

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

4-7-2008

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, April 7, 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, April 7, 2008. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/348

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

April 7, 2008, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

We hope you will plan to attend the Wall of Academic Pioneers Dedication Ceremony and Reception, from 1:30 – 2:45 p.m., in the Pathfinder Lounge of the Student Union, prior to the April 7 Senate meeting.

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Minutes of March 3, 2008**
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Mar08SenMin.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
3-29-08 revised policy http://www.wright.edu/rsp/Misconduct_Policy_proposed.doc
 - Items B – L are submitted by Tom Sav
 - B. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybs.pdf>
 - C. COSM Program Change: B.S. Dual Major Physics and Mathematics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phymth.pdf>
 - D. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Geology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phygeo.pdf>
 - E. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Biology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybio.pdf>
 - F. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Computing Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phycomp.pdf>

- G. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phyba.pdf>
- H. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Physics Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybal.pdf>
- I. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Physical Sciences Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybasl.pdf>
- J. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Life Sciences Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phyball.pdf>
- K. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Earth Sci/Physics Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybael.pdf>
- L. General Education Program Change: Area VI COSM College Component
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/sm101.pdf>
- M. 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
- N. Master of Science in Egr. (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
- O. Master of Psychology (PsyM) in Clinical Psychology – Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/Master_of_Psych_Proposal.pdf
- P. Graduate Certificate in Acute Care Pediatric Nurse Practitioner - Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/ACPNP_Graduate_Certificate.pdf

6. New Business

Items A - B are submitted by Jane Doorley and Carole Endres

- A. Promotion to Senior Lecturer Policy (Attachment A)
- B. Transitional Provision for Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee (Attachment B)

Items C – I are submitted by Tom Sav

- C. LC Program Change: Associate of Applied Business Graphic Design and Visual Media
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcgraph.pdf>
- D. LC Program Change: Associate of Applied Science: Financial Management
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcfinmgt.pdf>
- E. LC Program Change: Associate of Science: Business Administration
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcbusadm.pdf>
- F. LC New Program (Option): Associate of Technical Studies: Law Enforcement Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lclawenf.pdf>
- G. LC New Program (Option): Associate of Technical Studies: Management Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcmgt.pdf>
- H. LC New Program (Option): Associate of Technical Studies: Marketing Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcmkt.pdf>
- I. LC New Program: Associate of Arts: Criminal Justice
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lccjust.pdf>

7. **Written Committee Reports and Attendance** (Attachment C)
 - 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**

None.

9. **Special Reports**

None.

10. **Announcements**
 - A. Nominations, including self-nominations, for Faculty President-Elect (2008-09) are being accepted through Friday, April 11, 2008. Qualifications for the office of Faculty President are stated in the Faculty Constitution located at:
<http://www.wright.edu/academics/fhandbook/>

The following is applicable via Provost Memorandum No. 82-3, May 1, 1982:
“The President of the Faculty shall have a two course, or two-third, reduction in his or her full-time teaching load during the Fall, Winter, and Spring Quarters of his or her term of office. The President Elect of the Faculty shall have a one course, or one-third, reduction in his or her full-time teaching load for the Spring Quarter of his or her term of office.”

 - B. Next Faculty Senate: May 5, 2008, 2:45 p.m.
The May meeting will be held at the Lake Campus with transportation and refreshments provided. For those Senators who have not committed to travel to the Lake Campus, the Senate meeting will be broadcast to you at the regular time in E156, Student Union.

11. **Adjournment**

ATTACHMENT A

Policies and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

This policy applies to Lecturers who are eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

I. Definitions

- A. The **Promotion Document** is the information that the candidate seeking promotion submits to the department chair summarizing his or her case for promotion. It consists of the following items:
1. The candidate review statement (Appendix A)
 2. Evidence of outstanding teaching and service during the candidate's career at Wright State University
 - a. Annual performance evaluations for at least the six most recent years as a Lecturer
 - b. Optional additional evidence of outstanding teaching and service
 3. Evidence of leadership during the candidate's career at Wright State University
 - a. List of leadership activities, including dates
 - b. At least two internal or external letters of support that speak directly to the value of the candidate's leadership contributions
 - c. Other optional evidence of leadership
 4. Other items that may be required or suggested by approved college criteria (see Section II.C)
- B. The **Promotion File** consists of the Promotion Document and the following items that are added during the review process.
1. A written statement of the department chair
 2. The form shown in Appendix B used to record votes and recommendations
 3. A record of the College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee's vote and recommendation
 4. The recommendation of the college dean made in consultation with the provost
 5. Rebuttals and supporting material (if any) filed by the candidate
- C. **Senior Lecturer Promotion Committees** are composed of Senior Lecturers and tenured faculty members who review promotion cases at the college level and make recommendations to the college dean.

II. Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

- A. To be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, a Lecturer must have served six years at the Lecturer rank and during that time have demonstrated a record of:
1. Sustained outstanding performance in teaching and service, as defined in Section B, below.
 2. Leadership within the university, the discipline and/or the community as described in Section C, below. Evidence of the candidate's leadership may come from any time during his or her academic career but must include leadership contributions while a Lecturer at Wright State University.

B. Teaching and Service

Outstanding teaching and service are documented by annual performance evaluations and other available evidence as needed or desired. Teaching and service are evaluated according to criteria governing Lecturers in the departments and the colleges. The amount of recent teaching may be limited, and effective completion of administrative responsibilities may be substituted for service work expected of non-administrative faculty.

C. Leadership

Leadership in teaching, service and scholarship includes either **major initiatives** with substantial and ongoing impact, five or more **significant leadership contributions that form a pattern of continuing engagement**, or an equivalent combination of the two. In addition, individual colleges may develop alternative criteria appropriate to the work in their disciplines. Such criteria for approval must be approved by the Dean of the college, the University Faculty Affairs committee, and the Provost.

The following lists are illustrative only and are intended as a guide to determine whether an individual faculty member has met the requirements for promotion to Senior Lecturer. One item from the **major initiatives** list might in itself be sufficient to confirm the individual's leadership or might only be sufficient if combined with two to four of the items from the **significant leadership contributions** list. Similarly, all items on the lists will not be of equal value. Some factors that might impact the value are:

- The impact of the effort expended,
- The relative prestige (of awards, publications, etc.), or
- The differing levels of responsibility.

The candidate's combined activity and achievement must be of high quality, must exceed routinely assigned teaching and service, and must include demonstrated leadership.

1. **Major initiatives** with substantial and ongoing impact include the following types of activities or the equivalent:
 - Developing and sustaining a study abroad experience for students,
 - Obtaining substantial internal or external funding or grant monies,
 - Spearheading a major university project,
 - Coordinating a major campus event involving several units within the university and continuing for multiple years,
 - Advising a significant organization or student activity that results in regional and/or national recognition,
 - Developing and editing a professional periodical,
 - Writing and publishing a text book or ancillary materials adopted by multiple universities;
 - Writing and publishing a scholarly book, article or discipline specific publication.
2. **Significant leadership contributions** should include a *variety* of the following types of activities or the equivalent:
 - Developing a new course;
 - Developing internships or service learning courses, projects and partnerships;
 - Advising an Honors project;
 - Obtaining moderate internal or external funding or grant monies;
 - Providing formal and substantial faculty mentoring;
 - Promoting student success through documented initiation of innovative strategies or a superior commitment to student advising;
 - Receiving a university honor or recognition;
 - Directing/coordinating a college or department program;
 - Effectively chairing an active college or university committee;
 - Actively serving on a college or university committee that is highly active and productive;
 - Coordinating a college, campus or community event or a policy or process change within the college;
 - Promoting alumni relations or engaging in fundraising
 - Exercising leadership that draws on professional expertise outside the university
 - Receiving a community honor or recognition;
 - Holding an office in a professional or community organization;
 - Effectively chairing a major government or community board;
 - Effectively serving on a major government or community board that is highly active and productive;

- Providing professional consultation to community groups, government agencies or businesses;
- Presenting a competitively selected scholarly paper or serving as a reviewer in the competitive selection of scholarly work;
- Guest editing a professional journal.

III. Participants in Decisions of Promotion to Senior Lecturer

All grants of promotion to Senior Lecturer are made by the Wright State University Board of Trustees based on review and recommendations from the following committees and individuals.

