

6-1-2009

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, June 1, 2009

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

 Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

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

Faculty Senate

June 1, 2009, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

You are invited to attend a reception hosted by President Hopkins, from 2:00 - 2:45 p.m., in the Skylight Lounge outside of Room E156 Student Union.

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of Minutes of May 4, 2009**

http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/May09SenMin_000.pdf

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

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

5. **Old Business**

A. Senate Meeting Dates – 2009-2010

October 5, 2009	March 1, 2010
November 2, 2009	April 5, 2010
January 4, 2010	May 3, 2010
February 1, 2010	June 7, 2010

B. CECS Program Change: B.S. Mechanical Engineering

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/me.pdf>

C. CECS Program Change: B.S. Materials Science Engineering

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/mse.pdf>

D. COLA Program Change: B.S. Criminal Justice

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/crimjus.pdf>

E. CECS New Program: B.S. Computer Science: Visualization Option

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/csvisual.pdf>

F. COLA New Program: Minor in Women's Study: Sexuality Studies

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/sexual.pdf>

Dismissal of retiring Senators. Seating of new Senators.

6. **New Business**

A suspension of the rules will be requested to approve items **A, B, and C** today.

A. Approval of the list of March and June Graduates – Executive Committee

1) The list can be reviewed at the Registrar's Office.

B. Ratification of Committee Appointments for 2009-10 – Executive Committee

1) To be distributed at the meeting.

Items C – L are brought forth by UCAPC

- C. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Early Childhood Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/earlychd.pdf>
- D. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Athletic Training Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/athletic.pdf>
- E. COLA Program Change: B.A. Classical Humanities
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/classhum.pdf>
- F. COLA Program Change: B.A. Greek
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/greek.pdf>
- G. COLA Program Change: B.A. Latin
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/latin.pdf>
- H. COLA New Program: Minor in Russian Studies
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/russian.pdf>
- I. COLA New Program: Certificate in the African American Experience in Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/afsedu.pdf>
- J. COLA New Program: Certificate in African American Studies and Gender Experiences in Medicine
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/afsmmed.pdf>
- K. LC New Program: Honors Program for Associate Degree
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/lchonors.pdf>
- L. University Service Learning New Program: Citizen Scholar Certificate
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/citizen.pdf>
- M. Academic Integrity Policy Draft – Student Affairs (Attachment A)

7. Written Committee Reports and Attendance (Attachment B)

- 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: Dora Douglas
- G. Student Petitions Committee: Alan Chesen

8. Council Reports

- A. Athletic Council Final Report
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/ACrpttoFacSen5-22-09.pdf>

9. Special Reports

- A. AP Credit Policy Update – Joe Law
<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/AP-AlignmentRecommendFinal4-21-09.pdf>
- B. NCAA Bylaws Change – Beth Sorensen
- C. Banner and Prerequisite Checking – Marian Hogue

10. Announcements

- A. Next Faculty Senate: October 5, 2009, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union.

11. Adjournment

DRAFT: REVISION MAY 2009

Policy approved by a vote of the Faculty Senate on October 6, 2008

The student discipline process for violations of academic integrity is activated whenever an undergraduate or graduate student is accused of violating Section X 4 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 Community Standards and Student Conduct. An individual who suspects a student of cheating may at any time contact the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct 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 allegation of academic dishonesty unless the matter is resolved in the student's favor. Once notified by the professor, the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct 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. Both the student and /or faculty member may invite an advisor to be present during any phase of this process; however, advisors are not permitted to speak or to participate directly in the process.

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 notify the student of the

Author 5/22/09 9:51 AM

Deleted: judicial

Author 5/22/09 9:53 AM

Deleted: V, Category

Author 5/22/09 9:53 AM

Deleted: A/

Author 5/22/09 9:53 AM

Deleted: B

Author 5/22/09 9:55 AM

Deleted: Student Judicial Services

Author 5/22/09 9:55 AM

Deleted: Office of Student Judicial Services

Author 5/24/09 9:51 PM

Deleted: charge of

Author 5/22/09 9:56 AM

Deleted: Office of Student Judicial Services

allegations (preferably in writing). Within three business days of receiving the notification, the student should contact the faculty member and schedule a meeting. The subsequent meeting should be convened within two weeks. If the faculty member is not available, the student may be requested to see a suitable representative (department chair, Dean, etc). A copy of the Academic Integrity Violation Form or memo should be provided to the student when the faculty member and student meet. In the event the student fails to meet with the faculty member, a copy of the documentation can be provided to the student at his/her request by the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct.

If the student chooses to not schedule a meeting or fails to attend a scheduled meeting, the student will be found responsible for violating the academic integrity policy. The faculty member will choose one or more academic sanctions provided in the policy and submit the Academic Integrity Violation Form or the memo to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct. Furthermore, upon receipt of the documentation, the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct will bill a \$35 noncompliance fee to the student's bursar account and he/she will may 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. Any academic misconduct 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 academic sanctions provided for within this policy.

If the student and faculty member agree that a violation took place, the faculty member will complete the Academic Integrity Resolution Form and ask the student to sign the form. If the student refuses to sign, the faculty member will check the box "student did not sign" on the form. The form will then be sent to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct and a copy provided to the student. Additionally, the faculty member should retain his or her copy and forward all remaining copies of all forms to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct.

If, after reviewing all of the information, the faculty member believes that the seriousness of the incident warrants additional action beyond a grade sanction, the Resolution Form should be completed indicating that the case will be referred to the AIHP for consideration of additional sanctioning. 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.

- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: and the need for a meeting to discuss the incident.
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: one week
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: may
- Author 5/22/09 9:57 AM
Deleted: request
- Author 5/22/09 9:57 AM
Deleted: scheduled
- Author 5/22/09 2:58 PM
Deleted: .The faculty member may invite an advisor to be present during the meeting. However, advisors are not permitted to speak or to participate directly in the process.
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: the
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: the allegation is considered to be not contested by the student.
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: with the faculty member,
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: t
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: , 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.
- Author 5/22/09 11:30 AM
Deleted:
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: Any issue will be considered resolved.
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: and submit it to the Office of Student Judicial Services. docum€ ... [1]
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Inserted: and submit it to the Of ... [2]
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: The student will then b (... [3]
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Inserted: by the Office of Commr ... [4]
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: . indicating that the ... [5]
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Inserted: The completed form s (... [6]
- Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM
Deleted: further

In the event that the student denies the allegation(s), 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 and ask the student to sign the form. If the student refuses to sign, the faculty member will check the "student did not sign" box on the form. All remaining documentation is then sent to The Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct . The Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct is responsible for the scheduling of the hearing.

