

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

3-3-2008

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, March 3, 2008

Follow this and additional works at: https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

(2008). Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, March 3, 2008. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/347

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 library-corescholar@wright.edu.

Faculty Senate

March 3, 2008, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Minutes of February 4, 2008**
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Feb08SenMin.pdf>
3. **Report of the University President or Provost**
4. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**
5. **Old Business**
 - A. Draft Revised Policy on Administrative Procedures for Allegations of Research Misconduct – Peter Lauf
http://www.wright.edu/rsp/misconduct_bkgd.html
 - B. COLA Program Change: B.A. Modern Languages, French – Tom Sav
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/french.pdf>
 - C. COLA Program Change: B.A. Modern Languages, Modern Languages – Tom Sav
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/modlang.pdf>
 - D. GE Program Change: Area VI CECS College Component – Tom Sav
Add: EGR 101 Introductory Mathematics for Engineering Applications
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/egr101.pdf>
6. **New Business**

Items A-K are submitted by Tom Sav, Chair, UCAPC

 - A. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybs.pdf>
 - B. COSM Program Change: B.S. Dual Major Physics and Mathematics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phymth.pdf>
 - C. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Geology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phygeo.pdf>
 - D. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Biology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybio.pdf>
 - E. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Computing Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phycomp.pdf>
 - F. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phyba.pdf>

- G. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Physics Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybal.pdf>
- H. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Physical Sciences Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybasl.pdf>
- I. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Life Sciences Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phyball.pdf>
- J. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Earth Sci/Physics Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybael.pdf>
- K. General Education Program Change: Area VI COSM College Component
Add: SM 101 Scientific Thought and Method
- L. Master of Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship – Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/Masters_Innov_Entre_Exec_Summary.pdf
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/Masters_Innov_Entre%20Full_Proposal.pdf
- M. Master of Science in Engineering (MSE) in Renewable and Clean Energy – Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/MSE_Energy_Exec_Summary.pdf
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/MSE_Energy_Full_Proposal.pdf
- N. Master of Psychology (PsyM) in Clinical Psychology – Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/Master_of_Psych_Proposal.pdf
- O. Graduate Certificate in Acute Care Pediatric Nurse Practitioner - Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/ACPNP_Graduate_Certificate.pdf

7. Written Committee Reports and Attendance (Attachment A)

- A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: Tom Sudkamp
- B. Faculty Affairs Committee: Jane Doorley
- C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav
- D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: Joe Petrick
- E. Information Technology Committee: TK Prasad
- F. Student Affairs Committee: Maher Amer
- G. Student Petitions Committee: Alan Chesen

8. Council Reports

- A. Graduate Council – Jay Thomas
Report to be distributed at the meeting.

9. Special Reports

- A. Strategic Planning Update – Robert Sweeney

10. Announcements

- A. Faculty Senate Nomination Forms for the 2008-10 term were sent electronically the weeks of February 11 and 25. They should be returned immediately.
- B. Please turn in the Lake Campus Senate meeting survey form, if you have not already done so, as planning needs to be finalized.
- C. Next Faculty Senate: April 7, 2008, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

11. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT A

Senate Committee Reports March 3, 2008

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – Tom Sudkamp

The committee is scheduled to meet with Matt Filipic and Keith Ralston on Tuesday, March 11 at 1:30 p.m. A report will be forthcoming.

Faculty Affairs Committee – Jane Doorley

No report.

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

The UCAPC Report to the Faculty Senate Meeting of March 3 is available at <http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/6fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Joe Petrick

The next University Buildings & Grounds Committee meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 25, which is after the deadline to submit reports electronically. Therefore, the B&G report will be distributed at the Senate meeting.

