

5-7-2007

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, May 7, 2007

Follow this and additional works at: [https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/
archives_senate_minutes](https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes)



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at CORE Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas by an authorized administrator of CORE Scholar. For more information, please contact corescholar@www.libraries.wright.edu, library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Faculty Senate

May 7, 2007, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of Minutes of April 2, 2007**
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Apr07SenMin.pdf>

3. **Report of the University President or Provost**

4. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**
Guest Report: Stephen Acker, OSU, State-wide Initiative To Reduce Textbook Costs
Guest Report: Susan Carrafiello, University General Education Committee

5. **Old Business**
 - A. Lake Campus New Program: B.A. English – Tom Sav, Chair, UCAPC
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/lcbaeng.pdf>

 - B. Proposal of (+) (-) Grading System – Maher Amer, Chair, Student Affairs Committee

Adoption of the following grading scale is recommended by the Student Affairs Committee:

A-	3.70
B+	3.30
B	3.00
B-	2.70
C+	2.30
C	2.00
C-	1.70
D+	1.30
D	1.00
F	0.00

6. New Business

- A. Senate Meeting Dates for 2007-08. (All meetings are on Monday at 2:45 p.m.)
October 1, 2007 March 3, 2008
November 5, 2007 April 7, 2008
January 7, 2008 May 5, 2008
February 4, 2008 June 2, 2008
*All meetings are on Monday at 2:45 p.m.
- B. Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP) – Jay Thomas
<http://www.wright.edu/nursing/faculty/dnp.html>

Items C – CC are brought forth by Tom Sav, Chair, UCAPC

- C. CECS Program Change: Certificate in Object-Oriented Programming
[Renamed: Certificate in Contemporary Programming]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/certobj.pdf>
- D. CECS Program Change: Computer Science Minor for Engineers and Scientists
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/csminor.pdf>
- E. CECS Program Change: B.S. Mechanical Engineering
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/meeng.pdf>
- F. CECS Program Change: B.S. Materials Science and Engineering
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/matscieg.pdf>
- G. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Organizational Leadership
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/orglead3.pdf>
- H. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Early Childhood Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/earlyclld.pdf>
- I. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Rehabilitation Services
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/rehab3.pdf>
- J. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Middle Childhood Education -- Language
Arts/Social Studies Concentration
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/midclld.pdf>
- K. RSCOB Program Change: B.S. Accountancy
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/accbs.pdf>
- L. COLA Program Change: B.A. Motion Pictures
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bamotpc.pdf>
- M. COLA Program Change: B.F.A. Motion Pictures
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bfamotpc.pdf>

- N. COLA Program Change: B.F.A. Theatre Design/Technology/Stage Management
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/thdesign.pdf>
- O. CONH Program Change: BEACON: B.S.N. Nursing
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/becon2.pdf>
- P. COSM Program Change: Biological Sciences Entrance Requirements -- B.S. and B.A. in Biological Sciences
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bioenter.pdf>
- Q. COSM Program Change: B.S. Geological Sciences -- Geological Sciences Option
[Renamed: B.S. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Earth Sciences Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geoscibs.pdf>
- R. COSM Program Change: B.S. Environmental Health Sciences
[Renamed: B.S. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Environmental Sciences Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/envhthbs.pdf>
- S. COSM Program Change: B.A. Geological Sciences -- Geological Sciences Option
[Renamed: B.A. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Earth Sciences Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geosciba.pdf>
- T. COSM Program Change: B.A. Geological Sciences -- Earth and Space Sciences (Education) Option
[Renamed: B.A. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Earth and Space Sciences (Education) Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geoesba.pdf>
- U. COSM Program Change: B.A. Geological Sciences Education -- Life Sciences/Earth Sciences (Education) Option
[Renamed: B.A. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Life Sciences/Earth Sciences (Education) Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geoleba.pdf>
- V. COSM Program Change: B.A. Geological Sciences Education -- Earth Sciences/Chemistry (Education) Option
[Renamed: B.A. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Earth Sciences/Chemistry (Education) Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geoecba.pdf>
- W. COSM Program Change: Geological Sciences Minor
[Renamed: Earth Sciences Minor]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geominor.pdf>
- X. COSM Program Change: Environmental Health Sciences Minor
[Renamed: Environmental Sciences Minor]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/ehminor.pdf>

