

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

5-5-2008

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, May 5, 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, May 5, 2008. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/349

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

May 5, 2008, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Minutes of April 7, 2008**
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Apr08SenMin.pdf>
3. **Report of the University President or Provost**
4. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**
5. **Old 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)

At the last Senate meeting, the Faculty Affairs Committee presented for new business the Policies and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer policy. A question was raised about the lack of faculty input in the promotion process. **To address that concern, we will be offering the following amendment.**

In Section IV add a new section A that reads as follows:

- A. The Department Chair will forward the Promotion Document to a department committee charged to evaluate promotions to Senior Lecturer. That committee will review the document and prepare a letter recommending for or against the promotion.

In old Section A. the date will be changed from November 1 to November 15. Also the following will be added to the second sentence to reflect the change above: *The letters from the department committee that reviewed the Document and from the Department Chair ...*

Finally, in Appendix B, Department Committee will be added to the Record of Actions.

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>

6. New Business

A suspension of the rules will be requested to approve Items A and B today, so that the committees can be established and begin work immediately.

- A. Ad hoc Exploratory Committee on Transfer to Semesters – Tom Sudkamp
Representatives from the following areas will be invited to participate:
 - Chair of UCAPC
 - WAC
 - GE
 - Registrar
 - AAUP
 - Budget Planning and Resource Analysis
 - One representative from every college
- B. Ad hoc Senate Advisory Committee on Research Misconduct – Tom Sudkamp
Senate Executive Committee requests that an ad hoc committee be formed until Quadrennial Review Committee meets next year to update the Faculty Constitution, when they will add this committee as a standing committee of Senate.
- C. VSA Study Group Recommendation – Joe Law/Tom Sav
The VSA Study Group recommends that of the three exams below, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) exam be adopted and used for the pilot program in Fall 2008. Information on the three exams is available at the following links:
 - Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA)
http://www.cae.org/content/pro_collegiate.htm
http://www.cae.org/content/pdf/CLAVSA_Fact_Sheet.pdf
 - Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP)
<http://www.ets.org/> (select MAPP from the list of exams)
 - Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP)
<http://www.act.org/caap/vsa/>

D. Vision Statement, Mission Statement, Values and Goals (Attachment C)

E. Policy on Significant Changes to Academic Units – Tom Sudkamp

The authority to determine the organizational structure and names of academic units at Wright State University rests with the Board of Trustees, acting on recommendations of faculty and administrators, including those who might be directly or indirectly affected by changes.

Recommendations to create, to merge or otherwise alter, to terminate, or to change the name of colleges, schools, departments or other equivalent academic units shall be submitted by the Provost to the Board of Trustees. At least two months before such recommendations are made, the full-time faculty in any affected school or college, the Faculty President, and the Council of Deans must have been informed of the possible change(s) so that they may express their support or opposition if they choose to do so.

F. New Certificate: Graduate Certificate in Sports Management (CEHS) – Jay Thomas
http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/Sports_Management_Cert.pdf

Items G-N are brought forth by Tom Sav, Chair, UCAPC

G. COLA Program Change: B.A. Modern Languages German
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/german.pdf>

H. COLA Program Change: B.A. Modern Languages Spanish
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/spanish.pdf>

I. COSM Program Change: Biological Sciences Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/biominor.pdf>

J. COSM Program Change: B.S. Biological Sciences -- Bioinformatics Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/bioinfo.pdf>

K. COSM Program Change: B.S. Biological Sciences -- Exercise Biology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/bioexb.pdf>

L. LC New Program (Specialization): B.S. Organizational Leadership: Agricultural Systems Specialization
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcorgagr.pdf>

M. LC New Program (Specialization): B.S. Organizational Leadership: Manufacturing Operations Specialization
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcorgmfc.pdf>

N. LC New Program (Specialization): B.S. Organizational Leadership: Health Care Administration Specialization
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcorghlt.pdf>

O. Senate Dates for 2008-09 – For approval today

October 6, 2008	February 2, 2009	May 4, 2009
November 3, 2008	March 2, 2009	June 1, 2009
January 5, 2009	April 6, 2009	

- 7. Written Committee Reports and Attendance (Attachment D)**
 - 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. Next Faculty Senate: June 2, 2008, 2:45 p.m.
 - B. President Hopkins will host a reception for all Senators in the Skylight Lounge of the Student Union from 2:00-2:45 p.m., preceding the June Senate meeting.

- 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

VISION

In the pioneering spirit of the Wright Brothers, Wright State will be Ohio's most innovative university, known and admired for our diversity and for the transformational impact we have on the lives of our students and on the communities we serve.

