

Wright State University

CORE Scholar

Faculty Senate Minutes and Agendas

Faculty Senate

10-6-2008

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, October 6, 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, October 6, 2008. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/351

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

October 6, 2008, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**
2. **Approval of Minutes of June 2, 2008**
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/June08SenMin.pdf>
3. **Report of the University President or Provost**
4. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**
5. **Old Business**
 - A. Ad hoc Committee to Review WSU Policies on Freedom of Speech and Expression – Executive Committee
 - B. Revised Proposed Modifications to the Academic Integrity Policy – Student Affairs (Attachment A)
 - A draft copy of student sanctions is provided as Attachment B for your convenience, but is not being considered as Old or New Business.
 - C. CECS Program Change: B.S. Electrical Engineering – UCAPC
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/ee.pdf>
 - D. COLA Program Change: B.A. Social Science Education – UCAPC
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/socscied.pdf>
6. **New Business**
 - A. COSM Program Change: B.S. Clinical Laboratory Science - UCAPC
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/clinical.pdf>
7. **Written Committee Reports and Attendance** (Attachment C)
 - A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: Tom Sudkamp
 - B. Faculty Affairs Committee: Carole Endres
 - C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav
 - D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: Mateen Rizki
 - E. Information Technology Committee: Barbara Denison
 - F. Student Affairs Committee:
 - G. Student Petitions Committee: Alan Chesen

8. Council Reports

None

9. Special Reports

A. Voluntary System of Accountability Report – Joe Law
http://www.wright.edu/aboutwsu/docs/college_portrait08.pdf

B. Classroom Utilization Report – Marian Hogue
Materials will be distributed prior to the Senate meeting.

10. Announcements

A. Next Faculty Senate: November 3, 2008, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union.

11. Adjournment

ATTACHMENT A

Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Process – Revised

(At the June 2, 2008 Faculty Senate meeting, this document was return for revision. The new document is below. The old document is available as Attachment B to the June Agenda at: <http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/June08SenAgn.pdf>)

Academic Integrity Policy and Process

Approved by Faculty Senate on May 1, 2000, and General Faculty on May 9, 2000

The judicial process for violations of academic integrity is activated whenever an undergraduate or graduate student is accused of violating Section V, Category 4 A/B of the Code of Student Conduct pertaining to academic integrity. Students who are participating in a professional practice program may be held accountable to additional standards and should refer to all relevant policies and procedures pertaining to their particular school or college.

Any member of the community may report an alleged violation. A violation may be reported to the instructor of the course in which the alleged act occurred, the chair or dean (or equivalent academic administrator) of the college/school with which the course is affiliated, or a member of the staff of the Office of Student Judicial Services. An individual who suspects a student of cheating may at any time contact the Office of Student Judicial Services at (937) 775-4240 to receive assistance with any aspect of the academic integrity process. All reports must be in written form to be adjudicated.

A student accused of a violation of academic integrity is not permitted to drop or withdraw from the course giving rise to the charge of academic dishonesty unless the matter is resolved in the student's favor. Once notified by the professor, the Office of Student Judicial Services is responsible for notifying the Office of the Registrar that there is an alleged violation being considered. If the alleged violation cannot be resolved prior to the date upon which final grades must be reported to the Office of the Registrar, the instructor of the class with the advice and counsel of the department chair or equivalent, will assign a grade of "N." In the event that a student is exonerated as a result of an academic integrity investigation, the student may choose to either complete the course, with the opportunity to make up any work missed, or withdraw from the course without any notation of the course on the student's academic transcript.

When a student is suspected of committing an act of academic dishonesty, the faculty member should utilize the procedures listed below.

C. Faculty-Student Meeting Procedures

The faculty member will document the alleged violation utilizing either an Academic Integrity Violation Form or written memo. He/she will ~~then send the student an Academic Integrity Conference Notification Form to~~ notify the student of the allegations **(preferably in writing)** and the need for a meeting to discuss the incident. A copy of the Academic Integrity Violation Form **or memo** should be **provided to the student at the time the faculty member and student meet.** ~~included with the Notification Form. Either the student or the faculty member may invite the department chair (or~~

~~equivalent academic administrator) to attend the conference~~ **an advisor to be present during the meeting. However, advisors are not permitted to speak or to participate directly in the process.**

If the student chooses to not schedule or attend the meeting with the faculty member, the faculty member, in the student's absence, shall make a decision as to whether the student is responsible or not for the violation using all available information. Furthermore, upon receipt of the documentation, the Office of Student Judicial Services will bill a \$35 noncompliance fee to the student's bursar account and he/she will be referred to the academic integrity hearing panel (AIHP) for consideration of further sanctioning.