- Y. COSM New Program: B.S. Behavioral Neuroscience -- Option in Psychology
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bsneuopty.pdf>
- Z. COSM Program Termination: B.S. Geological Sciences -- Geophysics Option
- AA. COSM Program Termination: B.S. Geological Sciences -- Environmental Geosciences Option
- BB. COSM Program Termination: B.A. Geological Sciences -- Environmental Geosciences Option
- CC. Academic Policy Change: Fresh Start Policy
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/fresh.pdf>
Current Fresh Start Policy:
http://www.wright.edu/academics/fhandbook/fresh_start.html

7. Written Committee Reports and Attendance (Attachment A)

- A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: James Sayer
- B. Faculty Affairs Committee: Cathy Sayer
- C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav
- D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: Jim Amon
- E. Information Technology Committee: TK Prasad
- F. Student Affairs Committee: Maher Amer
- G. Student Petitions Committee: Alan Chesen

8. Council Reports

- A. Athletic Council – Mike Sincoff
- B. Graduate Council – Jay Thomas

9. Announcements

- A. Next Faculty Senate: June 4, 2007, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

10. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT A

Senate Committee Reports May 7, 2007

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – James Sayer

Faculty Affairs Committee – Cathy Sayer

Wednesday, April 4, 2007, 3:00 P.M. – 5:00 P.M.

Members in attendance: Linda Lester, Lisa Elick and Cathy Sayer.

Others in attendance: Carleen Beckermann, Administrative Assistant.

Members absent: Jane Doorley, Maggie Houston, Eric Matson, and Marguerite Veres.

Cathy provided to the committee the following updates:

- Maggie Veres is the chair of the Salary Sub-committee, which has not yet met.
- The Lecturer Appointment, Promotion and Termination policy has been approved by the Provost. Cathy stated she would offer all the colleges the opportunity to have her or a member of this committee attend a meeting to discuss/explain implications of this policy. One important point to emphasize is an instructor position cannot be “rolled over” into a lecturer position and that we have to be careful in the way we refer to movement from instructor rank to a lecturer position in order to avoid setting up inappropriate expectations.
- A faculty member has approached Cathy with regard to termination of his position. She wants to research the charge of this committee to ascertain the appropriate role she and the committee should play. She noted that this case highlights the importance of being careful and clear about the distinctions between instructor and lecturer positions.
- The continuing faculty appointment letters have been sent to the deans. The deans are responsible to send out these letters to appropriate individuals in their departments.

A discussion of Lake Campus policies and procedures for lecturers and instructors ensued. It was noted that at the Lake Campus, instructors and lecturers are limited from serving on some committees. Cathy stated that policies affecting lecturers and instructors continue to evolve, noting that formerly at the Dayton Campus, lecturers and instructors could not serve on the faculty senate but now may. It was also stated that the College of Nursing has only recently added clinical faculty to the committee that does their annual merit evaluations. Existing differences in the way bargaining unit and non-bargaining unit student evaluations are handled were also discussed along with the possibility that some change might be in order. Concern was expressed that at the Lake Campus, evaluation documents were passed along to the Faculty Affairs Committee for award purposes and that this had not been communicated in advance to faculty members.

Criteria for the Senior Lecturer position were discussed. It was agreed that promotion to senior lecturer should be as distinctive of an accomplishment for non-tenure line faculty as promotion to full professor is for tenure line faculty and that the criteria should reflect such distinction. The

following categories and criteria were proposed to assist in evaluating what will constitute leadership with regard to promotion to senior lecturer.

Leadership at the University level should constitute activities such as:

- Initiating or directing a major University initiative
- Designing and maintaining a college website
- Creating and sustaining a study abroad experience
- Directing a course taught in by multiple faculty in a number of sections: creating the final exam, creating a master syllabus, choosing the book, etc. (Cathy will check with Bill Rickert to see if any lecturers at WSU are involved in such activity.)
- Developing a new course through the University curriculum approval process
- Coordinating a major campus event that requires collaborating with several units within the University
- Advising a significant student organization or activity that results in regional and/or national recognition
- Receiving University recognition or honor

Examples of leadership at the Professional level include:

- Publishing in a Professional journal
- Providing significant service to profession or discipline, such as serving as the University representative of a state board
- Receiving professional recognition or honor

Community Leadership examples

- Heading a University project or program that provides ongoing or substantial service to the community
- Holding an office in a community organization or regularly organizing an event in support of a community organization
- Initiating and/or organizing activism in support of a cause
- Receiving community recognition and/or honor

The committee continued to consider whether a point system should be used in the in the promotion process and whether some items should be worth more points than others. Cathy will discuss this with Bill and report back to the committee.