Information Technology Committee – TK Prasad

Members Present: T.K. Prasad (CECS), Jan Belcher (CONH), Barbara Denison (RSCOB), Larry Fox (CaTS), Kathrin Engisch (COSM), Matthew Benjamin (COLA), Chris Watson (Library), George Frey (CTL)

Others: Dave Hochstein (Lake Campus), Dan Destephen (CTL), Ben Ausdenmoore (Student), Gary Onady (SOM), Karen Wonders (CEHS), Paul Hernandez (CaTS), Stephen Foster (Library).

- A. Prasad recapped issues discussed in the past as it relates to infrastructure (Laptops, Wireless Networking, etc), software compatibility and licensing, Banner, course scheduling, Email spam, etc. The problems and suggestions from the last Faculty survey were also addressed. For instance, “cordless” devices were not common place because of security issues. Classrooms are being upgraded to be “electronic” gradually subject to financial constraints. Office 2007 is free for official use but is available for a nominal charge for personal use. There is also a “Microsoft Office Compatibility Pack for Word, Excel, and PowerPoint 2007 File Formats” available from <http://www.microsoft.com/downloads/FileFormatConverters.exe> for upgrading Office 2003.
- B. The committee again brought up the aggravating problem of email spam. CaTS is testing Spam filters. Larry Fox mentioned that a promising candidate with default opt-in may be installed as early as February 2008 if it has testers’ blessings.

- C. Switch to Windows Vista has been tentatively moved to Fall 2008 subject to overcoming compatibility problems with existing applications.
- D. CaTS HelpDesk offers basic support services for free, but can now offer more in-depth support through Home Base. Check out <http://www.wright.edu/cats/homebase/>. Wireless guest account is being considered for Internet access without WSU authentication.
- E. Chris Watson mentioned that the Library tab of WINGS has been customized for each user, based on their Department or their student/faculty status.
- F. George Frey mentioned that Slide Projectors are not being made anymore and so cannot be replaced easily. Slides cannot be straightforwardly converted into digital format given the thorny copyright issues.

In the past, CS faculty teaching lower-level classes wanted to have a standard place to find out the version numbers and update schedule in addition to the installed software. Larry Fox offered to look into it and make relevant information available at <http://www.wright.edu/cats/labs>. He also agreed to be a point of contact for IT issues.

Next Meeting: early March.

Student Affairs Committee – Maher Amer

No report.

Student Petitions Committee – Alan Chesen

No report.

**Wright State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
March 3, 2008
2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union**

1. Call to Order

Faculty President Tom Sudkamp called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m.

- | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| ✓ Allen, J. | ✓ Higgins, S. | Proulx, A. | ✓ Xue, K. |
| ✓ Baker, B. | ✓ John, J. | ✓ Rattan, K. | ✓ Zryd, T. |
| ✓ Bargerhuff, M. | ✓ Kich, M. | ✓ Ross, L. | |
| ✓ Bergdahl, J. | ✓ Lauf, P. | ✓ Schuster, R. | ✓ Sudkamp, T. |
| ✓ Dustin, J. | ✓ McGinley, S. | (Dahms, K. sub) | ✓ Hopkins, D. |
| ✓ Endres, C. | Menart, J. | ✓ Self, E. | ✓ Angle, S. |
| ✓ Engisch, K. | ✓ Mirkin, D. | ✓ Shepelak, N. | ✓ Sav, T. |
| Fowler, B. | ✓ Nagy, A. | ✓ Sincoff, M. | ✓ Zambenini, P.
(Staff) |
| ✓ Goldfinger, M. | ✓ Norris, M. | ✓ Tarpey, T. | |
| ✓ Hershberger, P. | ✓ Pohlman, R. | ✓ Wenning, M. | |

2. Approval of Minutes of February 4, 2008

Minutes were approved as written.