MISSION

We transform the lives of our students and the communities we serve.

We are committed to:

- achieving learning outcomes through innovative, high quality programs for all students: undergraduate, graduate and professional;
- conducting scholarly research and creative endeavors; and to
- engaging in significant community service.

VALUES

Wright State University is proud to be at the nexus of discovery and innovation. At our core is a set of values that drive our priorities and decision making.

People – we are committed to the success of students, faculty and staff. We provide an inclusive academic environment for people with a diverse range of abilities and educational backgrounds; ethnic and cultural heritages; family experiences and economic means; physical and learning differences; geographically mobile and place bound circumstances; and career and life aspirations.

Learning – we are responsible for sharing a wealth of knowledge, enabling discovery, fostering innovation and supporting scholarship in its many forms to better serve our regional, national and global communities. As a learning-centered university, we fulfill responsibilities most effectively when students are engaged throughout the process of discovery. Freedom of academic inquiry and expression are the foundations of knowledge and discovery.

Partnerships – we are catalysts for transforming lives and the communities we serve. Through collaborations and partnerships with businesses, educators, agencies and organizations we will achieve our goals of regional development, cross-cultural cooperation, entrepreneurial advancement and improved global relations.

Relationships – the success of each individual strengthens our community. We promise to maintain high ethical standards in all of our relationships and operations through open communication, trust, professionalism, and a collaborative spirit. We recognize the inherent value and promise of each individual and welcome all who seek transform their lives.

Sustainability – the necessity of preserving our planet compels us to weigh the impact of our decisions, both short-term and long-term. Additionally, prudent financial management supports the sustainability of our operations. Furthermore, the pursuit of knowledge is sustainable, and our programs will maintain their relevance, only if we continually invest in the infrastructure to support research and creative endeavors.

GOALS

GOAL 1: ACADEMIC DISTINCTIVENESS AND QUALITY

Enhance our distinctive learning experience to produce talented graduates with the knowledge and skills essential for critical thinking, meaningful civic engagement, international competency, an appreciation for the arts, life-long learning and the ability to lead and adapt in a rapidly changing world.

GOAL 2: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Enhance student access to and successful participation in higher education through quality and innovative instruction and student life programs that increase graduation and career placement for a diverse student body.

GOAL 3: RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Expand our scholarship in innovative and targeted ways to address regional, national and global needs.

GOAL 4: COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATION

Provide leadership to promote and support social, cultural and economic development within the region through collaborations with local, state, national and global partners.

GOAL 5: VALUED RESOURCES

Develop and sustain the human, financial and physical resources required to accomplish the university's strategic goals.

OBJECTIVES

GOAL 1: ACADEMIC DISTINCTIVENESS AND QUALITY

Enhance our distinctive learning experience to produce talented graduates with the knowledge and skills essential for meaningful civic engagement, international competency, critical thinking, an appreciation for the arts, life-long learning and the ability to lead and adapt in a rapidly changing world.

Objective A: Ensure the alignment of General Education, the major, assessment, undergraduate and graduate program review and co-curricular activities.

Objective B: Diversify and enrich academic and professional programs.

Objective C: Make the academic and professional programs more accessible, responsive, and flexible.

Objective D: Attract, support and retain a nationally/internationally recognized diverse, student-centered faculty and staff.

Objective E: Enhance the quantity and quality of dialogue with our various communities to ensure our academic relevance and distinctiveness.

GOAL 2: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Enhance student access to and successful participation in higher education through quality and innovative instruction and student life programs that increase graduation and career placement for a diverse student body.

Objective A: Improve the enrollment and retention of direct from high school, graduate and non-traditional student populations.

Objective B: Enhance the academic success of students.

Objective C: Expand options for educational attainment other than traditional degrees.

Objective D: Develop effective educational processes to assist students in meeting post-graduate career and educational goals.

OBJECTIVES

GOAL 3: RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Expand our scholarship in innovative and targeted ways to address regional, national and global needs.

Objective A: Strengthen our national and international research reputation.

Objective B: Enhance Research and Sponsored Programs infrastructure leading to more external funding.

Objective C: Foster discovery at all levels in the educational pipeline.

Objective D: Translate our research and development efforts into jobs, products and economic development.

GOAL 4: COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATION

Provide leadership to promote and support social, cultural and economic development within the region through collaborations with local, state, national and global partners.

Objective A: Increase the opportunities within the curriculum for community engagement.

Objective B: Enhance WSU presence within the Dayton – West Central Ohio regions and beyond in ways that are important to the community.

Objective C: Offer degree and other educational programs to address emerging regional and State needs.