The implementation process was briefly discussed. It was agreed that the first year, the committee that makes these promotion decisions should include representatives from all of the colleges with faculty in the lecturer rank. In succeeding years, the committee should include individuals in the Senior Lecturer position.

The items remaining to be resolved include outlining the process, the composition of the promotion selection group and details about the packet of information candidates will need to submit. It was discussed that the committee may need to meet several more times in order to accomplish these items before the end of the year.

Cathy will attempt to meet with Bill to resolve some outstanding issues prior to the next meeting and report back to the committee. Cathy will contact members to set up the next meeting.

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

The UCAPC Report to the Faculty Senate Meeting of May 7 is available at <http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/8fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Jim Amon

The committee has been working with Communications and Marketing and will make an on-line survey available to various university communities in the near future.

Information Technology Committee – TK Prasad

The survey developed by the committee has been made available to the faculty community and data collection is in process.

Student Affairs Committee – Maher Amer

Student Petitions Committee – Alan Chesen

The Petitions Committee engaged in its routine business of considering petitions from the colleges at its most recent meeting on April 13. In addition, further discussion was held concerning whether or not it will be feasible to consider recommending to Senate a change in the petition date for the grade of W from its present deadline of the end of the quarter to the last class day. The representatives from the colleges will bring information to our next meeting garnered from the faculty in those colleges. We hope to know by the end of the next meeting whether or not we will pursue this matter. Finally, we tried to identify a committee member who will attend the May 4 refund appeals meeting. Our next meeting is scheduled for May 11.

Respectfully submitted,
Alan S. Chesen, Interim Chair

**Wright State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
May 7, 2007, 2:45 p.m.
E156 Student Union**

1. Call to Order

Faculty President James Sayer called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m.

Present (in bold): Akhbari, M.; Allen, J.; **Baker, B.; Cavanaugh, J.; Doorley, J.; Goldfinger, M.; Gray, B.; John, J.;** Kay, J.; Killian, J.; **Mateti, P.;** Mirkin, D.; **Nagy, A.; Norris, M.; Otto, R.; Rattan, K.; Sayer, C.; Schatmeyer, K.; Schuster, R.; Self, E.; Slonaker, W.; Small, L. (substituting for Shepelak, N.); Sudkamp, T.; Tarpey T.; Walbroehl, G.;** Wenning, M.; **Zryd, T.**

Faculty President – Sayer, J.; President - Hopkins, D.; Provost – Angle, S.; **Parliamentarian – Sav, T.; Secretary – Zambenini, P. (Staff)**

2. Approval of Minutes of April 2, 2007

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Apr07SenMin.pdf>

Minutes were approved as written.

**3. Report of the University President and Provost
President Hopkins**

Provost Angle is traveling and Vice President Filipic is joining us today. I'll bring you up to date on the state budget and I've asked Dr. Filipic to help respond to the Parking Resolution that was offered at the last Senate meeting.

State Budget Process – there is more work to be done in the Senate and Conference Committee. Governor Strickland has placed education as a top priority in his budget. His proposal suggested we receive 5% support from the state in the first year of the biennium, with an agreement to have a 0% increase in tuition, while implementing a 1% cost savings and documenting this in some fashion. The second year of Governor Strickland's biennial budget was to increase state funding by 2%, and ask us to hold our tuition increases to 3%, while also instituting a 3% cost savings that would be documented to the state. In essence, we have been considering a compact with the Governor, except the compact we would hope for would be more complete in that it considered affordability, quality, outcomes, etc.

Typically, the house does not improve upon the budget proposed by the Governor. However, we just received the House budget and they worked hard to improve on the Governor's budget with unanimous support by both republicans and democrats. We need time to plan for a 0% tuition increase because the average increase has been typically 6%. The house reversed this portion of the budget. It now states that higher education will get a 2% increase in state support in the first biennium and be allowed no more than a 3% tuition increase; while in the second biennium, state support will increase 10% with a 0% increase in tuition. This is a better opportunity to plan and increases the revenue stream. The House also added \$50 million in the first and second year of the biennium, dedicated to scholarships in areas of science, technology, engineering and math.

This is a very important sign after more than a decade of disinvestment in higher education. We are seeing some turning of attitudes toward higher education being the future of our state and how investing in higher education leads the way toward prosperity. We are encouraged and invite all of you to our annual budget presentation on May 17, 8:30 a.m. in the multi-purpose room of the Student Union. As we prepare for the presentation, we are using the House budget to tentatively plan, but more to come from Senate and Conference Committee.

On another note, I want to address Senate resolutions. At your request, I forwarded the Senate recognition of the basketball, baseball and swimming teams to the Athletics Department and they were very appreciative to receive that.