- A.** The candidate's department chair
- B.** A College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee consisting of the dean as a non-voting member and five voting members
 1. Three of the voting members will be of Senior Lecturer rank and will be elected by the college's fulltime, non-tenure track faculty. A college that does not have sufficient Senior Lecturers may staff the committee by first electing Senior Lecturers from another college. When that is not possible, substitutes may be elected from among the tenured faculty within the college. Each substitute must be from a different department.
 2. Two of the voting members will be members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, chosen by that committee.
 3. The voting members of the committee will elect a chair from among the members.
- C.** The candidate's dean
- D.** The provost
- E.** The university president

IV. Procedures for Granting Promotion to Senior Lecturer

To initiate the Promotion Process, a faculty member must submit the Promotion Document to the department chair by October 1. The document becomes part of the candidate's Promotion File and may not be altered after the candidate has submitted it, without permission of the candidate and the department chair. Once the promotion process has begun, only the candidate may terminate the process. To do so, the candidate must submit written notice of withdrawal to the dean, who will then convey this information as appropriate.

- A.** By November 1, the Department Chair will review the Promotion Document and prepare a letter recommending for or against the promotion. The letter will be added to the candidate's Promotion File. The candidate will have twenty (20) working days to add a rebuttal letter to the file.
- B.** By February 1, the College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee will review the candidate's file and make its written recommendation. If the Committee reviews materials that are not part of the individual's promotion file, the chair of that committee will promptly make such materials available to the candidate. The Promotion Document cannot be altered after it has been voted on by the College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee.
- C.** The college dean will inform the candidate promptly of the decision and vote of the College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee. The candidate will have ten (10) working days to add a rebuttal letter to the file.
- D.** By March 15, the college dean in consultation with the provost will review the file and prepare a letter recommending for or against the promotion. The college dean will inform the candidate promptly of the decision and provide the candidate access to his or her file, which will include the department chair and dean recommendations and the Committee's recommendation and vote.
- E.** By March 31, the provost will forward all recommendations for promotion to Senior Lecturer to the university president for consideration and recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees announces all promotions.

If the candidate disagrees with any of the statements or conclusions in the file, the candidate may submit a letter of rebuttal and supporting evidence at the points in the process indicated above. In addition, the candidate may use a rebuttal to report the acceptance or publication of a work of printed scholarship and/or the awarding of a grant or honor listed in the Document as under consideration. The rebuttal letter(s) and supporting evidence will be added to the candidate's promotion file and will be given full consideration at all subsequent stages of the promotion process. The candidate has the right to view the promotion file at any time during the process and after its completion.

Appendix A

Candidate Review Statement

The Candidate Review Statement specifies items to be included in the Promotion Document

Name of Candidate: _____

Department and College: _____

I hereby submit these materials as my Promotion Document in support of my candidacy for Senior Lecturer. My Promotion Document consists of the following:

Candidate Review Statement (Appendix A)

Candidate Curriculum Vitae

Evidence of outstanding teaching and service

- Annual performance evaluations for the past six years
- Other optional materials

Evidence of leadership

- List of leadership activities, including dates
- At least two internal or external letters of support that speak directly to the value of the candidate's leadership contributions
- Other optional materials

Any other items that may be required or suggested by colleges

Signature of Candidate

Date

Appendix B

Record of Promotion Votes and Recommendations

Name of Candidate: _____

Dept. and College: _____

Date Appointed as Lecturer: _____

Type of Action: Promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer

Record of Actions	Recommendation		Vote	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Department Chair				
College Committee				
Dean's recommendation				

College Committee

Name

Name

Name

Name

Name

ATTACHMENT B

Transitional Provision for College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee

Since there will be no senior lecturers for the first year that the policy is operational (2008-2009), the promotion committee will be comprised as follows:

A College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee will include five voting members: three tenured faculty members elected by the college's Non-Bargaining Unit Faculty and two faculty members chosen by and from the College Promotion and Tenure Committee.

The dean of the college will serve as a non-voting member of the Committee.

For at least five years, the Faculty Affairs Committee will review the Senior Lecturer Promotion process and make recommendations for changes, if needed.