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Feb08SenMin.pdf>

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

- We are pleased that Dr. Jim Sayer has accepted the position of Dean of the Lake Campus following a national search.
- Barack Obama was on campus last week. Many of our students were a part of the approximately 10,000 people in attendance. The Nutter Center is open to all political candidates.
- Dayton will be the recipient of \$600,000 in state funding to develop a STEM school initially to be located on or near Wright State University's campus. The Dayton Regional STEM School will offer a highly advanced curriculum for grades 6-12, designed to help students from Clark, Greene and Montgomery counties gain the skills needed to succeed in higher education and in the global economy. Thanks to the many faculty and staff here on campus who helped achieve this.

4. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

- The committee discussed a draft policy on giving faculty review and input to proposed name changes to academic units. There will be an upcoming meeting with several deans about the proposed policy.
- The Executive Committee discussed ways to get the entire campus involved in the review of Wright State's free speech and freedom of expression documents. It was suggested that this could possibly be a theme for the upcoming academic year and incorporated into campus seminars, the Presidential Lecture Series, and honors talks to explore the idea. We met with many groups on campus with much interest expressed and will work towards developing documents on the topic.

- Dr. Lillie Howard reported at the January Senate meeting on the Voluntary System of Accountability and addressed some of the implications of implementing the VSA, including tests needed to measure student's preparedness as well as exit tests. Today we will ask you to confirm a VSA Study Group as a subcommittee of the UCAPC, requesting a suspension of the rules for approval today, as this committee needs to begin work immediately in preparation for the fall.

5. Old Business

- A. Draft Revised Policy on Administrative Procedures for Allegations of Research Misconduct – Peter Lauf http://www.wright.edu/rsp/misconduct_bkgd.html
Amendments to the policy were distributed via e-mail prior to the meeting with a hard copy distributed at the meeting. (See Attachment A.)
1. Moved and Seconded to bring the policy to the floor for discussion.
 2. Moved and Seconded to accept the amendments to the policy (Attachment A).

Discussion ensued as to accept or not accept the amended policy.

Senator Comment: The document was shared with my colleagues in COSM with much feedback. The document has many highly objectionable aspects to our faculty, many of whom are research personnel. The difficulty is that by accepting federal monies, federal regulations must also be accepted and they are stringent. One of our foremost objections is that upon receipt of an allegation, laboratory facilities would be searched and materials sequestered and the inquiry would begin. We believe this is draconian and tyrannical. However, we are powerless because of the CFR.

I have six points that I would suggest as possible amendments to the policy.

- Legal Counsel – it violates two federal guidelines: the Fourteenth Amendment (the right to due process) and the Miranda ruling, which stipulates the right to remain silent and the right to an attorney (provided for you if you cannot afford one.) Counsel must be provided at the university's expense.
- Faculty are unaware that these regulations exist and absolutely must be trained as to how to respond to an allegation. I propose that every department be informed of the procedures so faculty may learn how to prepare for an allegation by preparing research notebooks, written in layman's terms. This allows them to immediately raise a defense because with this policy, they are assumed guilty.
- The role of the Research Integrity Officer was widely detested as it opens up that person for liable if he is ever wrong. No one person can be an expert in every area. I suggest that the RIO position be replaced by a standing committee of the faculty, which includes elected individuals as well as outside consultants. Their role would be to perform the job of the RIO. This is consistent with CFR 93.306.
- Allegations must be in writing. If the complainant does not have the perspicacity to present their argument in writing, they are essentially frivolous.
- The document has three phases of activity. Each one should have a committee of thoughtful experts to provide a careful assessment of the allegations. Again, liability insurance must be provided to faculty members.
- An investigation cannot be open-ended and must be very specific. Double indemnity must not be brought into the process and the investigation's scope must be limited to the allegations brought to the committee.

I want to emphasize that we do not want to get rid of a research misconduct procedure. We have to have it. While government regulations are stringent, there is

room for modification. I hope we will be able to create a document that gives restrictions to the CFR to some degree and is fair and judicious.

Dr. Lauf: I will address a few of the comments. The committee had about six universities in the region that we consulted with. Some are strict and others are more abbreviated. We have tried to present a shortened version. I do not know how this will be incorporated with CITI and Bill Sellers can answer that better. It will be addressed and made available to anyone during orientation meetings.

