

10-5-2009

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, October 5, 2009

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



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

Repository Citation

(2009). Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, October 5, 2009. .
https://corescholar.libraries.wright.edu/archives_senate_minutes/359

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 5, 2009, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of Minutes of June 1, 2009**

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/June09SenMin.pdf>

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

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

5. **Old Business**

Items A-I are brought forth by UCAPC

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

6. **New Business**

- A. Academic Policy: Fresh Start for Associate Degree seeking Students
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/fresh.pdf>

Semester Academic Calendar Policies:

- B. University Degree Requirements
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/SemesterUniversityDegreeRequirementsPolicy.pdf>
- C. Course Inventory Numbering
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/SemesterCourseInventoryNumberingPolicy.pdf>
- D. Expedited Course Inventory Process
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/SemesterExpeditedCourseInventoryProcessPolicy.pdf>
- E. Standard Credit Hour, Instructional Hour, Timeblocks
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/SemesterStandardCreditHourInstructionalHourTimeblocksPolicy.pdf>

7. Written Committee Reports and Attendance (Attachment B)

- A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: Tom Sudkamp
- B. Faculty Affairs Committee: Jay DeJongh
- C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav
- D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: Mateen Rizki
- E. Information Technology Committee: Barbara Denison
- F. Student Affairs Committee: Henry Chen
- G. Student Petitions Committee: Alan Chesen

8. Council Reports

9. Special Reports

10. Announcements

- A. Next Faculty Senate: November 2, 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 Comm ... [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 of 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 B

Senate Committee Reports October 5, 2009

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – Tom Sudkamp

No report

Faculty Affairs Committee –

No report

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

The UCAPC report to the Faculty Senate meeting of October 5 will be available on 9-30-09 at <http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/2fsrep.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Mateen Rizki

An oral report will be given at the Senate meeting.

Information Technology Committee – Barbara Denison

The committee is in the process of scheduling a meeting.

Student Affairs Committee – Henry Chen

No report

Student Petitions Committee – Alan Chesen

The Student Petitions Committee met on Friday, September 18, 2009 at 9:00 a.m. in room E107SU. Following an introduction by the chair and the introduction of members, the committee considered 23 student petitions brought forward from 7 academic units. Present were the following members:

A. Chesen, chair (RSCOB)
J. Howes (COSB)
K. Kollman (COLA)
A. Russell (CONH) for C. Aubin
F. Bennett (CEHS)
B. J. Hobler (Lake) for J. Adabor
R. Penmetsa (CECS)
T. McMillan-Stokes (UC)
E. Poch (Registrar--ex officio)
P. Mohr (Registrar--ex officio)

Absent were the following members:
J. Parker (student)
M. Morton (student)

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:45 a.m. The next meeting is scheduled for Friday, October 23.

Wright State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
October 5, 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.

- | | | |
|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| ✓ Belcher, Janice | ✓ Kich, Martin* | ✓ Slilaty, Daniel |
| ✓ Bergdahl, Jacqueline* | ✓ Klykylo, William | ✓ Stalter, Ann |
| ✓ Bukovinsky, David* | ✓ Krane, Dan | ✓ Steele, Tracey |
| ✓ Davis, Stephanie | ✓ Loranger, Carol | ✓ Wendeln, Marcia |
| ✓ Doom, Travis | ✓ Mamrack, Mark | ✓ Xue, Kefu* |
| ✓ Duren, Dana | ✓ Markus, Michael | ✓ Zryd, Teresa |
| ✓ Ebert, James* | ✓ McGinley, Sarah | |
| ✓ Endres, Carole | ✓ McIlvenna, Noeleen | ✓ Sudkamp, Tom* |
| ✓ Fernander, Allison* | ✓ Nagy, Allen* | ✓ Hopkins, David |
| ✓ (J. Allen, substitute) | ✓ Patel, Nimisha* | ✓ Angle, Steven |
| ✓ Fernandes, Ashley | ✓ Penmetsa, Ravi | ✓ Sav, Tom |
| ✓ Halling, Kirsten | ✓ Peplow, Amber | ✓ Zambenini, Pam |
| ✓ John, Jeffrey | ✓ Ramsey, Rosemary | |
| ✓ Jones, Sharon | ✓ Self, Eileen | |

2. Approval of Minutes of June 1, 2009

Minutes were approved as written.