ATTACHMENT C

Senate Committee Reports April 7, 2008

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – Tom Sudkamp

The Committee met on Tuesday, March 11 with Provost Steven Angle, Dr. Matt Filipic and Keith Ralston. Items of discussion included efficiency initiatives, an overview of the university's current financial situation, and NCA Self Study Data on Faculty FTE (tenured/non-tenured/adjunct). The full minutes are available at: <http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/documents/FBPmin3-08.doc>

Faculty Affairs Committee – Jane Doorley/Carole Endres

Present: Lisa Elcik, Carole Endres, Linda Lester, Sarah McGinley, Maggie Veres

The Faculty Affairs Committee met on Tuesday March 18th. The committee met with Bill Rickert to discuss the Policies and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer policy which will be entered as new business at the April 8, 2008 meeting of the senate. Since there will be no senior lecturers in the first year of the policy, we are also bringing forth a transitional statement that will be used to select the promotion committee for the 2008-2009 academic year.

Some of you may recall that the senate approved the Appointment, Promotion and Termination of Faculty in Non-tenure Track Positions policy on January 8, 2007. This policy established the rank of Senior Lecturer. The policy before you today is an extension of that policy which establishes the guidelines for being promoted to Senior Lecturer.

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

The UCAPC Report to the Faculty Senate Meeting of April 7 is available at <http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/7fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Joe Petrick

Minutes of February 25, 2008, 12:30 – 2:30 p.m., 110 Rike Hall

Committee Members in Attendance: Joseph Petrick, Chair, James Amon, Huntting Brown, Vicky Davidson, Jeff Gardner, Cynthia King, Yi-Hui Lee, Richelle O'Connor, Arnab Shaw, William Taylor

Meeting Purpose: Joseph Petrick opened the meeting by pointing to its primary purpose: to facilitate more cross-functional campus sharing of information regarding opportunities for improvement in addressing buildings and grounds issues.

University Buildings & Grounds Stakeholder Survey Detailed Analysis: James Amon provided a detailed analysis of specific questions from the 2007 University Building and Grounds survey. See the full analysis at:

Office of the Registrar Room Scheduling Update: Jeff Gardner provided a detailed update on the following topics: increased demand for computer labs; wireless access to Internet not available for teaching in some classrooms; requested conversion of 495 Millett to office space by Dean Taylor; moving classrooms out of less desirable classroom spaces; moving classrooms when capacity caps are exceeded; furniture movement between classrooms; and Ad Astra optimization. In addition, he provided statistic on campus wide classroom utilization and latest figures on Rike Hall space utilization.

Opportunities for sharing information among the Office of the Registrar and other campus functional representatives on the committee were discussed.

WSU University Sustainability & AASHE: Huntting Brown, the new WSU Director of Sustainability, offered an update on WSU's sustainability efforts and discussed the importance of WSU membership in the American Association for Sustainability in Higher Education (AASHE) for addressing buildings and grounds' issues.

Opportunities for sharing information among the Office of the Director of Sustainability and other campus functional representatives on the committee were discussed.

Campus Transportation Alternatives: Richele O'Connor and Ed Gemin discussed one campus sustainability activity - expanding campus initiatives and resources related to the use of bicycles on campus by all stakeholders. Options discussed included: storing bikes, which does not include a lot of bike racks, also a sheltered pedestrian bridge over crosswalk locations; assessment and improvement of current bike paths. The student representative, Will Taylor, expressed some student interest in pursuing this option.

Opportunities for sharing information among the Office of the Director of Sustainability, the WSU Student Government and other campus functional representatives on the committee were discussed.

Meeting Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm.

Information Technology Committee – TK Prasad

Minutes of March 4, 2008 Meeting

Members Present: Barbara Denison (RSCOB), Gary Onady (SOM), Larry Fox (CaTS), Kathrin Engisch (COSM), T.K. Prasad (CECS), Jan Belcher (CONH), Matthew Benjamin (COLA), Dave Hochstein (Lake Campus), Karen Wonders (CEHS)
Ex-officio: Dan Destephen (CTL), Paul Hernandez (CaTS), Stephen Foster (Library), Ben Ausdenmoore (Student)
Others: Chris Watson (Library)

- A. The committee revisited the email spam issue. Larry Fox mentioned that a promising spam filter with default opt-out policy will be installed next quarter (Spring 2008).
- B. CaTS folks (Mary Clem, Jim Rohrer) visited CECS last Friday for a brief presentation on IT Security. (<http://www.wright.edu/cats/security/>)
- C. Explicit authentication will be required when connecting to the network after rebooting the system. This will be instituted in phases. (For laptops and residence halls computer, periodic (re-) authentication is already in effect.)
- D. Computers are being scanned by CaTS to determine vulnerabilities. The growing targeted attacks with specific exploits are making it difficult to respond before damage is done and loopholes patched.