Senator Comment: In response to the Miranda comment, the scope of Miranda pertains to criminal charges brought by the state and is not applicable to WSU's Research Misconduct Policy.

Senator Comment: That is not true. It is a general guideline.

Senator Comment: I feel the document is unacceptable as written but would only require some minor changes. First, because the consequences of having an allegation brought forth are so dire, such as having your lab confiscated and shut down, that step should not be the responsibility of a single person but a committee of experts. The decision to go forward should be based on the assessment of this committee. Secondly, the respondent should be able to make copies of research notebooks at the time they are sequestered. Section 93.305 of the CFR states that where appropriate, the respondent should be given copies of, or reasonable, supervised access to the research records. That does not exist in our current document, as it is missing that line. It is acceptable for the committee to do the first step and is also in the model document. Page four contains a comment that a multi-campus institution or an institution with several large research components may wish to delegate these functions to more than one individual. For these reasons, I would not vote to accept the current document, but ask that these changes be made.

Senator Comment: The document reads as though the respondent is guilty until proven innocent. There are protections for the claimant but not for the respondent. They are both three-stage policies but in the second stage of the old policy, the stated purpose was to determine if the allegations were serious, frivolous or ill founded. The second stage in the new policy involves sequestration of data and equipment from the laboratory and the charges are taken very seriously. My colleagues would like to see evaluation of the charges before the sequestration stage, so that someone making nuisance charges couldn't trigger the process for reasons not in good faith. This is a significant difference in the policies. Thirdly, I also received input from colleagues that the first stage should include input from experts in the field to determine if there is actually a problem. The main point is that some of the protections for the accused in the old policy don't appear in the new policy, and there would be significant improvement if we could add these things and define the assessment stage more clearly. In the new policy, assessment lasts only one week and the RIO does not interview anyone before proceeding to the inquiry phase, which seems like a hair-trigger reaction.

Senator Comment: I agree that an oral allegation is absolutely unacceptable to include as part of the policy and procedures, whether implicit or explicit. I agree that we need a committee to handle the assessment phase, rather than putting it on one individual. There are several points in the document that can be considered more carefully. In our current policy, under the procedure for reporting and investigating alleged research misconduct, it states, "The guiding principal in processing an initial allegation is to protect the rights and reputation of all parties involved, including the accused and individual or individuals who in good faith report perceived misconduct." I was saddened that this was not included in the new policy and feel that the term "all parties" includes the university. In addition to the individuals involved, Wright State

suffers if allegations become known to the public. Additionally, in 2101.5e, Protecting the Respondent, it states, "As requested and is appropriate, the RIO and other institutional officials shall make all reasonable and practical efforts to protect or restore the reputation of persons alleged to have engaged in research misconduct." Does the phrase "as requested" imply that an individual has to ask to have their reputation protected? That should go without saying. This also appears a second time in the document in 2101.13c. Finally, allegations that are not made in good faith should be dealt with explicitly in the document, as it is part of the procedure of dealing with allegations of research misconduct. The current policy states, "In this context, if the committee believes that the allegations of misconduct were malicious, reckless, or intentionally dishonest, the allegations will be investigated and regarded with the same seriousness as misconduct in research itself. An ad hoc committee shall be established by the chief research officer to investigate the charges." That language does not appear in the document that we are considering for adoption today.

Dr. Sudkamp: Is it necessary to have written complaints or are we allowed to ignore oral complaints? What does the law say?