If, as a result of the meeting with the student, the faculty member believes that no violation took place, the faculty member will dismiss the case and the issue will be considered resolved. ~~Both judicial forms~~ **and any academic misconduct form/documentation** regarding the incident should be destroyed. However, if after discussing the incident with the student, the faculty member still believes that "more likely than not" a violation did occur; **the faculty member will choose one or more sanctions provided for within this policy.** ~~whether the student should receive a zero for the assignment, examination, paper, or project, or a grade of "F" for the course.~~

If the student and faculty member agree that a violation took place and the sanction imposed is appropriate, the faculty member will complete the Academic Integrity Resolution Form documenting the mutually agreed-upon outcome. The student will then be asked to sign the Resolution Form indicating that the information on the form is an accurate reflection of the decision(s) made during the meeting. A completed copy of the Resolution Form will be provided to the student. Additionally, the faculty member should retain his or her copy and forward all remaining copies of all forms/**memos** to the Office of Student Judicial Services.

If, after reviewing all of the information, the faculty member believes that the seriousness of the incident warrants additional action beyond **an academic grade** sanction, the Resolution Form should be completed indicating that the case will be referred to the AIHP for further **sanctioning consideration**. Furthermore, any student who has previously been found responsible for committing an act of academic dishonesty according to the records maintained within the Office of Student Judicial Services will also be referred to the AIHP for further sanctioning.

In the event that the student denies the ~~charge(s)~~ **allegation(s)** and/or does not accept the faculty member's sanction during the initial meeting with the faculty member, the faculty member will inform the student that the case will be forwarded to the AIHP for adjudication. The faculty member will then complete the Academic Integrity Resolution Form indicating a referral to the AIHP, have the student sign the form, and provide the student with his/her copy. All remaining documentation is then sent to the Office of Student Judicial Services. The Office of Student Judicial Services is responsible for ~~the~~ scheduling of the hearing.

D. Academic Integrity Hearing Panel (AIHP)

The AIHP consists of five panel members of whom three are faculty members, one of whom serves as the chair, and two of whom are students. Faculty panel members are nominated by the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate and approved by the Faculty Senate membership. The Office of Student Judicial Services is responsible for the selection of the student representatives.

The AIHP hearing is an opportunity for the student and faculty member to present views, call witnesses, and present documents and other evidence. The student accused of violating the academic integrity policy is required to represent himself/herself at the hearing. ~~An advisor of the student's choice may accompany him/her to the hearing, but is not permitted to address the panel.~~ The university may be represented by the instructor of the course giving rise to the alleged incident, by the chair of the department offering the course, or by the dean or designee of the college or school with which the course is affiliated. ~~An advisor who is not permitted to address the panel may also accompany the University's representative.~~

The AIHP will consider the documents, testimony, **and/or** other evidence presented to it by the student **alleged to have committed the violation** ~~charged~~ and the faculty representative. Based upon the standard of a preponderance of the evidence ("more likely than not"), the AIHP will render a decision. The AIHP will confer in private to determine whether the student committed an act of academic dishonesty and, if so, the proper sanction(s). If the AIHP finds the student **did commit a violation of the academic integrity policy**, it may impose any of the sanctions set forth in the Code in addition to the ~~letter grade academic~~ sanction that was issued by the faculty member. The student's cumulative disciplinary history will be taken into account during the sanctioning phase of the process. If the AIHP finds ~~in favor of~~ the student did not violate the academic integrity policy, the grade of "N" previously assigned to the student's record shall be expunged. The AIHP will refer the matter back to the faculty member who gave rise to the **allegation charge** with the instruction to reevaluate the student's work based on its merits.