D. Academic Integrity Hearing Panel (AIHP)

The AIHP consists two faculty members and a student member. One of the faculty members will be the chair of the committee. Faculty panel members are nominated by the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate and approved by the Faculty Senate. The Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct is responsible for the selection of the student representatives. The AIHP will review the written material submitted by the faculty and the student and select one of the following actions (1) AIHP concurs with the faculty member's opinion that the student has committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy, (2) AIHP concurs with the faculty member's opinion that the student has committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy and recommends an additional sanction, or (3) AIHP is unable to make a determination based on the written documentation and asks the student and faculty to appear at a AIHP hearing.

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. 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.

The AIHP will consider the documents, testimony, or other evidence presented to it by the student 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 in favor of the student, 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 charge with the instruction to reevaluate the student's work based on its merits.

If the AIHP finds against the student, it may impose any of the sanctions set forth in the Code in addition to the letter grade 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. The AIHP shall mail to the student written notice of its decision and the student's appellate rights. The student may appeal the decision of the AIHP to the University Appeals Board in writing, within five business

Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM

Deleted: and/or does not accept the faculty member's sanction during the initial meeting with the faculty member

Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM

Deleted: , have the student sign the form, and provide the student with his/her copy.

Author 5/22/09 2:52 PM

Deleted:

Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM

Deleted: of five panel members of whom three are faculty members, one of whom serves as the chair, and two of whom are students.

Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM

Deleted: membership

Author 5/22/09 2:55 PM

Deleted:

Author 5/22/09 2:53 PM

Deleted:

Author 5/26/09 10:50 AM

Inserted:

The AIHP will review the written material submitted by the faculty and the student and select one of the following actions (1) AIHP concurs with the faculty member's opinion that the student has committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy, (2) AIHP concurs with the faculty member's opinion that the student has committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy and recommends an additional sanction, or (3) AIHP is unable to make a determination based on the written documentation and asks the student and faculty to appear at a AIHP hearing.

days from the date of the decision letter. All appeals should be delivered to the The Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct . (See Section XI)

Additional Information Regarding Academic Misconduct

E. Appeal of Academic Integrity Hearing Process

The AIHP decision as to whether a student is responsible or not responsible for a violation of academic misconduct is final. Furthermore, if the student is found responsible by the AIHP, then the academic sanction recommended by the faculty member is also final. Only non academic sanction levied by the AIHP (e.g. a suspension for a second violation) may be appealed to the University Appeals Panel. Any appeal must be delivered, in writing, to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct within five business days from the date of the original AIHP decision letter. (See Section XI)

Author 5/22/09 5:02 PM

Deleted: form

E. Notification of Faculty

The AIHP decision will be relayed to the faculty member who initiated the process by the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct within one week of the panel decision.

Author 5/22/09 2:56 PM

Deleted: two

Author 5/22/09 2:56 PM

Deleted: s

G. Sanctioning Guidelines

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 not 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 be imposed 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 offenses. The student’s cumulative disciplinary history is also taken into account when determining the student’s sanction(s).

ATTACHMENT A

DRAFT: REVISION MAY 2009

(As it would appear in final format.)

Policy approved by a vote of the Faculty Senate on October 6, 2008

The student discipline process for violations of academic integrity is activated whenever an undergraduate or graduate student is accused of violating Section X 4 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 Community Standards and Student Conduct. An individual who suspects a student of cheating may at any time contact the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct 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 allegation of academic dishonesty unless the matter is resolved in the student's favor. Once notified by the professor, the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct 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. Both the student and /or faculty member may invite an advisor to be present during any phase of this process; however, advisors are not permitted to speak or to participate directly in the process.

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 notify the student of the allegations (preferably in writing). Within three business days of receiving the notification,

the student should contact the faculty member and schedule a meeting. The subsequent meeting should be convened within two weeks. If the faculty member is not available, the student may be requested to see a suitable representative (department chair, Dean, etc). A copy of the Academic Integrity Violation Form or memo should be provided to the student when the faculty member and student meet. In the event the student fails to meet with the faculty member, a copy of the documentation can be provided to the student at his/her request by the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct.

If the student chooses to not schedule a meeting or fails to attend a scheduled meeting, the student will be found responsible for violating the academic integrity policy. The faculty member will choose one or more academic sanctions provided in the policy and submit the Academic Integrity Violation Form or the memo to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct. Furthermore, upon receipt of the documentation, the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct 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. Any academic misconduct 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 academic sanctions provided for within this policy.

If the student and faculty member agree that a violation took place, the faculty member will complete the Academic Integrity Resolution Form and ask the student to sign the form. If the student refuses to sign, the faculty member will check the box "student did not sign" on the form. The form will then be sent to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct and a copy provided to the student. Additionally, the faculty member should retain his or her copy and forward all remaining copies of all forms to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct .

If, after reviewing all of the information, the faculty member believes that the seriousness of the incident warrants additional action beyond a grade sanction, the Resolution Form should be completed indicating that the case will be referred to the AIHP for consideration of additional sanctioning. 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 allegation(s), 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 and ask the student to sign the form. If the student refuses to sign, the faculty member will check the "student did not sign" box on the form. All remaining documentation is then sent to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct. The Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct is responsible for the scheduling of the hearing.

D. Academic Integrity Hearing Panel (AIHP)

The AIHP consists two faculty members and a student member. One of the faculty members will be the chair of the committee. Faculty panel members are nominated by the Executive Committee of Faculty Senate and approved by the Faculty Senate. The Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct is responsible for the selection of the student representatives. The AIHP will review the written material submitted by the faculty and the student and select one of the following actions (1) AIHP concurs with the faculty member's opinion that the student has committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy, (2) AIHP concurs with the faculty member's opinion that the student has committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy and recommends an additional sanction, or (3) AIHP is unable to make a determination based on the written documentation and asks the student and faculty to appear at a AIHP hearing.

