

Senate Recommendation to the Pr

Mailed out
May 18, 2009.

Originating Body Faculty Senate Originator Michael O'

Date submitted May 14, 2009 Requested Effective date ASAP

Recommendations: The Faculty Senate unanimously passed four resolutions recommending policy amendments in the areas of academic integrity policy, student academic grievance policy, faculty promotions policy and online course evaluation policy. These resolutions were passed at the April 21 and May 5, 2009 Faculty Senate meetings. The respective resolutions are attached.

Attach any supporting documentation.

Action Taken by Provost:

Date 5/15/09

☒ Recommendation Accepted ☐ Recommendation Not Accepted

☐ Recommendation returned to Originating Body for further review (see attached)

Disposition for Approved Recommendation:

☐ President
☒ Faculty Senate Chair
☐ Forum Chair
☐ Webmaster
☐ Catalogue Editor
☒ Student Handbook Editor
☒ Faculty Handbook Editor

☒ VP Student Affairs
☐ VP Finance
☒ School Deans
☐ Graduate Council
☐ Provost Council
☐ Other:

Sandra
Bob T.

Academic Integrity Policy

APPROVED BY FACULTY SENATE 04-21-09

Integrity is a principle that permeates all the activities of the University and guides the behavior of faculty, students and staff. The spirit of academic integrity denotes adherence to the precept that "one's work is one's own." The process by which integrity is upheld assumes clear communication of University expectations, standards and policies and clear communication of students' and faculty's rights and responsibilities. This policy applies to both undergraduate and graduate students.

Definitions

This policy is intended to foster student academic integrity and to address cases of student academic misconduct which may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Lying

Communicating untruths or withholding information as part of an investigation, or in order to gain an academic advantage.

Cheating

The act of wrongfully using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, study aids or the ideas or work of another in order to gain an advantage.

Acts of cheating include but are not limited to:

- giving unauthorized aid to another student or receiving unauthorized aid from another person on tests, quizzes, assignments or projects;
- using or consulting unauthorized materials or using unauthorized equipment or devices on tests, quizzes, assignments or projects;
- submitting as one's own work material written by someone else, whether purchased or not;
- altering or falsifying any information on tests, quizzes, assignments or projects;
- working on any project, test, quiz or assignment outside of the time constraints imposed;
- submitting an assignment in a somewhat altered form or using any material portion of a paper or project to fulfill the requirements of more than one course unless the student has received prior faculty permission to do so;

- failing to adhere to an instructor's specific directions with respect to the terms of academic integrity or academic honesty;
- using fraudulent methods in laboratory, studio, field, computer work or professional placement;
- other acts generally recognized as dishonorable or dishonest which bear upon academic endeavors.

Plagiarism

Students are responsible for learning proper scholarly procedures which require that all quoted material be identified by quotation marks or indentation on the page, and the source of information and ideas, if from another, must be identified and be attributed to that source. Acts of plagiarism include but are not limited to:

- intentionally or unintentionally deceiving or disregarding proper scholarly procedures;
- participating in illicit collaboration with other individuals in the completion of course assignments;
- presenting information, thoughts or ideas from another source as if they are your own, or without giving appropriate attribution;
- other acts generally recognized as plagiarism.

Procedures

The following procedures are intended to provide direction to all parties (e.g., faculty and students) regarding the appropriate steps necessary to initiate and administratively adjudicate a reported academic integrity violation. While the purposed steps are designed with most case and/or situation types in mind, the Dean of Students reserves the right to modify the process to best accommodate special situations or circumstances as necessary.

Course-based Faculty Action

Individual faculty members will, in most cases, have the right and responsibility to deal directly with any cases of academic misconduct that arise in their courses. If a faculty member believes a student has committed an act of academic misconduct, the following procedures should be followed:

1. *Advise Student* - The faculty member will advise the student in a timely fashion of the accusation and will allow the student an opportunity to question or respond to the charge before implementing a sanction.
2. *Determine Sanction* - The sanction issued should reflect the seriousness of the act. The faculty member may impose the following sanctions:
 - warning
 - reduction in grade recorded for a test, assignment, etc.
 - issuance of an F on test, assignment, etc.
 - issuance of an F and removal from a course

If the faculty member or professional program determines that the academic misconduct warrants a sanction greater than issuance of an F and removal from the course and/or dismissal from a program (e.g. suspension or expulsion from the University) the faculty member or professional program may recommend a greater sanction for consideration by the Academic Policies Committee (APC). To recommend suspension or expulsion as a sanction, the faculty member or professional program must submit to the Dean of Students a letter of recommended sanction and letters of endorsement from the Chair of the department or program involved and the Dean of the School, for review and consideration by the Academic Policies Committee. A copy of all such referrals must be sent to the student.