Dr. Bantle: In Section 93.201 of the federal regulations, allegations may be either written or oral. I have called the office of research integrity on this several times and in both cases, I was adamantly told that an oral accusation is as good as a written accusation. I don't believe this issue is on the table. I would prefer to have the accusation in writing. I have essentially tried to do that, even taking oral testimony down in writing and asking for a signature. In one case they signed it and in another they refused. An allegation in writing is actionable but I'm left guessing if it is oral. Regarding education, we agree that there will be an intensive educational program, where we not only provide a short informational document but also a yearly training program for faculty, staff and students. Be assured, we will spend a great deal of time educating people. As the Research Integrity Officer, there is no substitute for experience and I have dealt with five cases and have been to the Office of Research Integrity training sessions in Washington, and receive updated materials regularly. Regarding committees, we have an inquiry committee and an investigatory committee. At the assessment phase, I am not working alone but with the Provost, Bill Sellers and the Office of Research Integrity. The idea of assessment is to decide if the allegation fits the definition of research misconduct that is in fact research. In two of the cases I was involved with, the allegations did not fit the definition. Remember, at any time, the Office of Research Integrity can begin an investigation and also take control of our investigation. This document stops at discipline and leaves that to the university. Similarly, the Office of Research Integrity and the sponsoring federal agency can impose their own discipline, regardless of what decision WSU makes. With regard to having a committee at the assessment phase, I have one week to complete this and it is important to keep the number of people involved small for confidentiality purposes. I have used the cabinet staff to aid me. Regarding malicious statements, I immediately go to legal counsel for consultation. I do look for evidence of malicious intent and consult the Office of Research Integrity for their definition, working to keep them informed because they can throw out what I have done. Essentially, I keep them informed, ask pertinent questions and keep a written record of their decisions. It is very complex. I'm not sure a committee at the assessment phase is good. I have a window of time to pick up the data and if we are searching for evidence of wrong-doing, we would not want that person to have time to alter or destroy data or materials. I must act quickly and the inquiry committee is the first step to decide if it is necessary to move forward. In terms of restoring

reputations, confidentiality is the best way of doing that, as well as explaining to the involved parties the findings and results. We make a conscious effort to clear names and an important part of that is to not let an investigation go too long. Time limits are important if we can get the work done.

Senator Comment: Does this policy apply only to people who have PHS funding?

Dr. Bantle: No, it applies to everyone.

Senator Comment: The second page implies it applies only to biomedical and behavior research. Does this replace the old policy?

Dr. Bantle: Yes, it does, and we've been told that our old one is no longer appropriate and must be replaced. We must also send the new policy to the federal government for approval. Also, as part of our compliance efforts, we must give a yearly report of every incident on campus.

Senator Comment: Where were the cases you described?

Dr. Bantle: Two were at Oklahoma State, one at Ohio University, and two at Wright State University.

Senator Comment: One of the reasons for adding detail to the document is to provide safety to the process. We need a document to ensure the careful consideration you would give, if you were not here. The objective is not to doubt your abilities. Weren't the cases you dealt with all in science?

Dr. Bantle: All but one.

Senator Comment: So if there were an allegation of research misconduct regarding poetry, would it be difficult for you to deal with?

Dr. Bantle: This is why I have both inquiry and investigatory committees, and I am very careful to appoint people who have the necessary expertise.

Senator Comment: For a scholar, this is very frightening. Wouldn't it be nice to avoid this upset totally? Also, you must have seen situations where the interpretation as to whether something was research misconduct or not was questionable. There is nothing in the guidelines to provide an opportunity for an investigator to correct an error.

Dr. Bantle: We have more than one layer. There is assessment. If it goes on to inquiry, there is a small committee working fast which could override my rulings. Even then, it moves on to the investigation committee, which is larger. Then, there is an appeals process. There are multiple layers where mistakes can be corrected.

Senator Comment: All of those are advisory. Based on your experience, is it not possible for these decisions to be made by a consensus vote of the committee...

Dr. Bantle: They do that.

Senator Comment: ...rather than have the decision officer be the ultimate source; who can either accept or reject a committee's opinions?

Dr. Bantle: According to federal regulations, it has to be an executive.

Senator Comment: But couldn't the executive's decision be based solely on the committee's decision?