The AIHP shall mail to the student written notice of its decision ~~and the student's appellate rights~~ three to five business days of the hearing decision. The decision of the Academic Integrity Hearing Panel is final. ~~The student may appeal the decision of the AIHP to the University Appeals Board in writing, within five business days from the date of the decision letter. All appeals should be delivered to the Office of Student Judicial Services. (See Section XI)~~

Appeal of Academic Integrity Hearing Process

The AIHP decision as to whether a student is responsible or not responsible for a violation of the academic misconduct is final. Furthermore, if the student is found responsible by the AIHP, then the academic sanction recommended by the faculty is also final. Only non-academic sanctions levied by the AIHP that were in addition to the academic sanction (e.g. a suspension for a second violation) may be appealed to the University Appeals panel. Any appeal must be submitted in writing, to the Office of Student Judicial Services within five business days of the date of the original hearing decision letter. (See Code of Student Conduct, Section XI – Appeal

ATTACHMENT B

Sanctioning Guidelines - Final Draft 9-15-08

The appropriate sanction(s) for an act of misconduct must be decided on a case-by-case basis as appropriate by academic discipline, teaching method, course level, maturity of the student, and degree of misconduct. When possible, the sanction should be selected with an eye towards aiding the student in understanding the seriousness of their behavior and the consequences of ethical misconduct. The faculty member may issue any of the sanctions listed below separately or in combination. Additionally, the faculty member may also refer a student to participate in an Academic Integrity hearing to determine if additional sanctions beyond the academic sanctions assessed by the professor are appropriate.

Written Reprimand:

A written reprimand that the student's behavior was in violation of the academic integrity policy and should not be repeated may be an appropriate sanction for very minor violations (generally poor citations or other plagiarism without intent to defraud).

Retake/Replace Assignment:

Allowing a student to retake an assignment or to make-up an assignment with different work may be an appropriate sanction for minor violations in which the student admits culpability. Retake/Replaced assignments should have a maximum score less than that of the initial assignment.

No Credit ("0" for Assignment):

This sanction is the recommended sanction for most minor violations of academic integrity. This sanction is generally appropriate for collaborating on homework and/or minor plagiarism in a writing assignment.

Reduction of Final Class Grade:

This sanction may be appropriate in violations where the student refuses to take responsibility for their misconduct or compounds their misconduct with a pattern of inappropriate behavior. This sanction may also be appropriate for major violations in which the student is fully cooperative.

Failure of Class:

This sanction is recommended for most major violations of academic integrity. Such violations include cheating on a midterm or final exam, plagiarizing a term paper, or other misconduct on a major summative experience.

Non-academic Sanction(s):

Non-academic sanctions may impose by the Academic Integrity Hearing Panel (AIHP) in addition to the academic sanction that was issued by the faculty member. The AIHP may issue any sanction set forth in the Code of Student Conduct. Educational sanctions (i.e. ethics workshop), a notation on a transcript, revocation of a degree suspension or other non-academic sanctions are generally reserved for serious or repeated misconduct. Non-academic sanctions are automatically considered by the panel for repeat offences. The student's cumulative disciplinary history is also taken into account when determining the student's sanction(s).

ATTACHMENT C

Senate Committee Reports October 6, 2008

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – Tom Sudkamp

An oral report will be given at the meeting.

Faculty Affairs Committee – Carole Endres

No report.

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

The UCAPC report to the Faculty Senate Meeting of October 6, 2008 is available at <http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/2fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Mateen Rizki

No report.

Information Technology Committee – Barbara Denison

The IT Committee will spend fall quarter as part of the Semester Technology Committee assessing the impact of the proposed change to semesters on the administrative and academic software and the work required for this conversion.

Minutes of June 6, 2008 Meeting – TK Prasad, Chair 2007-08

Members Present: Jan Belcher (CONH), Barbara Denison (RSCOB), Kathrin Engisch (COSM), Chris Watson (Library), T.K. Prasad (CECS).

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

- A. Jan Belcher reported that administering tests in Distance Learning courses is not going smoothly (possibly due to technology limitations) leading to wastage of faculty time. Jan Belcher also observed that providing podium chairs or bar stools in electronic classrooms (similar to those in Psychology, Rike, etc) will be helpful for those teaching continuously for several hours.
- B. Kathrin Engisch reported that number of clickers in lecture rooms were insufficient.
- C. Chris Watson reported that there is a separate well-equipped 'Presentation Room' in the Library for use by students for practicing multi-media presentations
- T. K. Prasad would like to know why there is several days delay in getting a licensed copy of Acrobat 8.0 installed by CaTS (on a new machine) that has already been paid for. Why cannot this be delegated to authorized Dept. or College Systems Staff?