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. 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.

The AIHP will consider the documents, testimony, or other evidence presented to it by the student 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 in favor of the student, 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 charge with the instruction to reevaluate the student's work based on its merits.

If the AIHP finds against the student, it may impose any of the sanctions set forth in the Code in addition to the letter grade 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. The AIHP shall mail to the student written notice of its decision and the student's appellate rights. 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 Community Standards and Student Conduct. (See Section XI)

Additional Information Regarding Academic Misconduct

E. Appeal of Academic Integrity Hearing Process

The AIHP decision as to whether a student is responsible or not responsible for a violation of academic misconduct is final. Furthermore, if the student is found responsible by the AIHP, then the academic sanction recommended by the faculty member is also final. Only non-academic sanction levied by the AIHP (e.g. a suspension for a second violation) may be

appealed to the University Appeals Panel. Any appeal must be delivered, in writing, to the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct within five business days from the date of the original AIHP decision letter. (See Section XI)

E. Notification of Faculty

The AIHP decision will be relayed to the faculty member who initiated the process by the Office of Community Standards and Student Conduct within one week of the panel decision.

G. Sanctioning Guidelines

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 not 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 be imposed 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 offenses. The student's cumulative disciplinary history is also taken into account when determining the student's sanction(s).

ATTACHMENT B

Senate Committee Reports June 1, 2009

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – Tom Sudkamp

The Committee met with Keith Ralston and Caye Elmore, of Budget Planning and Resource Analysis, on May 20, 2009. Discussion on the current budget concerns continued, with the committee reviewing a five-year comparison of various units with information collected from the Academic Data Series and Current Funds Budget. Discussion also focused on the separation incentive and voluntary FTE reduction programs.

Members Present:

Sudkamp, Tom; Faculty Pres.
Choudhury, Enamul; COLA
Fichtenbaum, Rudy; RSCOB
Runkle, James; COSM

Guests:

Ralston, Keith
Elmore, Caye

Members Absent:

Lynd, Mary; CONH
Mukhopadhyay, Sharmila; CECS
Onady, Gary; BSOM
Roby, Doug; CEHS
Rosengarten, Ken; LAKE
Yerian, Stephen; SOPP

Faculty Affairs Committee – Carole Endres

Last meeting and final year report

Attendance: Cheryl Conley, Jane Doorley, Carole Endres, Beth Klaisner, Cynthia Laman, Ronald Taylor

The committee met for the last time this academic year on Thursday, May 7th. The main purpose of the meeting was to finalize two reports: one on the feedback about semester calendar preferences and the second was on the feedback about the process used for promotion to senior lecturer. Both reports were sent to Bill Rickert.

Bill Rickert also met with us to update the committee on the proposed incentives plans.

The primary focus of the committee this year was to monitor the process used to promote lecturers to senior lecturers. The complete report is attached. There are a number of issues that next year's committee should address.

There are some problems with the process itself in terms of what is expected in relation to the promotion document. I was surprised that in some colleges, the non-bargaining faculty were not allowed to vote for the college committee. Everything did work for those who went up for promotion but this could have been a major problem area IF someone had been denied at the college level and the non-bargaining faculty were not allowed to vote for the college committee. Also there appears to be a misunderstanding that in terms of voting for the college committee only those going up for promotion are allowed to vote when in fact ALL non-bargaining faculty are allowed to vote for the committee. The other major area of concern appears to be that opportunities to pursue activities that would qualify for major or significant contributions for leadership are not equally available among the various colleges. Some of the attitudes expressed in the report may be about a specific person's attitudes/perspective and not necessarily a department or college attitude.

The committee also decided that it would be helpful to those pursuing promotion next year to have a “template” of what a promotion document should contained and/or how it should be organized. This is very different from a tenure-track promotion document.

Finally, it appears that some departments did not complete annual evaluations for lecturers and/or take seriously the evaluation process since there was no potential for promotion for lecturers. Therefore, when these lecturers assembled their documents, they were not able to include all the appropriate evaluations because the lecturer has not been evaluated. This issue also needs to be addressed.

Comments about Promotion Process to Senior Lecturer Process

1. Did you have access to the senior lecturer promotion process document?

- Yes, and I referred to it as I completed my application.
- I did have access to the process document.
- I had a copy of the steps to follow, content to include and the dates of submission.
- Yes, was sent to all faculty in the college I believe (it was a year ago so hard to remember)
- Yes
- Yes, I got the document off of the web site
- Had difficulty finding the university documents
- 6 yes responses

“I was assigned a faculty member to oversee the process, but they did not seem to understand what was required and interpreted the promotion document without any real knowledge or ability to give me guidance.”

2. Was there any part of the process that was unclear to you?

- No.
- The process was very clear.
- After I submitted the document to my manager for review, I was not sure what feedback if any I was to receive from my chair or department review committee before it went to the next level.
- The process is explained with dates up through March 31st whereby the Provost must approve and send onto the President and Board of Trustees by then. However, there is no further information regarding when this last step will occur. I received notification from the Provost and he made it sound like it was a "done deal", but I was told it was not "official" until the President and BOT sign off on it.
- No
- There was some confusion about exactly how the document was to be put together. There were different formats used in our college that caused confusion.
- Two respondents experienced some confusion about whether the college was going to develop a college-specific version of the university documents related to the process
- 1 yes

“the promotion document was given to me and I was told to follow it even though I had many questions on interpretation; I did not understand what documents I needed, or how to write or submit these documents. The process was very vague and many of the requirements did not match my job description. One example was to list how many committees I serve on, but in our department, only tenured track professors serve on most of the university committees and lecturers serve on departmental committees.”

3. Did the chair/dean follow the process as outlined in the document?

- As far as I can tell, he did. He met with me in order to help me present my candidacy in the most positive light.
- Yes, the process was followed as outlined in the document
- Since this was the first year, it went rather well. I believe some of the feedback suggested for the lecturer promotion is different from the tenure track promotion process. This caused some confusion at the department level but was easily resolved.
- Yes
- Yes, overall but one chair did not and or was just confused
- 3 yes responses

“The Chair followed the requirements, but our Chair and our department treated the promotion the same as they would a tenure-track faculty member. They told me several times that this was a first time senior lecturer promotion and it was unclear to them how they should proceed. I was told a no vote came from some faculty who voted against the process rather than against my promotion.”