We have been considering the Parking Resolution and how to address the issues and prepare for next fall and beyond with long-term planning.

Dr. Filipic – The resolution adopted at the April Senate meeting called for 500 parking spaces to be added, for a long-term parking plan to be prepared by Fall 2007, and other steps to reduce the demand for parking in the core area. We have engaged an engineer to look at two sites to create additional parking: 1) an extension of Lot 1 by Russ Engineering, and 2) one of the prairie grass areas near Fred White Health Center (FAWHC). There are pros and cons to both and we are determining which to pursue or to pursue both. Even so, we would not generate 500 additional spaces before fall, but I believe we can make significant improvements. We will recover about 24 spaces from the FAWHC gated lot; 58 spaces from the construction area that was Bio 3 but is now called Diggs Laboratory, but we will not have those available until the end of September.

Certain departments moving to University Park have reduced demand; however, a car does not translate into a parking space. We typically have about 1.4 faculty/staff cars per parking space, which means we will gain about 20 spaces from those moves. We are planning on increasing the frequency/type of shuttle service but haven't yet determined what type of shuttle or the cost. We will have that ready by fall quarter. We believe it would make sense to tie a long-term parking plan to a broader buildings and grounds plan. This can't be done by September because it requires broad participation by faculty and staff.

There is value in creating a parking structure because of potential convenience of location and lowered consumption of space; however, there is a cost. OSU and UC charge fees from \$500 to \$1100 yearly. Remote parking there is truly remote. Is it a good idea for us to commit these resources to a parking garage? It isn't free and we welcome your input. The improvements we make will involve cost and I assume there is broad support for an increase in parking permit fees at an appropriate time, perhaps the 2009 calendar as that is the first year after the current faculty contract. This would begin to cover the improvements that are already underway as recommended by the Senate, and determine if significant additional parking increases should be pursued and funded.

We do not plan to add a shuttle service to the private, off-campus housing units along Zink road, because on-campus housing has declined and we feel this could further encourage students to live off-campus. At this time, we don't plan to increase shuttle service to on-campus housing, as they can't park on campus so it would not reduce the need for parking.

Dr. Sayer: What is your best projection for the number of parking spaces being added by fall?

Dr. Filipic: Somewhere between 200-350 if everything is combined together. This depends on if we build one or two lots.

Dr. Sudkamp: When will the decisions on the lots be pursued?

Dr. Filipic: We need to address that within the next month but it doesn't address 500 spaces or a comprehensive plan.

Dr. Sayer: I have a three-part question for the President from one of our Senators. Over the past month, state and federal government investigations of student loan administration by higher education institutions has expanded considerably, including in Ohio.

1) Has WSU been contacted by Ohio's attorney general, Marc Dann, about his office's investigation of student loan administration? If so, has WSU responded in writing and would you share a copy of that communication with this Senate body?

Dr. Hopkins: We did receive a letter from Attorney General Dann asking us to provide our information over the last few years concerning student loan processes and procedures. We will be discussing this at the IUC tomorrow. We did respond to three questions and we can share that with you. We do not believe that we have violated any ethical or legal aspects of this because we do not restrict student's options and choices.

2) Does WSU maintain a "preferred lenders" list for use by students and parents? If not, why, and if yes, how does a lender qualify?

Dr. Hopkins: I will ask Matt Filipic to respond.

Dr. Filipic: At the request of the financial aid office, we pursued an invitation to negotiate process over the winter with the goal to select a preferred lender for an alternative loan program. This was for people who have used their subsidized loan capacity, as determined by the federal government, and need to borrow further, possibly because parents are unable supply the cash the needs analysis says they should be able to supply. We had identified a lender that offered appropriate terms, one of which was that the lender would set aside a pool of funds to be made available for poor credit risk students. In the current national controversy, people objected to the financial aid office being involved in redistribution of income so we didn't pursue this issue. We are still interested in a process that would not require students to use a preferred lender, but encourage them to do so because it might generate a loan volume that would make favorable terms attractive from a lender's perspective, and that would be in everyone's interest.

3) Have any WSU employees received gifts or compensation from commercial lenders of student loans and what is the official WSU position on the practice of gifts and compensation?

Dr. Hopkins: We have looked at that question carefully for the past three years and have not discovered anything. There was a common practice until about three years ago, where our financial aid staff in the School of Medicine, served on advisory boards to advise lenders and their trips were paid. When the Ohio Ethics Commission came out with strong language against this in 2003, we eliminated that practice at WSU.