GOAL 5: VALUED RESOURCES

Develop and sustain the human, financial and physical resources required to accomplish the university's strategic goals.

Objective A: Encourage and support the professional development and wellness of faculty and staff.

Objective B: Enhance fiscal and operational management.

Objective C: Generate increased revenue.

Objective D: Increase investments in facilities/technologies to achieve strategic goals.

ATTACHMENT D
Senate Committee Reports
May 5, 2008

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – Tom Sudkamp

No report.

Faculty Affairs Committee – Jane Doorley/Carole Endres

No report.

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

The UCAPC Report to the Faculty Senate Meeting of May 5 is available at <http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/8fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Joe Petrick

No report.

Information Technology Committee – TK Prasad

Minutes of April 25, 2008 Meeting

Members Present: Barbara Denison (RSCOB), Gary Onady (SOM), Jan Belcher (CONH), Verne Smith (CaTS), Kathrin Engisch (COSM), Kathi Herick (Library), George Frey (CTL), T.K. Prasad (CECS).

Others: Matthew Benjamin (COLA), Dave Hochstein (Lake Campus), Ben Ausdenmoore (Student), Karen Wonders (CEHS), Paul Hernandez (CaTS), Stephen Foster (Library).

- A. The committee expressed satisfaction with the new email spam filter, and felt that it is significantly better than the previous one.
- B. Illuminate (audio-conferencing system) license is being renegotiated, and in all probability, will be renewed for the next academic year. CTL is also considering setting up a Lab environment with Illuminate facility.
- C. Verne Smith gave an update on the current Office 2007 installation and Microsoft Vista transition plans, and welcomed our concerns and feedback. Office 2007 is available free for official use, and is available for purchase (\$49) for personal home use. There is a free patch available from Microsoft for reading and writing Office 2007 file formats using Office 2003. CaTS is working closely with campus technology coordinators and is recommending a slight revision to the proposed Vista transition to coincide with hardware updates from HP. Laptops will move to new models later this summer (July/August) and desktops will be updated at the end of the year. Because XP support is more limited on the new hardware, CaTS recommends configuring these with Vista when they are released. CaTS, CTL and the University Libraries currently plan to move all public, computing facilities to Vista in time for Winter Quarter 2009. Two test labs running Vista are available and more will be brought online later this year. Vista training will be offered in preparation for this transition.

- D. WINGS portal is going through an upgrade over the summer with planned improvements to both email and calendar applications, especially with regards to access by various mobile devices, shared address book, etc.
 - E. Recent CaTS survey revealed that a number of facilities requested by the users are already present in the applications (voice mail access via 775-1010, etc), and so what is missing is a convenient way to uncover latent potential.
 - F. FYI: Cost for faculty use of Acrobat license is \$50. CaTS maintains a list of commonly licensed software at <http://www.wright.edu/cats/purchase/>.
 - G. Faculty can take advantage of home licensing options. Products such as Office and Windows XP are available free for home use under Work-at-Home licensing. Other products are available at low cost for personal use such as Visio (\$55), Project (\$95), Parallels (\$40), iLife and iWork (\$45) and others. For more information on home licensing visit, <http://www.wright.edu/software/>.
- Next Meeting: June 6, Friday from 2pm to 3pm in Room 399 Joshi

Student Affairs Committee – Maher Amer

No report.

Student Petitions Committee – Alan Chesen

The university petitions committee met on Friday, April 18, 2007 in 405 Russ Engineering Building at 9:00 a.m. for it's regularly scheduled monthly meeting. The committee conducted routine business hearing approximately 30 petitions.

Present were the following committee members: A. Chesen (RSCOB--chair), D. Hess (CEHS), M. Sunderlin (CONH), P. Caprio (UC), J. Deer (COLA), B. Rowley (CECS), B.J. Hobler (Lake), J. Howes (COSM), J. Hail (Registrar--ex officio), A. Luneke (Registrar--ex officio)

Absent was J. McCauley (student representative)

The next meeting will be held on May 16, 2007.

Wright State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
May 5, 2008
2:45 p.m., 151 Dwyer Hall/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. (Staff) |
| ✓ Fowler, B. | ✓ Nagy, A. | ✓ Tarpey, T. | |
| ✓ Goldfinger, M. | ✓ Norris, M. | ✓ Wenning, M. | |
| ✓ Hershberger, P. | ✓ Pohlman, R. | ✓ Xue, K. | |

2. Approval of Minutes of April 7, 2008

Minutes were approved as written.