Dr. Bantle: Once again, they have multiple levels of input; the complainant's initial response, the respondent's response, the inquiry and investigatory committees, plus my recommendation. A deciding official has a plethora of information at their disposal.

Senator Comment: Do you think it is important that the deciding officer be allowed to ignore all that information?

Dr. Bantle: Then we have appeals, courts, and other things. I am required to notify the agency it has gone to the investigatory phase and they may make decisions on their own.

Senator Comment: Do you think that criteria for research that is not federally funded should be applied and that procedures need to be different?

Dr. Bantle: I can't see two sets of laws or procedures to govern people's activities.

Senator Comment: Is there any reason why research that is not funded by federal funds be assessed under the terms of the policy?

Dr. Bantle: I believe applying different policies to different people could be problematic in court. This is my personal opinion.

Senator Comment: My only comment is about the lack of a committee at the first stage. When that stage goes forward, it is a big deal. To say there is a committee that can decide if the accusations are accurate – it is too late then, your reputation is already destroyed.

Dr. Bantle: Not true. It should be confidential all the way through the inquiry.

Senator Comment: But once a group of people comes to confiscate your notebooks, everyone can see that.

Dr. Bantle: I understand, but at the same time, if you have a committee at the first part, you already start to widen the circle of who knows about it.

Senator Comment: If you convene a committee without telling them who is involved, and major action occurs immediately upon the committee finishing, there is no way to disseminate the information. If they decide to move forward, documents are confiscated immediately.

Dr. Bantle: Are you saying that we keep everything confidential from the committee?

Senator Comment: Yes, at least about who is involved.

Dr. Bantle: It would have to be a standing committee and they would have to be trained extensively, similar to my training. It would need to be a long-serving committee. Could I get a standing committee together fast enough? I'm not sure.

Senator Comment: My comments don't pertain to the merits of the argument but with how we go forward. Our Senator colleagues are representing many more of our colleagues who have expressed significant differences with the policy. A vote is "iffy" at this point, until there is a mechanism to address the objections. We may not agree on the outcome, but I would like to see the objections on paper and the concerns addressed before I am comfortable voting on the policy.

Dr. Angle: Dr. Bantle, what are the time constraints on reaching a decision and getting the policy passed? We want to do this quickly but we wanted to consult with others. Dr. Lauf's committee has really added to the process, but there are other issues. Can we put off making a decision?

Dr. Bantle: Originally the Office of Research Integrity was leaning on us strenuously, but we have not heard from them recently. We made the choice to let the process go forward here, as it needed to. I feel we have a little more time. I would like to make sure all the issues are on the table so that more don't continue to surface.

Dr. Sudkamp: We have some choices since it is on the table. We can vote on it as it stands, it can be amended, or it can be tabled. Amendments should be well documented and written out precisely and from our discussion, we don't have that. If we were to table it for further consideration, I recommend that those people wishing to have amendments considered would submit those in writing to Dr. Lauf's committee, and that they consider them both with the law and the effect on the policy. We can consider them one-by-one as formal amendments in Senate.

Senator Comment: We can all agree that this is serious. I don't believe we have really gotten the faculty's opinion and we see that there are objections as well as good ideas. Can we consider that Senators return to their departments for review and then perhaps those can be presented to a new committee? We want to be

assured that faculty are aware of the policy. The changes are significant and perhaps other documents would emerge.

Senator Comment: I'm comfortable waiting another month to look at the policy. I would be concerned about delaying too long with going back to the colleges, forming another committee, etc. Voting today is too fast, remanding it to another committee would be too slow.

Dr. Sudkamp: The feeling I'm getting is that our concern is not only the policy, but how to address the suggestions. We don't want to rush, but address amendments in a reasonable amount of time without starting from scratch, as the issues are critical. We can table the policy, recommit it to the committee or vote today. The guidance as to how to move forward isn't what we're voting on.