Next Meeting: April - last week

Student Affairs Committee – Maher Amer

No report.

Student Petitions Committee – Alan Chesen

The university petitions committee met this morning to consider routine business concerning petitions submitted by undergraduate students. We were unable to meet on 2/22 due to the closure of the university. We saw no need to reschedule that meeting with another meeting so close at hand.

Present were:

Alan Chesen: RSCOB, Chair
Joe Deer: COLA
Brent Campbell: Lake Campus
Pat Caprio: University College
Joyce Howes: COSM
Debbie Hess: CEHS
Dick Rathbun for Bin Wang: CECS
James McCauley: Student
Joyce Hail: Registrar's Office (ex-officio)
Patti Mohr: Registrar's Office (ex-officio)
Diana Atkins: Registrar's Office (ex-officio)

Absent:

Mariana Sunderlin: CONH

The committee considered and made decisions pertaining to 20 petitions from the cancelled February meeting and 18 current petitions. Our next meeting will be on 4/18/08.

Respectfully submitted:
Alan S. Chesen, Chair

Wright State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
April 7, 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.	Zryd, T.
✓ Baker, B.	✓ John, J.	✓ Rattan, K.	
✓ Bargerhuff, M.	✓ Kich, M.	✓ Ross, L.	✓ Sudkamp, T.
✓ Bergdahl, J.	✓ Lauf, P.	✓ Schuster, R.	✓ Hopkins, D.
✓ Dustin, J.	✓ McGinley, S.	✓ Self, E.	✓ Angle, S.
✓ Endres, C.	✓ Menart, J.	✓ Shepelak, N.	✓ Sav, T.
✓ Engisch, K.	✓ Mirkin, D.	✓ Sincoff, M.	✓ Zambenini, P.
✓ Fowler, B.	✓ Nagy, A.	✓ Tarpey, T.	(Staff)
✓ Goldfinger, M.	✓ Norris, M.	✓ Wenning, M.	
✓ Hershberger, P.	✓ Pohlman, R.	✓ Xue, K.	

2. Approval of Minutes of March 3, 2008

Minutes were approved as written.

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Mar08SenMin.pdf>

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

Wall of Academic Pioneers dedication ceremony was held prior to Senate today. A number of our early faculty members attended the celebration, where a permanent display honoring their contribution to WSU was unveiled in the Pathfinder Lounge of the Student Union.

Enrollment for spring quarter is on target with both the first day enrollment and student credit hours up 1%. Our direct from high school applications for fall quarter are up 14%, with applications from African American students increasing 25%. Lake Campus applications have increased 30%, and the School of Graduate Studies applications are up 5%.

Student awards include the Goldwater Award to James Dahlman, son of faculty member Hank Dahlman, and the Ohio Student Employee of the Year Award for 2008 to Melissa Steinke of the Lake Campus.

The ArtsGala was held this past weekend for the ninth consecutive year with approximately 600 people attending. Since its inception, we have raised \$800,000 for scholarships. We are very grateful to a generous donor, who wishes to remain anonymous, who has gifted the university with a \$2 million donation to help us expand and modernize the Creative Arts Center.

The Master Plan is a much anticipated 10-year plan for the University System of Ohio (USO) that was recently released. As you know, we have been working closely with the Chancellor to align the ongoing revitalization of our strategic plan with the state master plan. We are not surprised by the content of the plan. Four goals (Educational Attainment, Quality, Affordability and Economic Leadership), twenty metrics, and forty-nine strategies are described with the central theme throughout being producing, retaining and attracting talent. We are excited by the bold, challenging and central role higher education is being asked to perform for the benefit of our state. As we finalize the revitalization of our plan this spring, we will identify with you how we specifically plan to contribute to the master plan over the next decade. For example, one strategy is to have a common calendar. We along with OSU, UC and OU are being asked to develop a timeline for transitioning to a semester calendar. We have consistently made clear that to achieve the bold goals of the plan we will require an increased investment by the state in higher education.

Provost Angle

I received two questions from Senate Executive Committee, the first one regarding the university's strategy for parking. As we work toward updating our Strategic Plan, we want to rationally and methodically consider our Campus Space Master Plan within the context of the new University System of Ohio. This fall, the parking situation went smoother than in the past. We will look at needs next fall with faculty, students, and staff, before moving ahead. An above ground parking facility is expensive and we don't want to construct a new parking lot only to remove it as we grow. One faculty member has suggested an outlying lot connected via the tunnel system.