Student Affairs Committee –

No report.

Student Petitions Committee – Alan Chesen

The University Petitions Committee met on 9/19/08 at 9:00 a.m. in E107 Student Union.

Members present were: A. Chesen, Chair, RSCOB, J. Hail, Secretary, Registrar's Office (ex-officio), A. Luneke and D. Atkins, Registrar's Office (ex-officio), M. Amir, CECS, B. Klaisner, COLA, M. Rammell, CONH, J. Howes, COSM, P. Caprio, UC, K. Rosengarten, Lake, M. Tenney, student representative. Members absent were: K. Wonders, CEHS, B. Ausdenmoore and M. Kassem, student representatives.

The committee conducted routine business and evaluated approximately 20 petitions. In addition, new members were introduced and informed about the general nature of the committee and the manner in which deliberations are to be conducted. The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:45 a.m. The next scheduled meeting is on 10/17/08 at 9:00 a.m.

Wright State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
October 6, 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, Jeffery* | ✓ Markus, Michael | ✓ Shepelak, Norma |
| ✓ Bargerhuff, Mary* | ✓ McGinley, Sarah | ✓ Sincoff, Mike |
| ✓ Bergdahl, Jacqueline* | Menart, James | ✓ Slilaty, Daniel |
| ✓ Bukovinsky, David* | ✓ Nagy, Allen* | ✓ Steele, Tracey |
| Dustin, Jack | ✓ Patel, Nimisha | ✓ Walbroehl, Gordon |
| ✓ Endres, Carole | ✓ Peplow, Amber | ✓ Xue, Kefu* |
| ✓ Engisch, Kathrin | ✓ Petkie, Douglas | Zryd, Teresa |
| ✓ Fowler, Barbara* | ✓ Pohlman, Roberta | |
| ✓ Hershberger, Paul | ✓ Proulx, Anne | ✓ Sudkamp, Tom* |
| ✓ Higgins, Steven | ✓ Rattan, Kuldip | ✓ Hopkins, David |
| ✓ John, Jeffrey | Ross, Leatha | ✓ Angle, Steven |
| ✓ Jones, Sharon | ✓ Schuster, Richard* | ✓ Sav, Tom |
| Kich, Martin* | ✓ Self, Eileen | ✓ Zambenini, Pam |

2. Approval of Minutes of June 2, 2008

Minutes were approved as written.

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/June08SenMin.pdf>

3. Report of the University President and Provost

President Hopkins

- Wright State's student headcount for Fall 2008 is the second highest in our history. The enrollment increase included significant gains for first-time-freshman. 17,662 (1991-17,761) Credit hours are highest ever, 1st retention increase, 3.5%, African American student retention increase, 4.5%.
- Representatives from Wright State University and Edison Community College signed the first two-plus-two transfer agreement between the schools during a daylong visit to Wright State's Dayton campus by Ohio's chancellor of education, Eric Fingerhut on Friday, Sept. 26.
- Heritage Society's – "A Toast to the Future" inducted 54 new individual and 25 community partners. Pleased to announce Dr. Ben Schuster's gift of \$1 million for modernization of our Concert Hall – part of a larger ongoing project to modernize and renovate the Creative Arts Center.
- Already known nationally for its programs and services for students with disabilities, Wright State has now taken its commitment to accessibility one step further by becoming the first university in the nation to create a dog park dedicated for the service dogs on campus.
- The state budget continues to be a challenge. Higher education was spared from cuts last Spring with a new understanding of the importance of higher education in turning around Ohio. Recently, a 4.75% cut across the board was announced. However, our SSI was exempt; and while we lost approximately \$450,000 in some line items, again, we were spared deep cuts. In preparation for what may be a third round of possible mid-year cuts, we must continue to be prudent in our decisions and allow for as much flexibility as possible to respond to pending challenges. Over the last year, through the leadership of Provost Angle, vice presidents and deans, we restructured our budget by \$5 million to allow us to strategically invest in the priorities

of our strategic plan. We must avoid “hunkering down” completely in these challenging times. Wright State and higher education are fundamental to the future of our state and we must move forward.