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/June09SenMin.pdf>

3. Report of the University President and Provost

President Hopkins

Welcome back to campus. While we're in our fifth week of the quarter, it seems as though we're just getting started with the school year and there are many things to celebrate.

Many things have happened in the past two weeks:

- Excellence Awards for faculty were celebrated on September 15.
- Excellence Awards for staff were celebrated earlier today, October 5.
- Dayton Regional STEMM School had a grand opening.
- National Center for Medical Readiness opened.
- Lake Campus opened following a \$9 million remodel and expansion. Our regional campus is the fastest growing campus in the state.

We welcomed almost 18,800 students to Wright State for the fall quarter, the largest in our history in terms of headcount. This is the most diverse group of students we have had and is growing every day. Our retention rates also continue to grow which is a tribute to faculty and staff.

Much time was devoted to our challenging budget last year. Enrollment is part of the cushion necessary to absorb the budget cuts that were made. We are also monitoring investment

revenues and are pleased to say that our investment revenues are on target to meet the budget we presented.

Projected state revenues: Our staff and non-bargaining unit faculty did not receive raises in July, as we postponed them until we could track key indicators to insure that our budget measures could be fully implemented. Our staff has been magnanimous and magnificent in working hard and being patient as we have worked through the difficult budget. As part of our tracking measures, on October 10 we received the state's next projection of state revenues. July and August indicate revenue projections were on target with September looking very positive. This leads to the hope that our budget will be implemented soon. The budget is still in some jeopardy as a considerable amount is based on projected revenue from slot machines at racetracks. This past week, Governor Strickland announced that the last year of the five-year transition to reduce personal income tax in Ohio is in jeopardy. He has recommended that the last year of income tax reduction be delayed to fill the gap of the \$900 million that may be lost if the slot machine legislation fails. This money will need to be found somewhere in the budget. Additionally, if we fall below a certain threshold, we are in jeopardy of losing all of the stimulus money that came to Ohio, which is a significant amount. I want you to be up-to-date. The signs are good but challenging and I appreciate the Governor taking steps to protect education.

Transitions: We instituted the voluntary separation incentive program as one of our strategies to address budget cuts and minimize the need for layoffs on campus. We have tried very hard to protect people. We had predicted that 120+ people would take advantage of the separation with 117 (40 faculty/77 staff) taking the offer. Their separations are staggered from September 2009 through June 2010 so that the impact on the university would be less devastating. This is part of finding \$3 million in savings and our budget strategy is to carefully consider how we can creatively fill these positions.

Semester Transition: The General Education Committee is doing an impressive job with reorganizing our curricula for the semester transition. This is a wonderful opportunity to sincerely consider the outcomes for our students in the future. This opportunity doesn't happen often. Our theme this year is, "The Year of Innovation," and we need a common vocabulary to define what innovation means. John Kao, author of Innovation Nation, states that innovation is nothing more than creating something new and valuable. As we go through this year of transition, I hope we will all take on this challenge and opportunity as we go forward.

Our leadership team is changing significantly, not only with our attrition program but also with some of our talented individuals being recruited away. We are dealing with these transitions and ask for your patience as we all think things through together and maintain our momentum at this great institution.

Provost Angle

I want to thank everyone for such a smooth start to the academic year. We added sections of courses that we had not anticipated would be needed until a week or so before school started. Finding classrooms and instructors and getting students registered were challenging but we had a very smooth start considering our record enrollment. I thank you for your efforts.

Senator Question: You didn't mention the increase in tuition. Could you talk about that?

President Hopkins: In July, when the state passed the state budget, it resulted in a reduction of our budget for the next two years. The state offered the opportunity for institutions to initiate a

3.5% tuition increase. Originally, the state had asked that tuition be frozen for the first year with a 3.5% increase in the second year; however, the Governor's budget did not come to fruition. When it became clear that the state could not honor their projections, our Board of Trustees chose to raise tuition immediately so that we could begin to benefit. These are important monies we have lost from state funding. Some other institutions did the same, while others delayed an increase until winter or summer 2010. We have been dedicated to be an affordable and high-quality institution as possible. The increase amounts to \$85 more per quarter for a full-time student. In the state, we are still one of the lower cost institutions.