4. Was the process and timeline reasonable?

- I had no trouble completing the process in a timely fashion.
- The timetables were followed.
- Yes
- The major deadlines were met.
- Yes
- Yes, the timetable was reasonable
- 3 yes responses
- 2 responses that timetable too quick for Fall submission; the lecturer was only given 1-1/2 weeks to assemble her dossier the other lecturer is applying this year

5. Did you get to vote on choosing the members of the college decision committee?

- Yes. And, I was very happy with the support I received at that level.
- I don't recall voting on that committee.
- Yes
- No
- Yes
- Yes, we got to vote and Dean very supportive
- 2 yes responses
- 1 don't recall
- 1 NA
- 1 No response

“I had no chance to vote, request, or discuss who was to be on the departmental or college committee or who would make the decisions. The department had the faculty vote, resulting in many different opinions about the process and the requirements for promotion.

- 4 not eligible

6. Are there any changes you would suggest to the process?

None that I can think of at this time.

Being the first to go through the process, I am not sure how to answer that. I would like to be notified or know what the promotion actually means

Clarify any difference in feedback between the lecturer and tenure track processes once the document is submitted.

Not that I can think of at this time other than my confusion described in #2 above.

More clarification about how to assemble all the documents and what format to use. Some put together huge binders of materials and others did not.

“Training” for the chairs and Deans about this process so that they are comfortable with it and so that they stop comparing it to the AAUP process. They assumed it was the same and wanted to “force” the Senior lecturer process into the AAUP process.

Some changes should be made to the policy to make it clearer about what the format should be.

Chairs need to be more informed about the policies that govern non-bargaining faculty and be held responsible for communicating that information to new faculty.

Out of 3 responses from individuals who qualified to apply but did not do so;

One was told by the dept. P & T committee chair not to submit because the individual did not have enough evidence of the kind of “service” activities required for the promotion—this individual expressed concern that service should be so heavily weighted in the qualifications for the promotion because teaching is supposed to be the primary task of lecturers

One did not feel that in that person’s case, there was enough time available, due to teaching and other commitments, to gather all of the required documents to apply

One was not aware of the possibility to apply until one week before the deadline so decided to wait until next year—suggested notification far in advance to qualifying individuals by the university—also found/finds documents to be confusing—especially the Candidate Review Statement, and references to it in the documents

Out of the 2 responses from instructors not yet eligible to apply for the promotion; both felt significantly uninformed of the process and/or qualifications

Yes “There needs to be a clearer format for when and how to submit documents, identify clearly the requirements needed by the department to make a decision, what criteria should the department use, and how different should the process be from promotions for tenure-track faculty.

I also do not think that everyone should be promoted to senior lecturer based on time served in that position. This promotion should carry the same weight as a tenured track faculty, but the criteria must reflect the responsibilities and contributions required of the lecturer position. Outreach programs, administrative duties beyond their job description, teaching evaluations, and extensive academic efforts by the faculty member would help distinguish between those that have simply lectured, and those that have provided an outstanding service to the university.”

Weight years of service and excellent teaching more heavily rather than relying on so many extras

that many of us are unable to do.

More specific departmental guidance; for example what constitutes service and teaching above and beyond the normal duties of a lecturer?

I think it is almost impossible for us “math-types” to qualify. We figured that most of us wouldn’t qualify unless we do some very out of the ordinary work.

I am sure that I know what is required to become a senior lecturer but I am reluctant to request recommendations.

I am not sure the exact year I became a lecturer- I don’t have the documentation in front of me at the moment, but if I am eligible (I am close to the 6 year minimum), I did not feel I had enough “extra activities” to be successful if I did choose to apply.

When I checked the web-site that outlined the necessary qualifications for promotion to senior lecturer, I noted that the Leadership criteria were difficult to meet for teachers in the math department. In the past, we were always given courses to teach, and that took up the bulk of our time; we had few opportunities to become engaged in the kinds of activities listed under “major initiatives” (or even those under “significant leadership contributions”).

Also, even if we had taken it upon ourselves to attempt some such endeavor, it would have been on top of our normal, already substantial workload. Spoke very highly of new math Chair and anticipates more opportunities in the future.

I would qualify but recently I have done nothing of note. I am caring for a grandson with autism.

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

The UCAPC Report to the Faculty Senate Meeting of June 1 is available at <http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/9fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Mateen Rizki

Information Technology Committee – Barbara Denison

Fall Quarter

The IT Committee met as part of the Semester Technology Subcommittee of the Exploratory Committee on the Transition from Quarters to Semesters. The semester reports are available at <http://www.wright.edu/academicaffairs/semesters/>.

Winter Quarter

The IT Committee met in January and in March and discussed the following:

I. CaTS Update

A. Wings and Course Studio

Paul Hernandez reported that Wings and Course Studio have had problems since August. Recent patches have worked. CaTS plans to go to a parallel deployment with multiple versions on multiple servers. This should alleviate overload problems. The vendor reported that Wright State has the highest number of users without a parallel deployment.

B. Wireless Network

Larry Fox reported that an Audible Magic appliance is used on the wireless network in the residence halls to block illegal downloads of copyrighted material, especially music and DVDs. CaTS would like to apply this to the wireless networks on the main campus. Approximately 25% of the network traffic are illegal downloads. Blocking the downloads would improve the performance of the wireless network for academic use. Doing this would block illegal downloads for faculty and staff as well as students. CaTS was seeking faculty input. Barbara Denison reported on this at the Faculty Senate meeting February 2.

C. Faculty Computing Initiative

The Faculty Computing Initiative was prepared by CaTS and was submitted to the Provost for approval. The per PC figure allocation is \$1060. This does not include the School of Medicine, which has different funding. At the time, it was not sure when the funds would be released.