Dr. Rizki (guest): Revisiting parking, are you going to make public the decision as to the placement of the new lots prior to securing a contract so we can be aware of the final decision

process. The committees are finishing business and this has gone behind closed doors, and I am interested in how the decision will be made.

Also, what will the faculty involvement be in the long-term parking plan? Will this be an open process? We have a habit of working on problems and in the end, decisions are made in a closed room and I am hoping this will involve the faculty throughout the decision-making.

Dr. Hopkins: At the next Faculty Senate meeting in June we will convey exactly what our plan is with the parking lots. I hope what we do is transparent and we have worked hard in our capital planning process to make sure the Buildings & Grounds Committee and Parking Advisory Committee are involved in conversations. We need your input and will be very transparent and engage people as we have done in the last two years.

Senator Comment: It seems logical that parkers bear the burden of the parking permits but it is interesting that almost is never the case anywhere else. When I go to work at the Air Force base, I don't pay to park; when I go to the museum, I don't pay to park. Certainly, at the mall I don't pay to park. No big employers or retailers, outside of downtown, charge to park and that area is dying perhaps not coincidentally. Somehow at universities, it was decided that parking was a profit center to bring in money. Once that assumption is made, all else follows and we are about to go further down that road, one that we're on that we don't re-examine, we just know that it has always been that way and appears it will continue.

Dr. Sayer: Lets ask the Lake Campus what their parking fees are?

Lake Campus: One time, \$5.00 fee.

4. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Guest: Stephen Acker, OSU

Thank you. This gathering mirrors the kinds of issues we would discuss at OSU as well as the cost of textbooks. The OBR project called Collective Action is looking at ways we can work together to moderate increases in costs across a variety of areas in education that use the electronic learning environment.

Textbooks have increased in cost about 9% per year, not all due to the publisher. Each sale must last for three years of revenue. If we can distribute the cost of access to instructional materials for each student, our goal of reducing the costs of textbooks by 50% can be realized, while publishers maintain an appropriate profit margin.

We do this through a group called the National Center for Academic Transformation, which has identified that 20 introductory courses enroll 50% of the FTE students at our public institutions. If we can make an impact on those 20 courses and the methods used to teach them, we can reduce the cost of textbooks. The target courses we're beginning with are listed in the handout I provided today. Secondly, we looked at Transfer Assurance Guidelines (TAG), because the learning objectives are equivalent, and identified six areas with our goal to find two institutions that are offering courses with the textbooks identified in the handout, so that data we gather can be distributed widely across the state to test effectiveness. Our assumption is that by introducing electronic resources into these environments we will have data by next March to help us decide at what level we want to use electronic resources in all our courses. We ask that participants be willing to share this at the state level and make the

data transparent. We will work with faculty participants this summer and publishers, faculty and OBR will meet to establish teaching strategies based on faculty input. Our goal is to not only reduce material costs but also improve learning objectives. In our Introductory Statistics course at OSU, we did a study with the PEW foundation and by creating learning contracts with students and using the electronic resources, we changed the dropout rate from 20% to 12% and saved \$185,000 per year. We would like to hear what you see as the critical factors to make this succeed.

Dr. Sayer: What would you like to receive from WSU?

Dr. Acker: I would like for faculty who are currently teaching from one of the books listed to see value in participating in the process and for your library, learning and technology groups, and senior administration to recognize the value in participating and to move forward.

Senator question: Could you submit written documentation, background, and objectives of the program to the Senate?

Dr. Acker: Yes, and the letter of solicitation provided to you today included many of the characteristics of the program.

Senator question: Who is responsible for transmitting this to the departments or are you just looking for an overall endorsement from this group?

Dr. Acker: We want to bring it to the faculty teaching the courses through as many channels as possible, and I am happy to return or if you choose to take it to your departmental faculty, I am available for any questions that may come up.

Senator question: Will the departments hear about this through another channel other than this body?

Dr. Acker: We distributed information through the directors of libraries at all institutions and department chairs that we identified, but we may not have been 100% accurate with our e-mails. Additionally, we are very interested in your opinion as to if increased learning can occur at the same time materials costs are going down.

Professor Houston (guest): If the administration sees value in this, they need to recognize that some resources are required in the way of stipends, release time, printing costs, etc.

Dr. Acker: The Collective Action Project and publishers are prepared to work with the faculty to customize the material, hold summer workshops to exchange teaching strategies, etc. In some previous projects, although none of the publishers have made this commitment, there have been stipends of \$3500 but the project is not currently funded to provide release time so institutional commitment is important to make this succeed. Another condition is that those who participate be current users of the textbooks, and not transfer into the program, to avoid conflict of interest.