Senator Question: How does that factor into the future with budgets like this?

President Hopkins: We have tried to help the Governor understand the relationship between tuition and state support. Ohio has been in the top 10 for public institution tuitions costs in the country for nearly a decade. On the other hand, we have been in the lower 10 of the 50 states for state support. As they have given us increased support in the previous biennium, we have been able to freeze our tuition. They understood that when support decreased, they had to open the door for more tuition increases. We have established a relationship so that they don't expect to cut our budget and freeze tuition at the same time. An increase of 3.5% is much less than we have done in the past.

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

Executive Committee met in September. We examined the committee structure and finalized appointments to the Faculty Senate standing committees.

The committee received a request to examine services provided to emeritus faculty and decided to forward that on to the Wright State University Retirees Association (WSURA) to get their feedback on support provided by the university.

Last year, Senate Executive Committee appointed a Free Speech Committee to consider issues of free speech at Wright State and provide a recommendation for a freedom of speech and academic expression policy. They have worked diligently since last year and we are expecting a recommended policy from them this quarter. This is a tricky issue and we appreciate the considerable amount of time and thought the committee has put in.

The Quadrennial Review Committee has been busy making recommendations and changes to our Faculty Constitution and Faculty Handbook. If you have suggestions on how we can better provide services to students and faculty, please contact a member of the Quadrennial Review Committee. The committee is chaired by Colleen Finegan and our Faculty President-Elect, Jackie Bergdahl, is assisting with putting the report together. We hope to receive their recommendations within the next two months.

The chairs of the standing committees of Faculty Senate were called together early in the quarter, with the challenge to consider ways their committee could function more efficiently and forward those suggestions to the Quadrennial Review Committee. We stress transparency with all Faculty Governance activities and the meeting minutes are posted on the Faculty Senate website.

We approved the agenda for the meeting today and also discussed the possibility for the need to have additional Senate meetings this year. With the semester transition, we anticipate

dealing with a large number of curricular issues from the Undergraduate Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee, and expect that during this year, 4,000 courses will need approval and the curriculum for all of our 183 programs will need to be approved as well.

5. Old Business

A.

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
2. Approved.

A. CEHS Program Change: B.S. Athletic Training Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/athletic.pdf>

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
2. Approved.

B. COLA Program Change: B.A. Classical Humanities
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/classhum.pdf>

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
2. Approved.

C. COLA Program Change: B.A. Greek
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/greek.pdf>

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
2. Approved.

D. COLA Program Change: B.A. Latin
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/latin.pdf>

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
2. Approved.

E. COLA New Program: Minor in Russian Studies
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/russian.pdf>

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
2. Approved.

F. 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 Approve.
2. Approved.

G. 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 Approve.
2. Approved.

H. LC New Program: Honors Program for Associate Degree
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/lchonors.pdf>

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
2. Approved.

I. University Service Learning New Program: Citizen Scholar Certificate
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0009/fsreport/citizen.pdf>

Senator Question: Last June, we asked the Director of Service Learning if there was a better term than “Citizen Scholar.” What is the result of our request?

Cathy Sayer: The Service Learning Advisory Council considered the question and decided to retain the name of Citizen Scholar Certificate. We felt it was important to retain a name that indicated the purpose of the program, rather than the method. We feel we are producing students who are prepared to engage in acts of citizenship and their acts constitute scholarship. This makes them junior scholars, but scholars, none-the-less.

Senator Comment: When I think of the word scholar, I don't think of someone who takes three or four courses, but rather someone who has spent years on study. The other question was about someone who might not be a citizen. Meaning, you're not a citizen of the United States. My objection stands, I believe the title is pompous.

Cathy Sayer: The citizen issue is dealt with in the document as we indicate that it is community/broadly defined, as in local, regional, national and global. One can be a citizen in many different ways.

Senator Question: Did you consider any of the specific suggestions for alternate names for the program?

Cathy Sayer: We did talk about all of the suggestions. Service Learning Certificate was suggested, but we felt that focused on the method of learning rather than the goal. I don't recall other suggestions.

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.

2. Approved.

- J. Academic Integrity Policy Draft – Student Affairs (Attachment A to the October 5, 2009 Senate Agenda) <http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/Oct09SenAgnCombined.pdf>

Dr. Sudkamp: The Student Affairs Committee and the AAUP worked jointly to produce this draft.