II. Distance Learning at WSU

CTL presented information on the status of distance learning on campus. Tracking of usage is not complete. Three new degrees have been implemented: Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction, Master of Information Systems, and the Doctorate in Nursing. Distance Learning is estimated to be about 3-4% of curriculum.

Dan DeStephen emphasized that the competition, including Sinclair Community College, is increasing its online offerings. Students will have a number of choices of where to take the TAG courses. He requested that colleges continue to consider the role of distance learning in their curriculum and strategic planning.

CTL will begin testing new course management software. WebCT 4.1 is aging and not Blackboard's newest product. CTL will pilot test Blackboard 9.0 soon. As WebCT ages, the textbook publishers are not creating compatible materials for it. Blackboard has promised all the functionality of WebCT. The interface will be different. Testing will also look at compatibility with existing courses, compatibility with Banner, use of Contribute, etc.

Spring Quarter

The Information Technology Committee met in April and in May and discussed the following.

I. CaTS Updates

A. Wings Portal Redesign

Denise Anderson gave a presentation on the Wings portal redesign. The committee discussed the role of message boards, blogging, and listservs. Questions were asked about the admin tab for employee services for faculty and staff. Load issues were discussed. Questions were also asked about providing mobile access.

B. Audible Magic

Installing Audible Magic would show due diligence on WSU's part to prevent illegal downloads of copyrighted materials. IT Committee members have checked with their colleges. After clarifications were issued to college feedback, there are no objections to installing Audible Magic. CaTS would like to install Audible Magic summer quarter to block illegal downloads on the wireless network on the main campus.

C. Email Encryption

Paul Hernandez reported that CaTS is researching email encryption solutions. Cost will be a major factor in the solution chosen. The first solution being considered is use an external provider. The current vendor of the anti-spam software is being considered. Users would go to a URL when they have an email message that they want encrypted. This solution could be implemented more quickly than an internal solution and would not require the user to have a separate encryption passkey. The user would just log on to the website with their WSU login and password.

D. Guest Accounts

CaTS demonstrated the new procedure for requesting guest accounts for campus visitors such as guest lecturers visiting for a short (day, week) period of time. A faculty or staff member who would like to sponsor a guest can access the Guest Account Request form under CaTS forms on the website. If a person calls the Help Desk, they will be shown how to complete the form online. CaTS will then call the faculty or staff member and get the account setup. This procedure can be done immediately. The guest will have access to the wireless network, labs, instructor stations in the classrooms. Guests will not have space on the H: or K: drives or access to Wings.

E. Exception requests

Larry Fox reported that faculty who need lab or router setups that don't conform to CaTs policy should complete an Exception Request form under CaTS forms. These requests will be routed directly to Larry Fox and then to the right department. Cats will work with faculty for a solution. In particular, Engineering and Computer Science has had a need for this.

F. Mobile access to mail, Wings, etc.

The IT Committee discussed that with the growing population of faculty, staff, and students using mobile devices that CaTS should plan for interfaces. Access to email on a mobile device works better through setting up the mail client instead of using the browser to access mail. The switch from Sun to Microsoft Exchange will also help since more software is designed to interface with Microsoft. Students will be switched by the end of 2009 and faculty and staff will be switched by the end of 2010. Microsoft Exchange will also help with calendaring and other mobile communication. Middleware would be needed to deliver information such as from Wings Express to handhelds in a usable way, versus scrolling an interface designed for full-size screens. CaTS and the user community would need to identify the information requested most frequently such as grades and schedules.

G. CaTS Website Review

The IT Committee reviewed the redesigned CaTS website. The website was redesigned to make it easier to find resources. For example, the free software page has information about LecShare and other instructional software.

II. Secure delivery of grades

The known acceptable methods for sharing grades are WebCT, Wings Express for final grades, and face-to-face meetings with students.

SOM requested CaTS to build a web-based interface providing their students access to grades via WINGS Express since SOM does not record grades for their students in Banner. Essentially the idea is a simple grades posting service for each class event (assignments, tests, etc.). Note that this would not be used for posting final grades to Banner. The faculty member would use a simple spreadsheet template containing a list of UIDs for the students in their class to record a score/grade and optionally notes for a given event. When the faculty member was finished completing the spreadsheet they would save it as a comma-delimited file (CSV), go to a new service in WINGS Express where they would select one of their classes, enter a name for the event, and upload the file. The service would do some light data validation and if error free would save the results in a database table. A second service would be built where students could see their list of events, scores and notes for a given class. Many faculty use the gradebook in WebCT which is secure. However, if there is enough interest among faculty who don't use WebCT gradebook, a solution could be built to work for all faculty. After discussion, faculty on the committee agreed to poll their colleges to see if there is interest.

III. CTL Update – Dan DeStephen

Dan DeStephen updated the committee on the status of WebCT which is no longer being updated by Blackboard. CTL will be looking at Blackboard version 8.0, Desire to Learn and Angel. A committee will give a recommendation by the end of fall quarter. A decision is anticipated by January, 2010 with winter, 2011 implementation. The two systems will run parallel for a period of time. It is critical to have the new platform installed for the development of semester courses. Cost will be a factor. The options are all above \$100,000 annually. WebCT is currently \$37,000 annually.

Submitted by Barbara Denison, Chair, with thanks to the IT Committee:

Anderson, Harry; SOM

Belcher, Jan; CONH

Chinov, Stefan; COLA

Engisch, Kathrin; COSM

Fulk, Roger; LAKE

Meyer, Cheryl; SOPP

Prasad, TK, CECS

Veres, Maggie; CEHS

Ex-off/Non-voting Members:

DeStephen, Dan; Dir., CTL

Watson, Chris; Univ. Lib.

Hernandez, Paul; Dir., CATS

Student Affairs Committee – Dora Douglas

The committee met on May 20 and continued discussion on changes to the Academic Integrity Policy. A draft proposal is being submitted to the administration and AAUP for input. The committee hopes to get feedback in time to submit the draft to the Faculty Senate at the June 1 meeting as New Business.

Members Present:

Douglas, Dora; COSM, Chair

Chen, Henry; CECS

Johnson, Doris; CEHS

Kassen, Moody; Stu. Gov. (n/v)

Kollman, Kathleen; COLA

Russell, Anne; CONH

Sudkamp, Tom; Fac. Pres.