3. *Complete Report* - The faculty member must complete an Academic Integrity Violation Incident Report form (available in the Faculty Handbook and online at http://www.salisbury.edu/provost/handbook/FH-2009/2009/final_AppendixS-AcademicIntegrityViolationIncidentRpt.pdf) for any incident in which a sanction has been issued or recommended, including a warning sanction. This form must be sent in a timely manner to the Dean of Students, the Chair of the department, and to the student as an official notification of the sanction.
4. *Maintain Records* – All materials or documents that may be pertinent to an Academic Integrity violation (e.g. Academic Integrity Violation Incident Report, correspondence, etc.) must be retained in the department central office for a period of five years. This provides a long-term central location of Academic Integrity sanctions which is important for reviewing repeat offenders.

5. *Repeat Offenders* – The Dean of Students will forward to the APC the names of students who have been reported for more than one academic integrity violation. Based on the severity of the offender history, the Academic Policies Committee may elect to impose additional sanctions which may include but are not limited to suspension or expulsion from the university.

Dismissal from Professionally Accredited Programs

The sanction of dismissal from a professional accredited program (i.e., MBA, Nursing, Social Work, Education, etc.) based on an academic integrity violation may be issued at the departmental level but must follow a clearly stated program policy and procedure that has been made available to students. The program must submit an Academic Integrity Violation Incident Report and a copy of the program dismissal letter to the student and the Dean of Students within two weeks from any dismissal action taken. A copy of all materials or documents associated with the professional program dismissal including, but not limited to, the Academic Integrity Violation Incident report form, correspondence, etc. should be forwarded to, the Dean of Students, the Dean of the school within which the program resides, and must also be retained in the department central office for a period of five years.

Student Appeals of Faculty or Professional Program Sanctions

A student has the right to appeal an Academic Integrity sanction issued by a faculty member or professional program, but must follow the following procedures:

1. *Submit An Appeal* - A student appeal, including a detailed statement of the grounds for the appeal and any supporting documentation, must be submitted in writing to the Dean of Students in the Office of Student Affairs within five working days of receiving the Academic Integrity Violation Incident Report from the Dean of Students and/or faculty member.

The student's written appeal ordinarily will be forwarded to the Academic Policies Committee by the Dean of Students within a reasonable time of its filing, usually within two weeks. In the event the Academic Policies Committee is not available, the Dean of Students will forward the appeal to the Provost, who will

attempt to create an ad hoc committee to handle the review as soon as practicable. (All further references in this policy to the Academic Policies Committee include the ad hoc committee where appropriate.)

The Dean of Students will send a copy of the student appeal to the faculty member or program director and the appropriate department chair. The Dean of Students will request from the faculty and/or professional program a copy of all documents used to determine the sanction and any additional correspondence or documents pertinent to the case.

2. *Continue Coursework* - In most cases, the student shall remain in the course pending the results of the appeal. However, the department chair, the program director and/or the Academic Dean have the discretion to remove the student from the course, from concurrent courses, and /or prevent enrollment in future courses pending the appeal decision where appropriate and where course continuation compromises the integrity of the classroom or instructional environment and will inform the Dean of Students at the time of this decision.

Academic Policies Committee Actions

Under this policy, the Academic Policies Committee serves to consider student appeals of faculty-imposed and professional program-imposed sanctions, adjudicates cases referred by faculty members where the recommended sanction may include suspension or expulsion from the University, and considers additional sanctions above and beyond faculty imposed sanctions in cases of repeat offenders. For appeals of faculty-imposed and professional program-imposed sanctions, the APC's scope of review will be limited and the student shall have the burden to prove that the faculty member or professional program exceeded their given authority and/or discretion and/or materially failed to follow proper procedures.

In all matters referred to the Academic Policies Committee, the committee will review all documentation and will have the following options:

- render a written decision based on the evidence submitted, or
- render a written decision based on further investigation, or
- initiate a formal hearing and render a written decision.