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/Apr08SenMin.pdf>

3. Report of the University President and Provost

President Hopkins

We're very happy to be at the Lake Campus today and thank them for hosting us. The Lake Campus is a gem for Wright State University. They transform the lives of students and the communities they serve in Ohio. We look forward to possibly coming to the Lake Campus for another Senate meeting sometime in the future.

We are fortunate to attend many celebrations in recognition of our students at this time of year. Some exciting achievements include the Model UN Team, who has won top honors at the competition for 29 consecutive years. Their position paper on policy was ranked first among all position papers, with over 1400 students participating from over 200 institutions worldwide. The Wright State team received the top award of Outstanding Delegation.

Other achievements of students, and the faculty members who mentor them, include our Senior Financial Services students, who won a national competition in Minneapolis on April 24-25 in the Financial Services Competition.

The College of Engineering and Computer Science participated in the Human Powered Vehicle Competition with the Mechanical Engineering Department students winning first place in Utility Vehicle Endurance. Students also won the first place award for best design in the Micro-Class Team Competition.

We base our success on our student's achievements and these are just a few examples of how well are students are achieving in their fields.

Provost Angle is going to address the Master Plan and the challenges of the Strategies. As reported at the April Senate meeting, the Master Plan has been released and includes four goals, twenty metrics and forty strategies imbedded in the Master Plan. We are presenting the revitalized Strategic Plan for the university at today's meeting. It is aligned as much as possible with the Master Plan, and looks at where WSU is headed in the next decade.

Provost Angle

The Research Misconduct Policy, passed by Senate at the April meeting, has not yet been signed off on, as it has gone to the Office of Research Integrity for approval which will take about two months. We're hopeful that it will be endorsed by the ORI, allowing us to formally adopt it.

As part of President Hopkins' report last month, there is a request for a common calendar within the University System of Ohio plan. This is not a mandate but is strongly encouraged. Having talked with my counterparts at Ohio University and University of Cincinnati, it appears there may be a forthcoming announcement as to when they will change to semesters. UC will be giving a report at their upcoming Faculty Senate meeting with a vote taken before a final decision is made. They are moving forward and have produced some documents that I believe we can learn from, and I expect to receive that from UC's Provost. Ohio State University is intending to make the move to semesters, but needs to coordinate with the implementation of their new student information system coming on-line sometime after 2009. Most institutions are considering a three-year time frame with implementation in Fall 2011. As Faculty Senate discusses the potential of moving to semesters, we want to be fully aware of what we need to consider and be prepared for, if we were to move to semesters.

One concern is for those two-year colleges that are not already on a semester calendar. They are encouraged to move to a semester calendar shortly after four-year institutions do. Sinclair would like to move to semesters in tandem with Wright State. We are in the discussion phase and currently working on understanding what we would face if we made the decision to move to semesters. Certainly there would be numerous curricular issues, which would involve a large amount of work for faculty.

Senator Question:

The Faculty Senate passed the Research Misconduct Policy. Whether or not the ORI approves it is a totally separate matter. The ORI may not approve certain aspects that may pertain to federal funding, but the administration is using this process for all research activities in all departments and all disciplines. The Faculty Senate rules on it so the assertion that the ORI has veto power over the Faculty Senate is without substance; however, since this is so, if the ORI does not accept our current document, what happens?

Dr. Angle: We would need to engage in a dialogue and the policy will return to the Faculty Senate. It is my understanding the reason it came to the Senate was because we were required to do this through the NIH Office of Research Integrity. That initiated the change from the previous policy. Jack Bantle could provide more detail but we are not allowing ORI to change or veto our policy, but we are passing on what we adopted. It would have to meet their approval. We won't make any changes without it returning to the Senate. We have made this clear to ORI and we hope the process goes smoothly. Nothing will happen to the document without it returning to Senate. We are operating with what has been approved by Faculty Senate.

Senator Comment:

What is troublesome is that we were not told you would be adding on this extra process. The question as to whether the ORI approves of the policy has to do only with those research projects it is funding and has nothing to do with all the other research activities, the majority in our case, which go on in other disciplines. I thought that was the sense of the Senate. There was a deep demarcation between these two things. The entire document seems to be in limbo and you are giving the ORI the ability to change it in an ad hoc manner.

Dr. Angle: We are giving the ORI the ability to review the policy and see if it meets their policy, not to make changes to it. I believe that idea was part of the discussion in the early meetings, although I have discussed it in many venues besides the Faculty Senate and I could be recalling incorrectly.

Dr. Sudkamp: It has always been the notion that even though it was approved here, it would be reviewed by the ORI. I agree with the Senator, what is approved here is the policy of our Faculty Senate until the Faculty Senate changes it. The hope is the ORI will look at it and approve of it, but if they don't it is still our policy.