Guest: Susan Carrafiello, Chair, UGEC

- GE assessment is one of our charges and we have been working with coordinators from various areas. We anticipate reports will be completed around May 15, forwarded to UGEC for review, and following approval will be posted to the assessment website.
- Service learning and how we can incorporate service learning/civic engagement in the context of GE has been discussed. The committee agreed that appropriate university processes need to be in place before it can become a part of GE formally, although many courses already use service learning/civic engagement.
- Review of GE syllabi is ongoing. We have been working with Dr. Jean Edwards, the new Director of GE, to develop a timeline for reviewing GE syllabi from winter quarter.
- GE Assessment Workshop, offered by the Higher Learning Commission of the NCA, was attended by several members of UGEC. We developed an action plan to make faculty more aware of GE and are working to develop a toolbox for faculty use.
- Workshops sponsored through CUPA are being developed to discuss the perception of GE at WSU by faculty, students and staff.

5. Old Business

A. Lake Campus New Program: B.A. English – Tom Sav, Chair, UCAPC
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/lcbaeng.pdf>

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
2. Approved.

B. Proposal of (+) (-) Grading System – Maher Amer, Chair, Student Affairs Committee

A-	3.70
B+	3.30
B	3.00
B-	2.70
C+	2.30
C	2.00
C-	1.70
D+	1.30
D	1.00
F	0.00

Materials from the Chair of Student Affairs, Dr. Maher Amer, were distributed electronically one week prior to the meeting. Dr. Sayer gave an overview of the proposed grading system.

Senator Question: One comment made at the April Senate meeting was that the proposed system can lower the grades of A students and raise the grades of C students. What was the thinking in not including an A+ in this scale?

Dr. Amer: We wanted to adopt the OSU system that has been tried for an extended period and that is what we proposed.

Senator Question: If you use a 0-100 scale, what constitutes an A- or a B+ and is there going to be standardization across campus according to what those equivalencies would be?

Dr. Amer: This is up to the instructor. Currently, we use 60, 70, 80, 90. In this case, we put two steps in-between so you can lower the gap between the A and B. An 89 would be a B+, not a B; a 91 would be an A-, not an A. The difference between B+ and A- is .3. The way we saw it, and our job as the Student Affairs Committee is to put the student's affairs as our target, is that this is a more precise and fair way to assess the students. We feel students may be motivated to achieve the + grade more than raising their grade a whole letter. The proposed grading system has pros and cons but it has been used at many universities with success. We would like to give the students the opportunity to have this system. I hate to see a student get an 89, which is a B. I know of many good students who barely miss the grade but to be fair to all students, I can't give it to them. This may be encouraging to students.

Senator comment: I only had one pro and one con from RSCOB faculty. I would appreciate hearing from other colleges.

Senator comment: The English dept. had a lively debate that was split down the middle. I did hear from other COLA depts. and it was also split. However, much of the debate has been predicated on assumptions about what might happen. The Arizona State University report that was shared with us electronically had results reported on page six of the material you sent. The impact studies stated by MIT and NCSU had small but somewhat consistent effects overall on GPA. One-third of graduates at both institutions saw a small decline. At MIT, four percent saw an increase of .1 or more and almost 23% of NCSU saw an increase in their GPA. The actual data is very mixed and there is not a strong indicator that it is better to change.

Dr. Amer: There is no evidence that good students will have a decline in grades. On page seven, the tabulations indicate that with or without the + or -, you can see the difference in the second digit and I don't believe this is harmful. When a student wants to seek an advanced degree, perhaps the + will help in their admittance.

Senator comment: Where are you quoting in the report that this helps with graduate school admittance?

Dr. Amer: If you look at the impact of the + - on the chart, page seven. I'm not arguing your point. This proposal has pros and cons but we feel it would encourage students to achieve better grades. The + makes a better impression.

Senator comment: CONH discussed this at our faculty meeting with about 40 in attendance. Three abstained, four supported the proposal and the remainder were against it. Concerns were voiced that there was no A+ and D- on the proposal and that we need to give equal opportunity. The possible unknown effect on graduate school and the lowering of GPA was a concern. I'm concerned that if this is published, we're saying this is our criteria and while we say faculty have options, it becomes questionable and we're talking about academic freedom. Academic freedom does not extend to making one-person decisions that go against established protocol and practice. I believe this would give students opportunities to petition. Some of the pros were that perhaps students would work a little harder and for those students who squeaked by, giving the - would be helpful.