1. *Review of Evidence* – A written decision may be determined based on the documents and materials submitted with the appeal.
2. *Investigation* – A written decision may be determined based on a series of interviews, a review of documents, and any other action deemed appropriate for the purpose of collecting additional information and evidence necessary for an informed and reasoned judgment to be rendered.
3. *Hearing* - A hearing shall be held when a student appeals the dismissal from a program, a faculty member or professional program recommends suspension or expulsion from the University, or if the APC chooses to hold a hearing in any other case. If a hearing is to be held, written notice of the time, date and location shall be sent to all parties. The hearing shall be conducted as follows:
 - The hearing shall be held at a reasonable time when all parties (to the extent possible) are available or have an opportunity to be present.
 - The parties shall be entitled to make opening and closing statements.
 - The parties shall be entitled to present evidence through witnesses and documents, and shall be entitled to question witnesses. At the discretion of the Chair, direct questioning by a party of a witness, including an opposing party, may not be permitted; rather, the parties may be required to convey their questions to the Chair, who will then convey them to the witness.
 - The scope of any hearing conducted by the APC on any given matter shall be consistent with the role of the APC in reviewing such matter.
 - Students are permitted to seek the support of a non-legal advocate for assistance in the preparation and presentation of a case before the Academic Policies Committee. The advocate shall otherwise not participate formally in the proceedings. In all cases, the advocate must be a member of the University faculty, staff, or student body.
 - Neither party may be represented by an attorney at the hearing, unless they are facing or are likely to face criminal charges relating to the alleged academic misconduct. Under these circumstances, both parties may elect to have counsel assist them. Under such circumstances the university legal counsel

4. *Findings* - After the Academic Policies Committee has completed its review, it shall issue a written decision based on findings of fact and conclusions, usually within three to five days, and shall provide a copy of the findings to the student, faculty member, program director, department chair, dean of the school, Registrar and Dean of Students. All parties must abide by these findings unless they are modified by the Provost as part of a limited appeal process in the circumstances outlined in the appeals section of this policy.

Appeals from Academic Policies Committee Findings

For student appeals of faculty imposed sanctions the decision of the Academic Policies Committee is final. For sanctions imposed by the APC (e.g. suspension or expulsion from the university or additional sanctions imposed by the Academic Policy Committee for repeat offenders) and committee findings of sanctions imposed by a professional program (e.g. dismissal from the program), the student or the professional program may appeal the Committee's findings to the Provost. Appeals must be filed within five working days of receiving notice of the committee's decision. The written appeal must be filed with the Provost and should set forth all of the reasons that support reversal of the committee's findings. The Provost will review the written appeal and the documentation associated with the case. The Provost has the discretion to take any action necessary to thoroughly complete a review, and then will issue a decision, which will be binding and final. The decision will be conveyed in writing to the student, the faculty member, department chair, dean of the school, Registrar, the Dean of Students and the Academic Policies Committee.

Impact of an Academic Misconduct F Grade

If the sanction imposed is an F in the course, the student shall not be permitted to withdraw from the course even if the sanction was imposed prior to the last day of the University schedule adjustment period. The imposition of an F grade shall stand for the course, unless the student successfully appeals the sanction.

Although students can repeat courses, a course repeated based on an imposed F grade for academic integrity violation(s) will have both grades calculated in the students

GPA and not replaced as it is under normal circumstances. The sanction of an F in a course will not be designated on the transcript as an academic integrity F unless it is an action determined by the Academic Policies Committee for an academic integrity violation repeat offender. A student who has received a course grade of F for an academic integrity violation will not be allowed to graduate from the University with honors.

University System of Maryland Policy

In accordance with Board of Regents policy, students expelled or suspended for reasons of academic dishonesty by any institution in the University System of Maryland shall not be admissible to any other System institution if expelled, or during any period of suspension.