Dr Angle: I do want to thank the committee, chaired by Dr. Peter Lauf, for the work they put into this. It was considerable and the changes made have made it a better document.

Senator Question: Is the policy in effect now? Has the Board of Trustees approved it?

Dr. Angle: Yes, if an issue is raised, it is the policy we will follow. The Board of Trustees, to my knowledge, has not approved the policy. It is close enough to our other procedure that I don't believe it is a problem to wait for approval from the ORI before receiving approval from the Board of Trustees.

4. Report of the Senate Executive Committee – Tom Sudkamp

The Executive Committee met on April 21 and included on today's agenda two items for which we'll be requesting a suspension of rules. We do not like to suspend the rules but these two items, establishing an Ad hoc Senate Advisory Committee on Research Misconduct and the Ad hoc Exploratory Committee on Transfer to Semesters, are time critical. There are no actions required, merely set up the committees so they may begin work.

The Executive Committee considered the best way to get the Senate Advisory Committee on Research Misconduct functioning as soon as possible. The policy on Research Misconduct that we passed at the April meeting calls for the establishment of a standing Advisory Committee on Research Misconduct, which would require a change to the Faculty Constitution; hence, approval by the entire faculty would be necessary. By temporarily setting this up as an ad hoc committee, the committee can begin work immediately, and the Quadrennial Review Committee can address any changes to the Faculty Constitution when they meet next year.

In the same mode, we need to begin exploring the issue of a transition to semesters which the Provost spoke of. You have in front of you a three-page handout of Gantt charts from the University of Cincinnati, which provides on a quarterly basis the process of changing to semesters from now until fall quarter 2011. This shows the efforts that would need to begin immediately if the decision is made to switch to semesters.

Another item on the agenda is the Policy on Significant Changes to Academic Units, which requires faculty input for the creation, termination, name change or merging of departments, colleges, schools or other academic units. Currently, there is no policy that requires faculty input.

5. Old Business

Senator Comment: For all of us who work with full-time, non-tenure track faculty, it is a pleasure and amazing to see them at work. They are an important component of the university's activities in every way, being superb teachers who display sensitivity to student's needs. They make the educational activity of the university viable. It is very nice that you are giving them this accolade but fundamentally, they are being treated as second-class citizens because they are denied tenure. Non-tenure track faculty, who are being denied the standards and protections that are given to other faculty are taking university faculty positions. There is no reason why these colleagues should be treated in this way and should be given every opportunity and increase in benefits and salary. By not being tenure-track they are disenfranchised. I don't know why the university is interested in increasing non-tenure track faculty but suspect it is a matter of economics. They deserve the protections in these documents but they are arbitrary and often ignored. They should be given the option for tenure. This is in the best interest of all involved and I would encourage the administration to reconsider this issue.

- A. Promotion to Senior Lecturer Policy (Attachment A)
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve with amendments below.
 - 2. Approved with amendments.
- B. Transitional Provision for Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee (Attachment B)
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.

At the last Senate meeting, the Faculty Affairs Committee presented for new business the Policies and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer policy. A question was raised about the lack of faculty input in the promotion process. **To address that concern, we will be offering the following amendment.**

In Section IV add a new section A that reads as follows:

- A. The Department Chair will forward the Promotion Document to a department committee charged to evaluate promotions to Senior Lecturer. That committee will review the document and prepare a letter recommending for or against the promotion.

A friendly amendment was offered at the Senate meeting to address lettering issues in Section III.

In old Section A. the date will be changed from November 1 to November 15. Also the following will be added to the second sentence to reflect the change above: The letters *from the department committee that reviewed the Document and from the Department Chair ...*

Finally, in Appendix B, Department Committee will be added to the Record of Actions.

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>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- D. LC Program Change: Associate of Applied Science: Financial Management
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcfinmgt.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- E. LC Program Change: Associate of Science: Business Administration
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lcbusadm.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- 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 Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- 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 Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- 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 Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- I. LC New Program: Associate of Arts: Criminal Justice
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/lccjust.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.

6. New Business

- A. Ad hoc Exploratory Committee on Transfer to Semesters – Tom Sudkamp
 - 1. A suspension of the rules was requested to move this item to Old Business for Approval today. Approved.
 - 2. Item A Approved under Old Business.
- B. Ad hoc Senate Advisory Committee on Research Misconduct – Tom Sudkamp
 - 1. A suspension of the rules was requested to move this item to Old Business for Approval today. Approved.
 - 2. Item B Approved under Old Business.
- C. VSA Study Group Recommendation – Joe Law/Tom Sav
The VSA Study Group recommends that the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) exam be adopted and used for the pilot program in Fall 2008.