Senator Comment: I move that we table the motion and send it back to the committee to collect information from those with concerns, outline those concerns and how they would address it in new language, and where they would put it in the new document.

Dr. Sudkamp: We have a motion to table the item. Is there a Second?

Senator Comment: Second.

1. Moved and Seconded to Table Item A until the April meeting, when an updated policy can be resubmitted for consideration.
 2. Approved to Table Item A.
- B. COLA Program Change: B.A. Modern Languages, French – Tom Sav
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/french.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Approve.
 2. Approved.
- C. COLA Program Change: B.A. Modern Languages, Modern Languages – Tom Sav
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/modlang.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Approve.
 2. Approved.
- D. GE Program Change: Area VI CECS College Component – Tom Sav
Add: EGR 101 Introductory Mathematics for Engineering Applications
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/egr101.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Approve.
 2. Approved.

6. New Business

- A. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybs.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- B. COSM Program Change: B.S. Dual Major Physics and Mathematics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phyath.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- C. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Geology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phygeo.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- D. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Biology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybio.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- E. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Computing Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phycomp.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

- F. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phyba.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- G. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Physics Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybal.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- H. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Physical Sciences Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybasl.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- I. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Life Sciences Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phyball.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- J. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Earth Sci/Physics Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybael.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- K. General Education Program Change: Area VI COSM College Component
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/sm101.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- L. Master of Engineering Innovation and Entrepreneurship – Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/Masters_Innov_Entre_Exec_Summary.pdf
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/Masters_Innov_Entre%20Full_Proposal.pdf
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- M. Master of Science in Engineering (MSE) in Renewable & Clean Energy – Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/MSE_Energy_Exec_Summary.pdf
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/MSE_Energy_Full_Proposal.pdf
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- N. Master of Psychology (PsyM) in Clinical Psychology – Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/Master_of_Psych_Proposal.pdf
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- O. Graduate Certificate in Acute Care Pediatric Nurse Practitioner - Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/ACPNP_Graduate_Certificate.pdf
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

A motion was called and approved to suspend the rules and add new agenda item, Voluntary System of Accountability Study Group, for approval today. This group is an ad hoc committee that will operate as a subcommittee of UCAPC. Creation of the new, ad hoc subcommittee was approved by voice vote.

7. Committee Reports

- A. See Attachment A to the March 3, 2008 Senate Agenda.
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/Mar08SenAgn.pdf>

8. Council Reports

- A. Graduate Council – Jay Thomas
A report was distributed at the meeting.

9. Special Reports

- A. Strategic Planning Update – Robert Sweeney
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/SPCFacSen3-08.ppt>

10. Announcements

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m. The next meeting will be on Monday, April 7, 2:45 p.m., in E156 Student Union.

/pz

ATTACHMENT A

March 4, 2008

To: Faculty Senators

Topic: Additional wording change to the proposed Research Misconduct Policy

For clarity, the AAUP-WSU and the University are in agreement that the following substitution is in order.

Please DELETE the following paragraph: (page 8, paragraph 3)

€ Be able to consult either (1) be accompanied and represented by with legal Counsel (at the respondent's own expense) and/or (2) be accompanied and represented by a personal representative or (3) be accompanied by and consult with a representative of the AAUP-WSU provided the respondent is a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member [options 1 through 3 are mutually exclusive] at any stage of an assessment, inquiry, or investigation; and to be notified of this right prior to any interview or meeting (at which the respondent will be present) that occurs as a part of the processes delineated in this policy;

Please put the following in its place:

€ Be accompanied and represented by either legal counsel (at the respondent's own expense) or a personal representative at any stage of an assessment, inquiry, or investigation. In addition, a Bargaining Unit Faculty Member can be accompanied by and consult with a representative of the AAUP-WSU at any stage of an assessment, inquiry, or investigation. The respondent must be notified of the above rights before the first interview or meeting (at which the respondent will be present) that occurs as a part of the processes delineated in this policy;