Senator comment: There seem to be many details we haven't addressed. Can this proposal be altered?

Dr. Sayer: A motion can be made to amend the proposal.

Senator comment: Perhaps this needs more study. Can we tentatively adopt a +/- system to try it out before having it figured into the grading system?

Dr. Sayer: You're saying that for GPA calculation we would still grade 4, 3, 2, 1, 0, but to demonstrate to students the transcript could display the +/-?

Senator comment: Yes. That is how it is done at MIT and Maryland, too. It seems to have some use for us at this point.

Dr. Sayer: We can offer that as a proposed substitute motion or you can offer a different motion to recommit the proposal to Student Affairs to study the MIT system.

Dr. Sav: Senate asked UCAPC at its April meeting to consider the proposal and it was unanimously rejected because the majority of systems we studied in UCAPC included +/3.33 and the -/6.66. You're rounding up for the - and down for the +, so it is not fair to the + student. It doesn't have a D- and most systems do. Also, without making the +/- system mandatory, problems will arise with academic freedom, petitions, and perhaps even students being able to leave University College and being accepted to other colleges. Also, retention could be a problem for students on the bubble. Don't rush into this. The SG representative on UCAPC was not aware of the negatives of a +/- grading system, just the positives, probably because they tend to be better students.

Senator comment: There seem to be issues we haven't looked at in detail. I would like to see them looked at in detail and together with UCAPC. I propose recommitting them to both committees for consideration.

Dr. Sayer: Can I accept that as a formal proposal to recommit this to both SAC and UCAPC for consideration?

Senator comment: Yes.

Dr. Sayer: Is there a second?

Senator comment: Second.

1. Moved and seconded to recommit the proposal to SAC and UCAPC for further study.
2. Approved.

6. New Business

- A. Senate Meeting Dates for 2007-08. (All meetings are on Monday at 2:45 p.m.)
October 1, 2007 March 3, 2008
November 5, 2007 April 7, 2008
January 7, 2008 May 5, 2008
February 4, 2008 June 2, 2008
*All meetings are on Monday at 2:45 p.m.
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.

- B. Doctorate of Nursing Practice (DNP) – Jay Thomas
<http://www.wright.edu/nursing/faculty/dnp.html>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.

Items C – CC are brought forth by Tom Sav, Chair, UCAPC

- C. CECS Program Change: Certificate in Object-Oriented Programming
[Renamed: Certificate in Contemporary Programming]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/certobj.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- D. CECS Program Change: Computer Science Minor for Engineers and Scientists
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/csminor.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- E. CECS Program Change: B.S. Mechanical Engineering
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/meeng.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- F. CECS Program Change: B.S. Materials Science and Engineering
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/matscieg.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- G. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Organizational Leadership
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/orglead3.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- H. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Early Childhood Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/earlycld.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- I. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Rehabilitation Services
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/rehab3.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- J. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Middle Childhood Education -- Language
Arts/Social Studies Concentration
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/midcld.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- K. RSCOB Program Change: B.S. Accountancy
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/accbs.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- L. COLA Program Change: B.A. Motion Pictures
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bamotpc.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- M. COLA Program Change: B.F.A. Motion Pictures
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bfamotpc.pdf>
1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.

- N. COLA Program Change: B.F.A. Theatre Design/Technology/Stage Management
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/thdesign.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- O. CONH Program Change: BEACON: B.S.N. Nursing
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/becon2.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- P. COSM Program Change: Biological Sciences Entrance Requirements -- B.S. and B.A. in Biological Sciences
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bioenter.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- Q. COSM Program Change: B.S. Geological Sciences -- Geological Sciences Option [Renamed: B.S. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Earth Sciences Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geoscibs.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- R. COSM Program Change: B.S. Environmental Health Sciences [Renamed: B.S. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Environmental Sciences Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/envhthbs.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- S. COSM Program Change: B.A. Geological Sciences -- Geological Sciences Option [Renamed: B.A. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Earth Sciences Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geosciba.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- T. COSM Program Change: B.A. Geological Sciences -- Earth and Space Sciences (Education) Option [Renamed: B.A. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Earth and Space Sciences (Education) Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geoesba.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- U. COSM Program Change: B.A. Geological Sciences Education -- Life Sciences/Earth Sciences (Education) Option [Renamed: B.A. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Life Sciences/Earth Sciences (Education) Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geoleba.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- V. COSM Program Change: B.A. Geological Sciences Education -- Earth Sciences/Chemistry (Education) Option [Renamed: B.A. Earth and Environmental Sciences -- Earth Sciences/Chemistry (Education) Option]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geoecba.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- W. COSM Program Change: Geological Sciences Minor [Renamed: Earth Sciences Minor]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/geominor.pdf>
- X. COSM Program Change: Environmental Health Sciences Minor [Renamed: Environmental Sciences Minor]
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/ehminor.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- Y. COSM New Program: B.S. Behavioral Neuroscience -- Option in Psychology
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/bsneuo.pdf>
 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.