Guest: Dickstein, Gary; Judicial Affairs

Members Absent:

Morris, Kathy; Stu. Aff.

Parker, Joel; Student

Wonders, Karen; CEHS

Student Petitions Committee – Alan Chesen

The University Petitions Committee met on Friday May 15 at 9:00 a.m. in room E107 of the Student Union. Present were the following members:

A. Chesen (Chair--RSCOB)
J. Howes (COSM)
K. Rosengarten (Lake)
B. Klaisner (COLA)
T. McMillan-Stokes (UC)
K. Wonders (CEHS)

C. Aubin (CONH)
B. Ausdenmoore (student)
S. Sheetz (student)
T. Brittingham (registrar's office--ex-officio)
P. Mohr (registrar's office--ex-officio)
Absent was P. Misra (CECS).

The committee heard approximately 30 petitions. A. Chesen informed the committee that E. Poch, assistant registrar, has finalized the language of a proposed change to the university fresh start policy for associate degree seeking students. This proposed change will be presented to UCAP. The next scheduled meeting of the committee will be on Friday June 19 at 9:00 a.m.

Wright State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
June 1, 2009
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* | ✓ Jones, Sharon | ✓ Shepelak, Norma |
| ✓ Bargerhuff, Mary* | ✓ Kich, Martin* | ✓ Sincoff, Mike |
| ✓ Belcher, Janice | ✓ Markus, Michael | ✓ Slilaty, Daniel |
| ✓ Bergdahl, Jacqueline* | ✓ McGinley, Sarah | ✓ Steele, Tracey |
| ✓ Bukovinsky, David* | ✓ Menart, James | ✓ Walbroehl, Gordon* |
| ✓ Duren, Dana | ✓ Nagy, Allen* (J. Edwards) | ✓ Xue, Kefu* |
| ✓ Dustin, Jack | ✓ Patel, Nimisha | ✓ Zryd, Teresa |
| ✓ Endres, Carole | ✓ Peplow, Amber | |
| ✓ Engisch, Kathrin | ✓ Petkie, Douglas | ✓ Sudkamp, Tom* |
| ✓ Fowler, Barbara* | ✓ Pohlman, Roberta | ✓ Hopkins, David |
| ✓ Hershberger, Paul | ✓ Proulx, Anne | ✓ Angle, Steven |
| ✓ Higgins, Steven | ✓ Rattan, Kuldip | ✓ Sav, Tom |
| ✓ John, Jeffrey | ✓ Self, Eileen | ✓ Zambenini, Pam |
| | | |
| ✓ Davis, Stephanie | ✓ Klykylo, William | ✓ Penmetsa, Ravi |
| ✓ Doom, Travis | ✓ Krane, Dan | ✓ Ramsey, Rosemary |
| ✓ Ebert, James | ✓ Loranger, Carol | ✓ Stalter, Ann |
| ✓ Fernandes, Ashley | ✓ Mamrack, Mark | |
| ✓ Halling, Kristin | ✓ McIlvenna, Noeleen | |

2. Approval of Minutes of

Minutes were approved as written.

http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/May09SenMin_000.pdf

3. Report of the University President and Provost

President Hopkins

I want to thank the Senate for all your good work this year. As we look back, you should be honored and pleased with your accomplishments. We have record enrollments, research and contract activity, and many people are supporting our mission even though giving amounts have decreased.

Budget - Because of the challenging economy in Ohio, the State is still working on their budget, we were not able to present a budget at our annual workshop, which was held on Thursday, May 28. Dr. Filipic presented an historical analysis with information that can be accessed at http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/fy08-09_cfbw.ppt. His presentation did a great job of clarifying information that has circulated that has not been completely accurate, and to help us understand the situation we're facing. We desire to be transparent about all aspects of the budget and to keep you apprised of how we're moving forward.

The governor and house presented their budgets, and last week the Senate presented a budget that is going on to a conference committee. Dr. Filipic will address specific points.

Dr. Filipic – Following the last Faculty Senate meeting, the State Budget Director and Tax Commissioner had a press conference to describe April tax revenues in Ohio, which were substantially below December estimates. Annual filings were more than \$300 million below the monthly estimate. As a result, both offices stated they expected a \$600-\$900 million shortage for the remainder of this fiscal year, which ends June 30, with no other solution than to use the rainy day fund. Unfortunately, the Governor's proposal for the coming biennium proposed complete depletion of the rainy day fund to fund spending in the next biennium. Later it was announced that the shortage for the current year would actually be \$912 million.

If current year revenues are so far below the revised estimates, it is reasonable that revenues for the coming biennium will also be below the revised estimates. Consequently, the State will have a deficit of approximately \$3 billion, relative to the budget the Governor proposed and the House adopted. The Senate unveiled its budget proposal last week, which will be adopted shortly. This budget reduced spending by \$1 billion; however we won't know until the end of June where the remaining reductions will come from. It is encouraging that higher education has been a priority throughout the process. Obviously, we can't put together a university budget until we know the state budget.

One additional comment is that in the Senate budget, funding proposed by the Governor in the coming biennium for the cooperative education and internship programs was eliminated; however, the core funding formula was not reduced. Expectations for undergraduate tuition was not changed, meaning no increase for this coming fall and no more than 3.5% next year.

Senator Question: What is the normal revenue for the State of Ohio per month?

Dr. Filipic: I don't know off hand what the income tax revenue estimate is for April. It would not be their annual tax revenue estimate divided by 12, because in addition to the normal monthly withholdings they receive from employers along with quarterly estimated payments, you have the annual filings in April. The total state budget is approximately \$25 billion, so divided by 12 it equates to slightly more than \$2 billion per month. There is also a substantial amount of federal money that goes into the general fund, so not all of the \$25 billion is tax revenue. I would encourage everyone to look at slide 37 of the budget presentation, which is a chart of annual changes in state income tax collections going back to 1990. Every year prior to 2009, state income tax collections have grown, both vigorously and slowly depending on the economy, but they are currently 15% below last year.

Senator Question: In terms of university enrollment, it has increased. If enrollment is good and funding from the state is level, how does that balance out?

