proposal offers a less harsh alternative.

In response to Professor Cokely’s question, Professor Herman explained that OSCCR determines whether a suspension should be immediate or not and could defer it based on time of year or other circumstances and probation puts the student on notice. Professor Herman noted that faculty have expressed concern with the severity of the current
procedure and have avoided reporting incidents which create the problem of every offence being a first offence as no records were kept by OSCCR. Students have become more serious about the matter of academic integrity as well.

The current policy has only two steps: deferred suspension and then expulsion.

**VOTE to accept APC resolution #1: PASSED, 27-0-0.**

Professor Zgarrick read the following and it was seconded.

**APC Resolution #2**

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate support in principle OSCCR’s request to have the discretion to decide, in consultation with the faculty member, whether an alleged violation requires review by the Student Conduct Board. Cases not referred to the Student Conduct Board will be retained on file by OSCCR.

Professor Peterfreund suggested that the second resolution is implicitly contradictory to the first resolution unless it spells out filing a violation will not abrogate the first.

Professor Herman explained that, should the faculty member and OSCCR agree that the complaint does not warrant Student Conduct Board review, it is placed on file so that offenses create a record in order to judge repeat offenses in an appropriate manner. Sanction takes place only if OSCCR agrees.

Professor Gaffney asked whether every faculty member who discovers cheating is obliged to tell OSCCR and whether offenses placed on file without judicial process protect the judicial rights of students. Professor Herman noted that registering complaints is not mandatory but noted that the faculty member who does so is involved in the disposition of the report.

In response to Dean Gibson, Professor Rickles responded that the first record is for information and, depending upon the violation, would help to determine the level of sanction on later violations.

Professor Strauss spoke in favor and asked about the process for students who commit an egregious offence whereby immediate expulsion may be warranted. Professor Zgarrick noted that the Committee had discussed the matter and decided that use of the word “typical” does not preclude immediate expulsion if warranted. Vice Provost Loeffelholz noted, too, that the APC is not attempting to provide the final language for the policy whereupon Professor Muftu asked if the final language would come to the Senate.

The Senate further discussed the nature of egregious offences noting that the University has jurisdiction to propose its own sanctions and is obliged to act if someone is a danger to the community. The purpose of a record of a first offence is that the student knows a violation has taken place and the next time the student cannot plead innocent. It was noted, too, that the designation of egregious is defined in the Student Handbook. The legislation today concerns academic misconduct and does not abrogate that section of the Student Handbook.

Professor Muftu suggested that the proposal might be clarified by adding “and will not be considered an offense without judicial process.” This was not an amendment and was not
taken up by the movers. Professor Strauss spoke against the addition as it could serve to lessen the impact.

**VOTE to accept APC resolution #2: PASSED, 27-0-0.**

Professor Zgarrick read the following and it was seconded.

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend that OSCCR, with the appropriate resources and consultation with individuals having expertise in academic affairs, design a mandatory online tutorial and quiz for both faculty and students on academic integrity policies, sanctions, and reporting procedures.

Professor Zgarrick explained that the Committee discussed this proposal in terms of the sexual harassment training in that it should be advertised and training made available.

Professor Peterfreund proposed a friendly amendment to add “and implement” which Professor Zgarrick accepted.

Professor Fox wondered about the importance of the proposal given that there are many policies and procedures that should be advertised and promoted. He suggested that it be discussed at department and college faculty meetings.

Professor Strauss spoke in favor noting that faculty and students need to take it seriously. Professor Gaffney also spoke in favor in order that all faculty and students are notified. He added that it will allow faculty members to avoid having to address with these matters themselves.

Professor Herman noted that the Academic Integrity Policy (AIP), signed by both the Faculty Senate and the Student Government Association, imposes obligations on both students and faculty. The academic universe holds greater cultural diversity than in the past and standards differ around the world making it obligatory for the university to set the policies of academic integrity. Online training delivers the message to everyone.

Professor Bansil suggested that the effectiveness of a quiz is questionable and that the community must be sensitized in a more interactive manner such as at faculty meetings and periodic focus groups. Professor Daynard cautioned such a quiz requires careful planning to avoid ambiguity or misdirection.

Professor Ondrechen also expressed doubt as to the effectiveness and requested clarification on how it may be made mandatory and whether a penalty is levied for not taking part. Vice Provost Loeffelholz suggested that the matter be built into student orientation.