Senator Comment: Could you remind us of the motivation of this testing?

Dr. Law: Under the University System of Ohio, this testing is being mandated. As part of the VSA, one data point is a measurement of student progress in GE in the areas of critical thinking and writing. VSA is set up so universities have a choice of three exams.

- 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

D. Vision Statement, Mission Statement, Values and Goals (Attachment C)

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

E. Policy on Significant Changes to Academic Units – Tom Sudkamp

The authority to determine the organizational structure and names of academic units at Wright State University rests with the Board of Trustees, acting on recommendations of faculty and administrators, including those who might be directly or indirectly affected by changes.

Recommendations to create, to merge or otherwise alter, to terminate, or to change the name of colleges, schools, departments or other equivalent academic units shall be submitted by the Provost to the Board of Trustees. At least two months before such recommendations are made, the full-time faculty in any affected school or college, the Faculty President, and the Council of Deans must have been informed of the possible change(s) so that they may express their support or opposition if they choose to do so.

Senator Question: Who makes the recommendations and by what process?

Dr. Sudkamp: The policy doesn't specify who makes those but it is usually administrators in the units. This assures that if recommendations are made, faculty will have input on whether they accept it or not.

Senator Question: What is the process under this new guideline for faculty initiating a change.

Dr. Sudkamp: If faculty initiate a recommendation, it would be sent to the Provost and shared with the specified constituencies.

Senator Comment: It seems vague. You would expect there to be a more formal process.

Dr. Sudkamp: The second part is a formal process where recommendations will be given to the Senate and the Council of Deans for a two-month period. One could specify who gets to make the recommendations, but as it stands it allows faculty, administrators or other groups to do so. It would be possible to limit making recommendations to one group, but that may be counter-intuitive. This gives faculty a right they have never had, that their input will be heard.

Senator Question: Final decisions are made by the Provost?

Dr. Sudkamp: Actually by the Board of Trustees, which has always been the case.

Senator Question: Will this statement become effective now or will it be retroactive?

Dr. Sudkamp: It would not be retroactive.

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

F. New Certificate: Graduate Certificate in Sports Management (CEHS) – Jay Thomas

http://www.wright.edu/sogs/newgradprograms/Sports_Management_Cert.pdf

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

Items G-N are brought forth by Tom Sav

G. COLA Program Change: B.A. Modern Languages German

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/german.pdf>

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

H. COLA Program Change: B.A. Modern Languages Spanish

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/spanish.pdf>

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- I. COSM Program Change: Biological Sciences Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/biominor.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- J. COSM Program Change: B.S. Biological Sciences -- Bioinformatics Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/bioinfo.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- K. COSM Program Change: B.S. Biological Sciences -- Exercise Biology Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/bioexb.pdf>
 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- L. LC New Program (Specialization): B.S. Organizational Leadership: Agricultural Systems Specialization
 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- M. LC New Program (Specialization): B.S. Organizational Leadership: Manufacturing Operations Specialization
 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- N. LC New Program (Specialization): B.S. Organizational Leadership: Health Care Administration Specialization
 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- O. Senate Dates for 2008-09 – For approval today

October 6, 2008	February 2, 2009	May 4, 2009
November 3, 2008	March 2, 2009	June 1, 2009
January 5, 2009	April 6, 2009	

 1. Approved.

7. Committee Reports

- A. See Attachment D to the May 5, 2008 Senate Agenda.
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/May08SenAgn.pdf>

8. Council Reports

None

9. Announcements

There will be a reception prior to the June 2 Senate meeting from 2:00-2:45 p.m. in the Skylight Lounge of the Student Union, outside of E156. All Senators, new and retiring, are encouraged to attend. Provost Angle will host for President Hopkins, who will be out of town.

10. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:40 p.m. The next meeting will be on Monday, June 2, 2008 at 2:45 p.m., in E156 Student Union.

/pz

ATTACHMENT A

Final Version

Approved by Faculty Senate May 5, 2008

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;
- o 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. Department Committee
- B. The candidate's department chair
- C. 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 voting members.
- D. The candidate's dean
- E. The provost
- F. 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. The Department Chair will forward the Promotion Document to a department committee charged to evaluate promotions to Senior Lecturer. The committee will review the document and prepare a letter recommending for or against the promotion.
- B. By November 15, the Department Chair will review the Promotion Document and prepare a letter recommending for or against the promotion. The letters from the department committee that reviewed the Document and from the Department Chair 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.
- C. 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.
- D. 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.
- E. 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.
- F. 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 Committee				
Department Chair				
College Committee				
Dean's recommendation				

College Committee

Name

Name

Name

Name

Name

ATTACHMENT B

Approved by the Faculty Senate May 5, 2008

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 be comprised of the dean of the college as a non-voting member; three voting members elected by the college's full-time non-tenure track faculty from the college's tenured faculty and two voting members from the College Promotion and Tenure Committee chosen by that committee.