Original Version Approved by the Faculty Senate, March 13, 2001

Revisions Approved by the Academic Policies Committee, May 11, 2004

Revisions Approved by the Faculty Senate, May 11, 2004

Revisions Approved by the Office of the Maryland Attorney General, June 17, 2004

Revisions Approved by the Provost, June 18, 2004

Revisions Approved by the Faculty Senate 4-21-2009 and the Provost 5-??-2009

Student Academic Grievance Policy
Approved by Faculty Senate 05-05-09

Salisbury University has established the Student Academic Grievance Policy to give students of the University community a forum in which to address concerns related to academic matters (e.g. grade disputes and professional program dismissals when they do not involve an academic integrity violation). The policy provides a method for aggrieved students to express substantive complaints about academic matters and have them resolved in a timely fashion. The following matters are not covered by these grievance procedures:

- Claims involving alleged discrimination or harassment
- Claims relating only to alleged violations of policies which were promulgated exclusively by the University System of Maryland, actions of the Board of Regents or actions of the Chancellor of the System, over which SU has no jurisdiction
- Student judicial matters
- Grievances against University police officers that could result in the imposition of any discipline against the officer(s)
- Student Academic Integrity Violations

Informal Grievance

Students are encouraged to attempt to resolve differences between themselves and others in an informal manner prior to initiating a formal grievance under this policy. This may entail only a conversation in which the views of both parties are aired in a mutually satisfactory manner or a conversation using a neutral third party for mediation. In the cases in which the differences involve a faculty member, and the differences are not resolved informally between the faculty member and the student, the student is encouraged to consult with the department chair prior to filing a formal grievance. If an informal resolution cannot be achieved, the grievant may elect to begin the formal grievance procedure that follows.

Formal Grievance

Step One

The grievant must submit a formal grievance in writing to the person alleged to be responsible for the actions leading to the grievance within 20 working days of the date on which the grievant knew or should have known of the action that led to the grievance. Nothing in this policy is to be construed to inhibit or prevent the grievant from withdrawing a formal grievance once the formal grievance procedures have begun.

A formal grievance must set forth in writing a statement which clearly defines the basis of the grievance, a chronology of events leading up to the grievance, the names of people with knowledge of the event, pertinent dates, a description of the actions taken against the grievant which led to the dissatisfaction and a proposed resolution to the

situation. Any documentation relevant to the grievance should be attached to the letter. If known, information about relevant University policies should be provided. The grievant has the burden to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the action or inaction complained about did occur and that it was inconsistent with University policies or procedures.

The person alleged to be responsible for actions leading to the grievance will provide a written response to the grievant within five working days of receiving the formal grievance. The written decision should address the specific issues raised in the grievance and include all pertinent information.

Step Two

If the response is not satisfactory to the grievant; he or she has five working days to file the formal grievance with the supervisor of the person (department chair for faculty member) alleged to be responsible for the actions leading to the grievance. The grievant must include all prior written responses. The supervisor of the person alleged to be responsible for the actions leading to the grievance will provide a written response to the grievant and the person alleged to be responsible within five working days of receiving the formal grievance.

Step Three

If the supervisor's response is not satisfactory, the grievant has five working days to file a formal grievance with the dean of the school in which the dispute has occurred. The grievant must include all prior written responses. The dean of the school will provide a written response to the grievant within five working days of receiving the grievance.

Step Four

If the response from the dean of the school is not satisfactory, the grievant has five working days to forward the formal grievance to the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs who will refer the grievance to the Academic Policies Committee for review. In the event the Academic Policies Committee is not available, the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs will forward the appeal to the Provost, who will attempt to create an ad hoc committee to handle the review as soon as practicable. (All further references in this policy to the Academic Policies Committee include the ad hoc committee where appropriate.)

Committee Review of Evidence

The committee normally has 10 working days from receiving the formal grievance to decide among the following options:

- 1) review submitted evidence: render a written decision based on the documents and materials submitted with the appeal;
- 2) investigation: render a written decision based on a series of interviews, a review of documents, and/or any other action deemed appropriate for the purpose of collecting additional information and evidence necessary for an

informed and reasoned judgment to be rendered. The investigation, including interviews, will usually be completed within 20 working days of the decision to conduct an investigation; or

3) hearing: render a written decision based on a hearing. If the Committee determines that a hearing is to be held, the committee shall send written notice of the time, date and location to all parties. The hearing shall be conducted as follows:

- The hearing shall be held at a reasonable time when all parties (to the extent possible) are available or have an opportunity to be present.
- The parties shall be entitled to make opening and closing statements.
- The parties shall be entitled to present evidence through witnesses and documents, and shall be entitled to question witnesses. At the discretion of the Chair of the Committee, direct questioning by a party of a witness, including an opposing party, may not be permitted; rather, the parties may be required to convey their questions to the Committee Chair, who will convey them to the witness.
- Students are permitted to seek the support of a non-legal advocate for assistance in the preparation of a case before the Academic Policies Committee. The advocate may counsel the grievant during the hearing but shall not officially speak or participate formally in the proceedings. In all cases, the advocate must be a member of the University faculty, staff, or student body.
- Neither party may be represented by an attorney at the hearing, unless they are facing or are likely to face criminal charges relating to the subject of the grievance. Under such circumstances the University legal counsel must also be present. At no time may legal counsel give statements or participate in questioning witnesses or Committee members.

The hearing shall be closed with attendance limited to individuals directly connected with the case as determined by the Chair of the Committee. The University may record the hearing at the discretion of the Chair. Any University recording will be University property for University reference only and will not be made part of the student's University record.

- Formal rules of evidence need not be followed at the hearing. The Committee may receive such evidence as a reasonable person would consider reliable in making important decisions. If a question arises about the authenticity of a document or the reasonableness, relevance or redundancy of evidence, the Chair of the Committee shall be the final decision maker on the evidence's admissibility.
- The parties may request, in writing, that the Committee contact specified persons to appear at the hearing to testify on behalf of the parties. The request must be made at least five working days before the scheduled hearing in order to allow ample time for the Committee to make the requests.

- The Chair of the Committee shall be responsible for conducting the hearing in an efficient and decorous manner and shall rule on all disputes related to the procedures used throughout the proceedings. Reasonable limits may be set by the Chair on the length and nature of the opening statements, the evidence presented and on the duration of the hearing. At any time, the Chair may seek the advice of legal counsel.
- Since the University lacks full judicial authority, such as the power to subpoena or place witnesses under oath, a party's procedural rights cannot be coextensive with or identical to the rights afforded the accused in a civil or criminal legal proceeding. The procedures outlined are designed, however, to assure fundamental fairness and to protect parties from arbitrary or capricious disciplinary action. Deviations from these procedures shall not necessarily invalidate a hearing or the results of a hearing unless significant prejudice results.
- When possible the hearing should be completed within 20 working days of the decision to conduct a hearing.

Committee Findings

After the Committee has completed its review, the Committee shall issue a written decision based on findings of fact and conclusions, including procedures followed and any applicable University policies and procedures, usually within ten working days, and shall provide a copy of the findings to all directly involved parties, including, but not limited to, the parties involved, the department chair, the dean of the school, the Dean of Students and the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Appeal of Committee's Findings

If either party elects to appeal the decision of the committee, he or she must provide written notice of the appeal to the Provost, within five working days from the date of the Committee's written decision. The written appeal should set forth all of the reasons that support reversal of the Committee's decision and include any supporting documentation.

The Provost has the discretion to take any action necessary to thoroughly complete a review, and then will issue a decision, which will be binding and final. The decision will be conveyed in writing to the student, the faculty member, department chair, dean of the school, the Dean of Students, the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the Academic Policies Committee usually within ten working days of receiving the appeal.

Jurisdictional Disputes

If a dispute arises over the jurisdiction of the committee assigned to decide the matter, the jurisdictional dispute shall be resolved by the Assistant Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Confidentiality

Matters pertaining to any grievance must be kept in confidence by the parties directly involved. Committee findings will only be provided to the parties, and other University personnel on a need to know basis (e.g. Committee members, department chair, dean of the school, the Office of the Provost, and the Office of the Vice President of Student Affairs).

Timeline

All time limitations contained within this policy may be extended for good cause as determined by the relevant committee, Provost, or the Dean of Students. Failure to adhere strictly to the timelines shall not be grounds for appeal unless significant prejudice has occurred.