Professor Fox suggested creation of a handbook of all matters of importance for faculty. Professor Zgarrick, noting that this was not addressed by the Committee, added that it could work and explained that combined use of printed matter and verbal discussion was most effective in conveying information concerning medications to patients.

Several senators spoke in support of the resolution noting that not doing anything is tantamount to dismissing responsibility. A manner in which to educate the community effectively is needed and next year’s APC could address that matter.
Professor Lefkovitz spoke against and offered a friendly amendment to mandate training for students but not for faculty until it may be determined what is appropriate for faculty. Professor Zgarrick, in consultation with several Committee members, did not accept the suggestion as friendly and so it was entered as an amendment. Discussion ensued on the amendment.

Professor Gaffney spoke against the amendment as there is an advantage to even a simple process. Vice Provost Ronkin spoke in favor as it proposes that OSCCR train faculty. The Senate discussed use of the word “quiz” and the prudence of agreeing to the amendment without Student Government Association input.

VOTE on an amendment to mandate training for students and not for faculty: FAILED: 9-18-0.

Professor Fitzgerald then proposed a friendly amendment to delete “quiz” which was accepted by the movers.

As amended, the resolution is as follows:

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate recommend that OSCCR, with the appropriate resources and consultation with individuals having expertise in academic affairs, design and implement a mandatory online tutorial for both faculty and students on academic integrity policies, sanctions, and reporting procedures.

VOTE to accept APC resolution #3, as amended: PASSED, 25-0-3.

Professor Zgarrick read the following and it was seconded:

APC Resolution #4

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate endorse OSCCR’s plan to finalize these revisions of the Academic Integrity Policy in consultation with the Office of General Counsel.

VOTE to accept APC resolution #4: PASSED, 25-0-0.

Professor Zgarrick read the following and it was seconded:

APC Resolution #5

BE IT RESOLVED That the Faculty Senate endorse the creation of an online course proposal system to track new proposals, route them efficiently to the concerned units and committees, and collect feedback.

Professor Rickles, Chair of the APC, was recognized and noted that resolutions five and six pertain to the Committee’s second charge [to review best practices for course offerings to ensure excellence in teaching with special emphasis on identifying and using specific expertise where it is found within the University]. He explained that, among peer institutions, there exists some confusion concerning overlap of courses. This proposal will address inconsistencies among units and allow a transparent process. An electronic program is under consideration presently by Vice Provost Ronkin.
Professor Peterfreund noted that a system already exists but only within colleges which is deficient. He proposed a friendly amendment to add “University-wide” which was accepted by Professor Zgarrick.

Vice Provost Ronkin noted overlap in proposals five and six. He averred that a system exists for course proposals and the Registrar is investigating programs. Delegates on the University Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (UUC) from each College have offered valuable feedback on all course proposals.

The resolution, as amended, reads:

**BE IT RESOLVED** That the Faculty Senate endorse the creation of a University-wide online course proposal system to track new proposals, route them efficiently to the concerned units and committees, and collect feedback.

**VOTE to accept resolution #5 on an online course proposal system, as amended:** 
PASSED, 26-0-0.

Professor Zgarrick read the following and it was seconded:

**APC Resolution #6**

**BE IT RESOLVED** That all course proposal forms at the unit, College, and/or University level should require the proposing unit to indicate which other units might be affected by the course proposal; who was contacted within those units regarding the course proposal; and the response of the affected units. Curriculum committees and/or faculty of the affected unit(s) are expected to express any concerns about the course proposal within a designated time period prior to consideration at the next level of approval.

Several senate members expressed concern that the proposal could slow the process and discourage faculty from submitting new course proposals. They opined that the resolution could be viewed as somewhat antagonistic. As well, the current system allows sharing among all units within a college and UUCC shares with all colleges. While it is a good idea to get the process online, it cannot be expected that every faculty member must give approval.

Professor Strauss spoke in favor noting that a unit could decide to offer a course already being taught at another college in order that monies are not shared. Provost Director reported that the hybrid budget model does not descend to the unit level and that the only time he has experienced a unit proposed to teach a course already being provided by another college was when that course was being taught by low-quality instructors. The outcome was that the instructor quality issue was addressed and the proposing college did not teach the course.

Several additional Senate members spoke against the proposal due to the presence of a well-functioning UUCC to address such matters.

Professor Daynard called for cloture and, as there was no opposition, the vote ensued.

**VOTE to accept APC resolution #6: FAILED, 2-21-3.**
A motion to adjourn was made and seconded. The Senate adjourned at 1:25 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jo Ondrechen, Secretary
Faculty Senate