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

VISION

In the pioneering spirit of the Wright Brothers, Wright State will be Ohio's most innovative university, known and admired for our diversity and for the transformational impact we have on the lives of our students and on the communities we serve.

MISSION

We transform the lives of our students and the communities we serve.

We are committed to:

- achieving learning outcomes through innovative, high quality programs for all students: undergraduate, graduate and professional;
- conducting scholarly research and creative endeavors; and to
- engaging in significant community service.

VALUES

Wright State University is proud to be at the nexus of discovery and innovation. At our core is a set of values that drive our priorities and decision making.

People – we are committed to the success of students, faculty and staff. We provide an inclusive academic environment for people with a diverse range of abilities and educational backgrounds; ethnic and cultural heritages; family experiences and economic means; physical and learning differences; geographically mobile and place bound circumstances; and career and life aspirations.

Learning – we are responsible for sharing a wealth of knowledge, enabling discovery, fostering innovation and supporting scholarship in its many forms to better serve our regional, national and global communities. As a learning-centered university, we fulfill responsibilities most effectively when students are engaged throughout the process of discovery. Freedom of academic inquiry and expression are the foundations of knowledge and discovery.

Partnerships – we are catalysts for transforming lives and the communities we serve. Through collaborations and partnerships with businesses, educators, agencies and organizations we will achieve our goals of regional development, cross-cultural cooperation, entrepreneurial advancement and improved global relations.

Relationships – the success of each individual strengthens our community. We promise to maintain high ethical standards in all of our relationships and operations through open communication, trust, professionalism, and a collaborative spirit. We recognize the inherent value and promise of each individual and welcome all who seek transform their lives.

Sustainability – the necessity of preserving our planet compels us to weigh the impact of our decisions, both short-term and long-term. Additionally, prudent financial management supports the sustainability of our operations. Furthermore, the pursuit of knowledge is sustainable, and our programs will maintain their relevance, only if we continually invest in the infrastructure to support research and creative endeavors.

GOALS

GOAL 1: ACADEMIC DISTINCTIVENESS AND QUALITY

Enhance our distinctive learning experience to produce talented graduates with the knowledge and skills essential for critical thinking, meaningful civic engagement, international competency, an appreciation for the arts, life-long learning and the ability to lead and adapt in a rapidly changing world.

GOAL 2: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Enhance student access to and successful participation in higher education through quality and innovative instruction and student life programs that increase graduation and career placement for a diverse student body.

GOAL 3: RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Expand our scholarship in innovative and targeted ways to address regional, national and global needs.

GOAL 4: COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATION

Provide leadership to promote and support social, cultural and economic development within the region through collaborations with local, state, national and global partners.

GOAL 5: VALUED RESOURCES

Develop and sustain the human, financial and physical resources required to accomplish the university's strategic goals.

OBJECTIVES

GOAL 1: ACADEMIC DISTINCTIVENESS AND QUALITY

Enhance our distinctive learning experience to produce talented graduates with the knowledge and skills essential for meaningful civic engagement, international competency, critical thinking, an appreciation for the arts, life-long learning and the ability to lead and adapt in a rapidly changing world.

Objective A: Ensure the alignment of General Education, the major, assessment, undergraduate and graduate program review and co-curricular activities.

Objective B: Diversify and enrich academic and professional programs.

Objective C: Make the academic and professional programs more accessible, responsive, and flexible.

Objective D: Attract, support and retain a nationally/internationally recognized diverse, student-centered faculty and staff.

Objective E: Enhance the quantity and quality of dialogue with our various communities to ensure our academic relevance and distinctiveness.

GOAL 2: EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Enhance student access to and successful participation in higher education through quality and innovative instruction and student life programs that increase graduation and career placement for a diverse student body.

Objective A: Improve the enrollment and retention of direct from high school, graduate and non-traditional student populations.

Objective B: Enhance the academic success of students.

Objective C: Expand options for educational attainment other than traditional degrees.

Objective D: Develop effective educational processes to assist students in meeting post-graduate career and educational goals.

OBJECTIVES

GOAL 3: RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

Expand our scholarship in innovative and targeted ways to address regional, national and global needs.

Objective A: Strengthen our national and international research reputation.