Provost Angle

The University System of Ohio Plan calls for the establishment of Centers of Excellence at each campus in the system. We’re working to get criteria and we’ll have a broad call for faculty to provide input. The process will involve an initial consultation in January and February, with a team the Chancellor will bring to campus to review what we see as our possible Centers of Excellence. We’ll then have until the end of June to fine tune and submit them formally to the Chancellor. Dr. Sudkamp is part of the group looking at the criteria, along with the academic deans and our VP for Research. Given the budget situation, this isn’t a process where we’re looking for new state dollars, but rather investing our own funds. In many respects it is not different from what WSU has done in the past, to build on strengths, look at areas of opportunity, needs of the community, and partnerships in the region to help move our campus forward. It seems more formal but is not significantly different from what we have been doing. We don’t want to de-emphasize our core programs because they are all excellent; however, the Centers will focus on growing selected areas.

Dr. Tom Sudkamp and Dr. Lillie Howard are co-chairing our Semesters Committee. Its goal is to look at what we will need to do if we move to semesters. I appreciate the efforts of those of you on the committee. What we have heard from our sister institutions is that this is a great deal of work but also a great opportunity, particularly as it pertains to curriculum. Perhaps only once in our careers would we have the opportunity to reshape every course in our curriculum.

4. Report of the Senate Executive Committee – Tom Sudkamp

We’re fortunate to have Lillie Howard co-chairing the Semesters Committee. We had over 60 faculty and staff members at our kick-off meeting and have added many since then. Five people from the University of Cincinnati, who went through the planning procedure last year, attended the first meeting. Their plan, which can be found on our semesters conversion website, is a good resource. Eight subcommittees have been named to look at specific areas: Academic Advising, Articulation & Transfer, Budget, Calendar, Communication, Curriculum, Infrastructure & Academic Policy, and Technology. Their tasks are to create a timeline, identify areas within their scope that would be affected by a conversion to semesters, and identify resources needed and the responsible parties to make the decisions. The Semesters Committee has five representatives from Clark State and four from Sinclair to coordinate a potential conversion. These institutions have indicated that if we move to semesters they will do so at the same time, allowing us to keep our articulations agreements and rework courses to fit seamlessly.

The former Provost of Shawnee State and the Provost from Central State attended the second meeting and enlightened us on the processes they used in their calendar conversion and the unanticipated items that they discovered during the conversion. We have another meeting on October 31 and hope to include representatives from the University of Toledo and Cleveland State to speak about their conversion. Because their schools are similar in size, issues of scope may be more pertinent.

Our goal is to have a report completed by early winter. The impetus for this came from the USO Strategic Plan and the Chancellor has strongly urged us to consider moving to a common academic calendar. Last week, the Ohio University Board of Trustees approved a move to semesters beginning fall 2012. University of Cincinnati Board of Trustees will vote on the issue in November.

Executive Committee – The committee met on September 22. We spent considerable time finalizing committee assignments, and approved deleting the old policy and placing the new Administrative

Procedures for Allegations of Research Misconduct in the Faculty Handbook. Another item we considered was Freedom of Speech and Expression, which is on the agenda today.

5. Old Business

- A. Ad hoc Committee to Review WSU Policies on Freedom of Speech and Expression – Executive Committee
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- B. Proposed Modifications to the Academic Integrity Policy – Student Affairs Attachment A to the October 6, 2008 Senate Agenda
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/Oct08SenAgn.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- C. CECS Program Change: B.S. Electrical Engineering – UCAPC
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/ee.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- D. COLA Program Change: B.A. Social Science Education – UCAPC
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0008/fsreport/socscied.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.

6. New Business

- A. COSM Program Change: B.S. Clinical Laboratory Science - UCAPC
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/clinical.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

7. Committee Reports

- A. See Attachment C to the October 6, 2008 Senate Agenda.
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/Oct08SenAgn.pdf>

8. Council Reports

None

9. Special Reports

- A. Voluntary System of Accountability Report – Joe Law
http://www.wright.edu/aboutwsu/docs/college_portrait08.pdf
- B. Classroom Utilization Report – Marian Hogue
http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/ClassUtilizeRpt_000.xls

10. Announcements

11. Adjournment

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