I will ask Marian Hogue to update us on the second question concerning prerequisite checking through Banner.

Marian Hogue: Pre-requisite checking is on target for a trial run for Fall 2008. With CATS' help, we were able to make modifications to the system. Currently, a warning will be displayed on the screen if a student registers and does not meet pre-requisites. The transition period will not prevent registration.

In Fall 2008, we will be able to produce a report of any student not meeting pre-requisites. Some departments may reevaluate pre-requisites and change those to recommended courses. Banner won't catch 100% of those students failing to meet pre-requisites. For instance, faculty would still need to determine if a course would meet the requirements if the student transferred it in.

Senator question: What is being done to be sure students are prevented from registering for courses offered at the same time or overlapping course times?

Marian Hogue: We can probably implement a warning system for time conflicts, but it won't prevent a student from registering.

Senator question: Is it possible for faculty to be notified when a student is registered this way? A pre-requisite should be a blockade. They are an educational issue, not a bookkeeping issue.

Marian Hogue: Beginning Fall 2009, they will not be able to register.

Senator question: Will faculty be pressured to drop pre-requisites?

Marian Hogue: I believe this will vary by department, depending on individual student issues.

Senator question: Does Banner prevent students from over-registering for multiple sections, which prevents other students from registering?

Marian Hogue: No.

Senator comment: I've complained about this issue for five years and was promised Banner would resolve this, but years later we're still dealing with it. Why can't we begin the transition this summer and implement it in Fall 2008 rather than 2009?

Marian Hogue: We can try to accelerate the process but we need good data and I don't believe summer registration will supply us with appropriate data to analyze.

4. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**

The Executive Committee met on March 17, adopting a new technique for modifying the Faculty Handbook. The agreement between the Faculty President's Office and the Provost's Office states: "The Wright State University Faculty Handbook is jointly maintained by the Office of the Faculty President in cooperation with the Office of the Provost. Additions, deletions or modifications to this material may only be made with the written approval of the Provost and either the Faculty Senate or its Executive Committee." The Executive Committee decided to review changes to the Faculty Handbook, approve minor changes, and forward only those items of interest or deemed controversial to the full Senate. All changes will be documented in the minutes of the Executive Committee, and the Provost's Office and the Office of the Faculty President will jointly maintain a record book of changes.

Following this discussion, the Executive Committee reviewed and approved a proposed change to the wording in the President's Award for Early Achievement.

The committee reviewed nominations for Faculty Senate elections and ensured there were sufficient candidates for each constituency.

The committee approved the agenda for the meeting today.

5. **Old Business**

- A. Draft Revised Policy on Administrative Procedures for Allegations of Research Misconduct
3-29-08 revised policy http://www.wright.edu/rsp/Misconduct_Policy_proposed.doc
Richard Bullock is representing the policy as Senator Lauf is out of town.

Richard Bullock: Upon receiving the policy back from Senate, Dr. Lauf summarized the comments and concerns from Senate. We engaged in e-mail discourse before coming together again as a committee to revise the document.

Tom Sudkamp: The document shows the changes that were made. If Senators have questions or comments, you may ask those now.

Senator comment: I want to ask if you know what a Post Doctoral Fellow is? (RB-Yes.) Do you know what a titration is? (RB-More or less.) Do you know what micro-RNA is? (RB-No.) Are you aware if the administration is in favor of this revised document? (RB-As far as I know.) Could we get that clarified?

Provost Angle: Yes and Dr. Sellers and Dr. Bantle have read through it also.

Senator question: So you're all right with the revised version. I wanted to make some general comments that have not been brought to the floor. We need to understand exactly what research misconduct actually is and how it occurs. I am familiar with three cases, the first announced about two weeks ago in Science Magazine. It involved a Nobel laureate who ended up retracting a paper that had become influential in the field of neuroscience. The problem was apparently research misconduct on behalf of someone who works on the team that did the project about which the paper concerned. It probably was a Post Doctoral Fellow and likely involved difficulties with reporting data. Because no one in this person's lab or other labs had been able to reproduce the work, there was a research misconduct inquiry.