Dr. Filipic: This is very important. Our economic conservatism has allowed us to advance to this point with less pain than many of our peers. Our core budget, excluding auxiliaries and sponsored research, is funded by tuition and state funding and pays for the overhead of the university. This funding is very dependent on tuition and enrollment trends. Our working assumption is that we will continue with the growth we have enjoyed this year but we have not projected additional growth. It is difficult to know what will

happen to our enrollments. Unlike private colleges that have high tuition and aid packages that have to be accepted or rejected by May 1, we are unsure about our enrollment until the first day of class.

President Hopkins: No doubt that our enrollment growth helped us deal with the mid-year cuts that totaled almost \$1.5 million. Our enrollment growth is very important to help us deal with this challenge. Our goal is to grow one to two percent in enrollment because we felt we could manage that and we need to work toward that goal.

Dr. Sudkamp: Returning to the budget, are there other items that differ between the House Bill and Senate Bill that directly concern us?

Dr. Filipic: The House added money to the Urban University Program that has been zeroed out in the Senate budget, and DAGSI has been zeroed out. We should look at the Senate budget as a high water mark, as we will end up lower than that, but I don't know where the cuts will come from.

Provost Angle

I would like to thank those of you who will be ending your term on Senate. We appreciate your efforts and hard work and look forward to working with Senators who will continue next year, and new Senators who will be joining us.

In spite of the sobering budget news, Ohio is in good shape if we compare ourselves to colleagues in Florida, Arizona, and California. We are being treated with priority within a bad budget situation. Higher education is being looked at as an answer to economic problems and an engine for the future. We have a responsibility to deliver on those expectations. We have had good financial management and are in a good position to weather this. Looking at how we can move ahead, we need to position ourselves to come out of this downturn and take advantage of opportunities. The Faculty Senate will be our partners in the semester transition, although a great deal of work for all of you, is a huge opportunity for the institution and I look forward to working with you in that effort.

4. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

The 2009-10 Executive Committee met on May 11 to appoint membership to the Senate committees for next year. This will be an action item on today's agenda.

The 2009-09 Executive Committee had its final meeting of the year. We received the Shots Fired training, presented by Officer Patrick Ammon. If you have not received the training, I highly recommend it. It provides you with information on how to respond and issues to think about in case of an emergency on campus.

We agreed to send a letter to Student Government stating that Executive Committee of Faculty Senate did not object to the Syllabus Archive Project, subject to the conditions that faculty must approve any syllabi that are posted on the site and have the right to remove syllabi at any time.

The committee also approved today's agenda.

I would like to thank this year's Executive Committee for their hard work. Thanks to Jeffery Allen, Mary Bargerhuff, Jackie Bergdahl, Dave Bukovinsky, Barbara Fowler, Martin Kich, Allen Nagy, Gordon Walbroehl, Kefu Xue.

5. Old Business

- A. Senate Meeting Dates – 2009-2010
 - October 5, 2009 March 1, 2010
 - November 2, 2009 April 5, 2010
 - January 4, 2010 May 3, 2010
 - February 1, 2010 June 7, 2010
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- B. CECS Program Change: B.S. Mechanical Engineering
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/me.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- C. CECS Program Change: B.S. Materials Science Engineering
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/mse.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- D. COLA Program Change: B.S. Criminal Justice
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/crimjus.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- E. CECS New Program: B.S. Computer Science: Visualization Option
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/csvisual.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- F. COLA New Program: Minor in Women's Study: Sexuality Studies
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/sexual.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.

Dr. Sudkamp: I would like to thank all of the Senators for their hard work, in particular those Senators who are concluding their terms. I would also like to thank the chairs of our committees: Matt Rizki, Buildings & Grounds; Tom Sav, Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy; Barb Denison, Information Technology; Dora Douglas, Student Affairs; Carole Endres, Faculty Affairs; Allen Chesen, Petitions. The work would not get done without their efforts. Also, Tom Sav, who serves as our Parliamentarian and Pam Zambenini, who serves in the Faculty Office. New Senators are invited to take a seat at the table.

I am pleased to announce that Dr. Jacqueline Bergdahl will be our new Faculty President-Elect for the coming year. Congratulations to Dr. Bergdahl.

6. New Business

A suspension of the rules was requested to move Items A, B, and C to Old Business and approve at today's meeting.

- A. Approval of the list of March and June Graduates – Executive Committee
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
 - 2. Moved and Seconded to approve today.
 - 3. Approved.

- B. Ratification of Committee Appointments for 2009-10 – Executive Committee
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
 - 2. Moved and Seconded to approve today.
 - 3. Approved.
- C. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Early Childhood Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/earlychd.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
 - 2. Moved and Seconded to approve today.
 - 3. Approved.
- D. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Athletic Training Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/athletic.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- E. COLA Program Change: B.A. Classical Humanities
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/classhum.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- F. COLA Program Change: B.A. Greek
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/greek.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- G. COLA Program Change: B.A. Latin
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/latin.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- H. COLA New Program: Minor in Russian Studies
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/russian.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- I. COLA New Program: Certificate in the African American Experience in Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/afsedu.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- J. COLA New Program: Certificate in African American Studies and Gender Experiences in Medicine
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/afsmmed.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- K. LC New Program: Honors Program for Associate Degree
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/lchonors.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
- L. University Service Learning New Program: Citizen Scholar Certificate
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/citizen.pdf>
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

Senator Question: Why isn't the Citizen Scholar Certificate called a Certificate in Service Learning?

Professor Sayer: The Service Learning Advisory Council did research at other institutions. We wanted to select a title that indicated the purpose of the certificate rather than the method. The Senate passed the definition of service learning that defines it as a teaching and learning method, so it is a pedagogy by which we teach certain things. We liked this title because it addressed the purpose of the program, which is to prepare students for effective citizenship. Some other choices seemed more political and we wanted to stay with the idea of preparing students with citizenship skills.

Senator Comment: When I think of the word “scholar,” taking six courses does not make a scholar. Is the title communicating the meaning of the certificate to potential employers?

Professor Sayer: The literature for service learning often uses the term, “the scholarship of engagement.” It is a different way of defining scholarship. Rather than a piece of paper, it is an action. Students are put to work enacting the things they are learning as scholars. The program is structured so students take one, 200 level course and the other courses can be any of the 200-400 level courses; except for the capstone experience, which is research that will result in a piece of scholarship that would benefit the community.