Faculty Senate Resolution Passed

To amend the Faculty Promotions Process

For the Purposes of Transparency and Rebuttal

(Passed by the Faculty Senate on April 21, 2009)

(Amended Text is Attached)

1 Section in Faculty Handbook begins on 2-13 Section
2 (*Amended text is underlined*)

3 *D. Procedures for Promotion of Faculty.*

4 D 1b. All applications for promotion must be
5 initiated through the submission of credentials to
6 a departmental promotions committee, the department
7 chair, and dean of the school for review and
8 recommendation. The departmental committee, chair
9 and dean respectively, must add to the candidate's
10 application file a written recommendation stating
11 whether or not they endorse the candidate's promotion.
12

13 D 1c. The Departmental promotions committees adds a
14 written positive or negative recommendation to the
15 candidate's application file, immediately sends a copy
16 of this letter to the candidate, and forwards the
17 complete file to the department chair who in turn adds a
18 written positive or negative recommendation to the
19 candidate's application file, immediately sends a copy
20 of this letter to the candidate, and forwards the complete
21 file to the dean of the school. The dean adds a written
22 positive or negative recommendation to the candidate's
23 application file immediately sends a copy of this letter
24 to the candidate, and forwards the complete file to the
25 University Committee on Promotions. Copies
26 referenced in this paragraph shall be sent to the
27 candidate's university email address with a cc to the
28 Promotions Committee.

29
30 At any step of this process the candidate may, within
31 five business days of the date of email service
32 referenced in D1c above, provide written rebuttal in any
33 professionally reasonable manner (i.e. a short
34 memorandum or more formal rebuttal letter). After
35 reviewing the letters from the Departmental promotions
36 committee, the chair, and the dean, the candidate may
37 write a formal rebuttal letter. This letter must be
38 delivered to the chair of the University Committee on
39 Promotions not later than the first business day after
40 April 5. The chair of the University Committee on
41 Promotions will add this letter and any other prior
42 rebuttal documents to the candidate's file before making
43 the file available to the full committee for review
44

45 D 1d. The University Committee on Promotions reviews
46 the completed file using the criteria described in
47 section B.1 of this policy and the procedures
48 described in section D.1 of this document.
49
50

**Senate Resolution
On Online Course Evaluations
(Passed by the Faculty Senate on April 21, 2009)**

Renew the contract with CourseEval through May 2010 for the departments that are currently using it with no attempt to add additional departments. CourseEval is already being used by several departments and cost wise it is the least expensive package of the three reviewed and can also be used for other assessment purposes.

Start an SU development project to create our own course evaluation system to be housed inside of GullNet. A project team would be created with appropriate faculty, staff and IT personnel. There will be several benefits to doing this including: save about \$10,000 per year in maintenance costs, lower the learning curve by using GullNet as the interface, the tool would be supported at SU so modifications and training could be handled locally, and reports could be customized more readily. The goal would be to have a pilot group use the new system in December 2009.

April 4, 2009

To: Michael O'Loughlin, President, Faculty Senate

From: Samuel Geleta, Chair, Learning With Technology Committee

Dear Mike:

On February 17, 2009 the Learning with Technology Committee (LWTC) was charged by the senate to assess various online course evaluation programs, with an eye towards quality, ease of use, and cost; and recommend one program that will meet the needs of those departments presently interested in using online evaluations. The committee's recommendation to the Senate was expected by April 7, 2009.

The LWTC Committee proceeded with discussions and demonstrations in assessing online evaluation programs:

- Participation in a brown bag presentation: "Moving Course Evaluation Online, Maryland Experience" by College Park on March 2, 2009.
- Three vendors were selected and presented their products to the committee members, other faculty and staff from University Analysis, Reporting, and Assessment, and Information Technology.
 - Blackboard Outcomes System
 - CoursEval by Academic Management System
 - CollegeNet course evaluation product
- Issues regarding hosting the software, student identity and anonymity, software use for other survey purposes, linking to existing PeopleSoft and institutional support requirements were discussed. Participating IT members brought up the idea of possible "in house" development of an evaluation and survey tools. An additional meeting was established to explore this option based on fundamental requirements of such a system, which was developed.

Based on the data collected and discussed thus far the recommendation of the Committee is:

Renew the contract with CoursEval through May 2010 for the departments that are currently using it with no attempt to add additional departments. CoursEval is already being used by several departments and cost wise it is the least expensive package of the three reviewed and can also be used for other assessment purposes.

Start an SU development project to create our own course evaluation system to be housed inside of GullNet. A project team would be created with appropriate faculty, staff and IT personnel. There will be several benefits to doing this including: save about \$10,000 per year in maintenance costs, lower the learning curve by using GullNet as the interface, the tool would be supported at SU so modifications and training could be handled locally, and reports could be customized more readily. The goal would be to have a pilot group use the new system in December 2009.