Another case involved a highly accomplished scientist in the field of neuro-pharmacology. In his lab, as well as others, it consisted of the principle investigator and many other people. Apparently, in this lab, the need of the Post Doctoral Fellow to obtain publications resulted in repetitious reporting of data. This went to a process similar to the document we are considering today. Even though the principle investigator was not responsible for the duplication of data, he was found to be responsible and lost his position and has left science.

The third case involved a large laboratory environment that employed graduate students who became angry with the principle investigator, falsified data and brought false charges against the principle investigator. This resulted in psychological injury to people involved, particularly those who have devoted their lives trying to make nature tell a story she doesn't want to tell.

The issue is that research misconduct is not simply plagiarism or an issue of someone malevolently trying to falsify data. These things happen because of the contingencies and pressure on people to produce in a realm where quantity often replaces quality. The issue is profound. The suggestions by the committee, and agreed upon by the administration, make some sense but some discussion at the April Senate meeting was not reflected in the new document. In response to our queries about the difficulties the RIO would have in assessing issues, we were told, "Trust me. It's ok. I'll take care of it because I'm experienced." We were never told what the experience was or if the handling of the cases was correct. Was the right judgment made? Let's assume the positive and that Dr. Bantle did a fine job. What about his successor? Are we going to allow one person to call the shots on these awful situations? We had called for a review by a committee of experts. Even the Spanish Inquisition allowed this and also gave a chance to repent before

torture. The Spanish Inquisition is more progressive than our own document. The idea that you present a Senate Advisory Committee is excellent and I'd like to suggest that we use that realm where we have agreement, to try to deal with this difficult situation. I'd like to suggest that the Senate incorporate the Senate Advisory Committee for Research Misconduct into its Constitution and Bylaws immediately and that this committee be charged with three activities: 1) systematically go to each department and teach them about the document and federal requirements; 2) gather suggestions from investigators and return to the Senate to try to implement the suggestions; 3) without participating in the inquiry, the committee needs to monitor each case as it comes to the RIO, to understand the nature of the problem. This would allow us to continue work on this document as a whole so that it is more effective.

Tom Sudkamp: Are there other questions or comments? Seeing none, the question is to approve the Administrative Procedures for Allegations of Research Misconduct as submitted.

1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
2. Approved.

- B. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybs.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 2. Approved.
- C. COSM Program Change: B.S. Dual Major Physics and Mathematics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phymth.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 2. Approved.
- D. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Geology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phygeo.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 2. Approved.
- E. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Biology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybio.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 2. Approved.
- F. COSM Program Change: B.S. Physics: Computing Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phycomp.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 2. Approved.
- G. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phyba.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 2. Approved.
- H. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Physics Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybal.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 2. Approved.
- I. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Physical Sciences Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phybasl.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 2. Approved.

- J. COSM Program Change: B.A. Physics: Life Sciences Licensure Program
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/phyball.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- K. 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 approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- L. General Education Program Change: Area VI COSM College Component
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/sm101.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- M. 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 approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- N. Master of Science in Egr. (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
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- O. 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 approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- P. 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 approve.
 - 2. Approved.

6. New Business

- A. Promotion to Senior Lecturer Policy (Attachment A to the April Agenda)
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/Apr08SenAgn.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- B. Transitional Provision for Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee (Attachment B)
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/Apr08SenAgn.pdf>
- C. LC Program Change: Associate of Applied Business Graphic Design and Visual Media
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcgraph.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- D. LC Program Change: Associate of Applied Science: Financial Management
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcfinmgt.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- E. LC Program Change: Associate of Science: Business Administration
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcbusadm.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

- F. LC New Program (Option): Associate of Technical Studies: Law Enforcement Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lclawenf.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- G. LC New Program (Option): Associate of Technical Studies: Management Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcmgt.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- H. LC New Program (Option): Associate of Technical Studies: Marketing Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcmkt.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- I. LC New Program: Associate of Arts: Criminal Justice
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lccjust.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

7. Committee Reports

- A. See Attachment C to the April 7, 2008 Senate Agenda.
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/Apr08SenAgn.pdf>

8. Council Reports

None

9. Special Reports

None

10. Announcements

None

11. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next meeting will be on Monday, May 5, 2:45 p.m., at the Lake Campus. The meeting will be broadcast in E156 Student Union for those Senators who are unable to travel to the Lake Campus.

/pz