Senator Question: How will international students know this program is open to them since the word “citizen” is used?

Professor Sayer: We don’t intend for the program to be limited. The idea of global citizenship would come into play.

Dr. Sudkamp: It strikes me that the title “Certificate in Civic Engagement” would hit the idea more than “Citizen Scholar.” Will people understand what you are trying to get at?

Professor Sayer: I would be happy to take these comments back to the Service Learning Advisory Council, who spent a long time debating what the title should be.

Senator Comment: Students who get a certificate want it to have value in the workplace, and employers who are reading the title on a vita need a feel for what the certificate is about.

- M. Academic Integrity Policy Draft – Student Affairs (Attachment A)
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

7. **Committee Reports**

- A. See Attachment B to the June 1, 2009 Senate Agenda.
http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/June09SenAgn_000.pdf

Dr. Sudkamp: Stephen Foster, University Librarian, distributed a note to the deans stating that he anticipates needing to reduce the materials budget for fiscal year 2010 by 10%, and that a reduction of this magnitude requires that all material expenditures be examined. He hopes to preserve electronically sources and journal subscriptions, but some cuts will be required. Dr. Foster will communicate with faculty as reductions are initiated, especially in regards to journal cancellations. Contact Dr. Foster with concerns.

Dr. Rizki: The Buildings and Grounds Committee had many charges this year. The committee looked at revising a Faculty Dining Room but studies indicated that was not cost effective, given the current set up of food services at WSU. We looked at ways to improve classrooms and developed a Classroom Form in conjunction with the Registrar’s Office. We have consulted with CATS and the form should be on the web for official use during fall quarter in preparation for winter quarter. We are developing a classroom problem reporting form, with CATS help, so faculty can report all sorts of problems with classrooms via a web-based form. We reviewed construction projects, the most important of which is the Medical Sciences

classroom project, which has been approved and is in the bidding process. Six new classrooms are to be online for fall quarter. We are also participating in a classroom analysis and looking at best practices in scheduling and considering recommendations for additional classroom construction. The committee is considering a policy or plan for updating furniture in departments and colleges. We have not resolved this yet. The state is mandating a reduction in energy consumption and the committee spun off a subcommittee to organize a student competition to develop informational items to remind faculty, staff and students as to what they can do to save energy. We hope to have this project completed in the fall quarter. Additionally we looked at the status of parking on campus, especially with an enrollment increase this fall. The Director of Parking feels that additional buses and the promotion of Lot 20 and the Nutter Center will make for a workable situation.

8. Council Reports

A. Athletic Council

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/ACrpttoFacSen5-22-09.pdf>

Dr. Sudkamp: In the report, it states that Wright State is not in line with Title IX requirements. What are the implications of this and what will be done to bring us back in compliance?

Dr. Krane: The Gender Equity Subcommittee Report addresses the incident with Title IX and NCAA Certification. In March, it became apparent to the committee that for the first time in its history, WSU was not in compliance with Title IX expectations for gender equity issues. We have been proud of our Title IX compliance and last year were number one in the country for compliance. The problem is the newly created men's track team at WSU. It was a well-intentioned act to provide an opportunity for male, scholarship athletes in other sports to participate in another sport without additional costs to the university in scholarships and minimal coaching costs since a track coach was already in place for women. The problem arose with the way the NCAA recons student athlete participants, which is not by the number of scholarships awarded, but by the number of student athletes participating. Hence, the male student athletes are counted as student athletes in two sports, and we lost a favorable balance of male/female athletes. Failure to comply with Title IX and the NCAA should get our attention in a big way. Athletic Director Bob Grant is well aware of the situation, as well as Dan Abrahamowicz, and they are working to remedy the situation. There will not be a remedy by next year, so the report for 2010 will reflect that we are still out of Title IX compliance. The remedy is pending budget issues in the Athletics Department, as we are hearing they face a 17% reduction. There is active attention being given to the matter to resolve it in time for the NCAA certification visit in three years.

Senator Comment: Is there an approval process in place to add a new sport without sending it to the Athletics Council? Can the Athletics Department add a sport at their whim, or is there a structure in place so people know a new sport had been added?

Dr. Krane: As the Vice Chair, I attended all Athletics Council meetings. I do not recall that there was ever an announcement that a new sport was being added, and I am confident that there was never a vote taken by the Athletics Council.

Senator Comment: Will Athletics Council look into this? It seems that if Athletics Council is going to play a role, new sports, especially those that endanger Title IX compliance, should come before the Council.

Dr. Krane: The NCAA does not require institutions to have an Athletics Council, but for those who do, they are charged with oversight. I believe the oversight mechanism has worked well as we have brought the matter to the attention of Faculty Senate, and if the administration did not know, they do now. Proactive oversight may be a good idea and we should perhaps address that with the administration based on the situation now. At the very least, the system in place worked, as we have time to remedy the situation before the next accreditation visit.

9. Special Reports

A. AP Credit Policy Update – Joe Law

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/AP-AlignmentRecommendFinal4-21-09.pdf>

B. NCAA Bylaws Change – Beth Sorensen

I would like to proudly announce that our baseball team won the Horizon League Championship, than attended the NCAA Tournament for two games. I'm very proud of their performance this year.

Wright State has been advocating for a national change in NCAA policy for pregnant students. If students became pregnant, they lost their financial aid and as nurses, we recognized the health risk involved, as it gave students little option other than abortion or concealment of the pregnancy. We began a grassroots, national conversation and in January of 2008, the NCAA Division I Board of Directors unanimously approved the protection of financial aid if a student athlete became pregnant. We were privileged to have the opportunity to participate in writing the NCAA policy for an institution's appropriate response to pregnant and parenting student athletes. It is available online and I am available to address any class or group about the policy. We are not done now that national policy exists, but are focused on getting word out on the availability of resources, and continuing to advocate each institution's individual response to pregnancy.

C. Banner and Prerequisite Checking – Marian Hogue

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

10. Announcements

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next meeting will be on Monday, October 5, 2009, 2:45 p.m., in E156 Student Union.

/pz