Objective B: Enhance Research and Sponsored Programs infrastructure leading to more external funding.

Objective C: Foster discovery at all levels in the educational pipeline.

Objective D: Translate our research and development efforts into jobs, products and economic development.

GOAL 4: COMMUNITY TRANSFORMATION

Provide leadership to promote and support social, cultural and economic development within the region through collaborations with local, state, national and global partners.

Objective A: Increase the opportunities within the curriculum for community engagement.

Objective B: Enhance WSU presence within the Dayton – West Central Ohio regions and beyond in ways that are important to the community.

Objective C: Offer degree and other educational programs to address emerging regional and State needs.

GOAL 5: VALUED RESOURCES

Develop and sustain the human, financial and physical resources required to accomplish the university's strategic goals.

Objective A: Encourage and support the professional development and wellness of faculty and staff.

Objective B: Enhance fiscal and operational management.

Objective C: Generate increased revenue.

Objective D: Increase investments in facilities/technologies to achieve strategic goals.

ATTACHMENT D
Senate Committee Reports
May 5, 2008

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – Tom Sudkamp

No report.

Faculty Affairs Committee – Jane Doorley/Carole Endres

No report.

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

The UCAPC Report to the Faculty Senate Meeting of May 5 is available at <http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/8fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Joe Petrick

No report.

Information Technology Committee – TK Prasad

Minutes of April 25, 2008 Meeting

Members Present: Barbara Denison (RSCOB), Gary Onady (SOM), Jan Belcher (CONH), Verne Smith (CaTS), Kathrin Engisch (COSM), Kathi Herick (Library), George Frey (CTL), T.K. Prasad (CECS).

Others: Matthew Benjamin (COLA), Dave Hochstein (Lake Campus), Ben Ausdenmoore (Student), Karen Wonders (CEHS), Paul Hernandez (CaTS), Stephen Foster (Library).

- A. The committee expressed satisfaction with the new email spam filter, and felt that it is significantly better than the previous one.
- B. Illuminate (audio-conferencing system) license is being renegotiated, and in all probability, will be renewed for the next academic year. CTL is also considering setting up a Lab environment with Illuminate facility.
- C. Verne Smith gave an update on the current Office 2007 installation and Microsoft Vista transition plans, and welcomed our concerns and feedback. Office 2007 is available free for official use, and is available for purchase (\$49) for personal home use. There is a free patch available from Microsoft for reading and writing Office 2007 file formats using Office 2003. CaTS is working closely with campus technology coordinators and is recommending a slight revision to the proposed Vista transition to coincide with hardware updates from HP. Laptops will move to new models later this summer (July/August) and desktops will be updated at the end of the year. Because XP support is more limited on the new hardware, CaTS recommends configuring these with Vista when they are released. CaTS, CTL and the University Libraries currently plan to move all public, computing facilities to Vista in time for Winter Quarter 2009. Two test labs running Vista are available and more will be brought online later this year. Vista training will be offered in preparation for this transition.
- D. WINGS portal is going through an upgrade over the summer with planned improvements to both email and calendar applications, especially with regards to access by various mobile devices, shared address book, etc.

- E. Recent CaTS survey revealed that a number of facilities requested by the users are already present in the applications (voice mail access via 775-1010, etc), and so what is missing is a convenient way to uncover latent potential.
 - F. FYI: Cost for faculty use of Acrobat license is \$50. CaTS maintains a list of commonly licensed software at <http://www.wright.edu/cats/purchase/>.
 - G. Faculty can take advantage of home licensing options. Products such as Office and Windows XP are available free for home use under Work-at-Home licensing. Other products are available at low cost for personal use such as Visio (\$55), Project (\$95), Parallels (\$40), iLife and iWork (\$45) and others. For more information on home licensing visit, <http://www.wright.edu/software/>.
- Next Meeting: June 6, Friday from 2pm to 3pm in Room 399 Joshi

Student Affairs Committee – Maher Amer

No report.

Student Petitions Committee – Alan Chesen

The university petitions committee met on Friday, April 18, 2007 in 405 Russ Engineering Building at 9:00 a.m. for it's regularly scheduled monthly meeting. The committee conducted routine business hearing approximately 30 petitions.

Present were the following committee members: A. Chesen (RSCOB--chair), D. Hess (CEHS), M. Sunderlin (CONH), P. Caprio (UC), J. Deer (COLA), B. Rowley (CECS), B.J. Hobler (Lake), J. Howes (COSM), J. Hail (Registrar--ex officio), A. Luneke (Registrar--ex officio)

Absent was J. McCauley (student representative)

The next meeting will be held on May 16, 2007.