- Z. COSM Program Termination: B.S. Geological Sciences -- Geophysics Option
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- AA. COSM Program Termination: B.S. Geological Sciences -- Environmental Geosciences Option
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- BB. COSM Program Termination: B.A. Geological Sciences -- Environmental Geosciences Option
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.
- CC. Academic Policy Change: Fresh Start Policy
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0007/fsreport/fresh.pdf>
 Current Fresh Start Policy:
http://www.wright.edu/academics/fhandbook/fresh_start.html
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Old Business.

7. Committee Reports

- A. See Attachment A to the April 2, 2007 Agenda.
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Apr07SenMin.pdf>

Updates:

Budget Priority – The committee just received the Personnel Funding books and next week is the budget presentation from Dr. Filipic.

Faculty Affairs – The committee has met twice since this report was written. The process of developing criteria for promotion to Senior Lecturer has progressed, and the committee members are currently seeking input from their colleagues since the list of criteria is firming up. They continue to work on the procedure and participants and will have a draft following their next meeting. The process should not be rushed so it may not be ready for the June Senate meeting.

UCAPC – The committee requests that Senate reiterate that it is the full responsibility of UCAPC, except in special circumstances, to approve all course modifications and inventories. I want everyone to be aware that all the Geology and EGL and GH courses are being changed to EES courses, via the creation of the new Department of Environmental Earth Sciences. This will impact many programs throughout the university.

Senator question: So catalog programs that say you can use Geology so-and-so as options, do the departments have to change those or will they automatically be done?

Dr. Sav: You have to tell me. Program changes have to come to the Senate, so where do we cut off the program changes? It would be reasonable to streamline this so they do not have to be brought to the Senate. But Senate must make that decision.

Dr. Sayer: That makes sense because we are talking only nomenclature, not content.

Dr. Sav: There are some content changes due to prerequisite changes.

8. Council Reports

A. Athletics Council – Mike Sincoff

The Athletic Council has met six times and we have one more meeting. The Council has:

- Modified the Student Athlete Pregnancy Policy that was first created in 2004 and was one of the first nationally. It has currently been modified to include males because of their psychological, financial and readiness issues in becoming parents. We are the first school in the nation to have policy that includes males and have requests from 66 schools for information so that they can model our policy. The DDN has interviewed both Beth Sorenson and me, and we expect an article to be published this month. ESPN has also interviewed Beth Sorenson for a program called “Between the Lines” that will air this month.
- Asked coaches, the head athletic trainer, the athletic director, and individuals experienced with strategizing and creating the Athletics Department budget to address the Athletic Council, learning that these last two entities need to be more aligned with one another.
- Heard from President Hopkins about the role the Athletics Council plays on campus, as well as the role of intercollegiate athletics.
- Had a visit from John LeCrone, Commissioner of the Horizon League, who addressed the Athletics Council about WSU’s role in the Horizon League.
- Completely overhauled the Athletic Council Constitution and Bylaws.
- Had updates on student athlete academic standings. Our student athletes had a collective GPA of 3.028 and the entire student body was 2.896. Winter quarter, student athletes collective GPA was 3.0 and the entire student body was 2.9. One hundred fifty students received certificates of academic achievement. We are graduating 73% of our student athletes in a six-year period.
- Received a report from the Gender Equity Subcommittee that we are in compliance with Title IX.
- Received a report from the Diverse Student Athlete Committee that all diverse student athletes are functioning well at WSU.
- Successfully introduced a new drug and alcohol policy.
- Appointed an ad hoc committee to consider honoring past athletes during the 40th year Anniversary Celebration.

B. Graduate Council – Jay Thomas

(A written report was distributed at the meeting.)

- The DNP is part of New Business for Senate this month.
- The OBR has met and approved the RSOCB Master of Information Systems.
- A new program for Master of Leadership Development is being developed by CEHS.

9. Announcements

President Hopkins will host a thank you reception for both new and retiring Senators following the June 4 Senate meeting.

10. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next meeting will be on Monday, June 4, 2:45 p.m., in E156 Student Union.

/pz