Senator Comment: On the second page, second paragraph, there is a typographical error.

Dr. Sudkamp: We'll accept that as a friendly amendment, it should read, "may be."

1. Moved and seconded to Approve.

2. Approved.

6. New Business

- A. Academic Policy: Fresh Start for Associate Degree Seeking Students
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/fresh.pdf>

Dr. Sav: The focus of the policy is to accommodate associate degree seeking students. The policy is basically cut in half from the baccalaureate degree seeking student policy, except for the three-year period, which we felt was independent of the degree.

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

Semester Academic Calendar Policies:

- B. University Degree Requirements

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/SemesterUniversityDegreeRequirementsPolicy.pdf>

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

- C. Course Inventory Numbering

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/SemesterCourseInventoryNumberingPolicy.pdf>

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

- D. Expedited Course Inventory Process

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/SemesterExpeditedCourseInventoryProcessPolicy.pdf>

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

- E. Standard Credit Hour, Instructional Hour, Timeblocks

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0010/fsreport/SemesterStandardCreditHourInstructionalHourTimeblocksPolicy.pdf>

1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

Discussion: Because the Semester Academic Calendar Policies were offered as a group to be moved to Old Business for the November 2, 2009 Senate meeting, the synopsis of discussion below is a general record of concerns.

Senator: Page 2 of 6, Course Inventory: Document states 0 credit hours/690 undergraduate – this means we have 690 undergraduate courses that don't carry credit?

Dr. Sav: Some of those are the WI sections as well as the laboratories that were included. It is somewhat misleading that we actually have just under 7,000 courses.

Senator: Page 3 of 3 of the Semester Calendar/Time-block: Is this what we are currently using?

Dr. Sav: Yes, in March 2001 it was approved by this body for the conversion to the GE program in 2003.

Senator: When I look at the one evening per-week class schedule, either I'm very early or very late. I don't see a 6:05-9:25 time slot.

Dr. Sav: The handout is accurate but the time-blocks have been maneuvered within the standard. The two-evening-per-week start time of 6:05 has been widely adopted for the one-evening-per-week course start time.

Dr. Sudkamp: I asked Institutional Research to look at the time scheduling of evening classes but it was problematic as they came up with 45 different time groupings for evening classes. We are not advocating this as it creates class-scheduling issues. Staying within the time-block will be the word for the future.

Senator: Why the decision to begin at 7:25 on Monday, considering how difficult it is to get students and faculty here at 8:30?

Dr. Sav: That is available but not mandatory. There are programs and groups of students that start at that time and earlier. That start time is available but whether groups need to start then is another matter.

Senator: Why are MWF classes 55 minutes rather than 60 minutes?

Dr. Sav: That is binding per the agreement between AAUP and the university in setting the calendar, which is a 14-week calendar, as well as the 80 minute classes on TTH. It is not debatable.

Dr. Sudkamp: As someone involved in the conversion, the OBR has recently promulgated guidelines on what constitutes a semester credit hour and the actual number of minutes of seat time. I believe 750 minutes equals one semester credit hour. Fifty-five minutes per class for 14 weeks comes out to 60 minutes over the OBR limit. Fifty minutes does not meet the standard, but fifty-five meets them generously. The eighty minutes on TTH barely meets the requirements and is actually three minutes short.

Senator: Page 2 of 2 of the University Degree Requirements: There are minimum numbers but not maximum numbers. Has there been discussion to set maximums? Isn't part of the financial reward getting students through their program within a specific time frame?

Dr. Sav: Yes. I would like to make a correction to the * on that table, if you printed it out before it was corrected. The Ohio Revised Code states that the Associate Degree should not exceed 110 quarter hours or 60 semester hours. That should read 73 semester hours, not 60. There is no maximum set by OBR, except the 120 for the Bachelor's degree, which is a firm guideline. There is not a maximum for the Associate degree, nor do we have a university maximum. The paragraph following the table states, "strongly encouraged that departments, colleges and units design programs that meet but do not exceed the university minimum requirements. For those who can, programs should be designed so that a full-time student gets out the door in four years without summer course work.

Dr. Sudkamp: That has been discussed for the reasons stated. Our measures for success include getting students out on time. It has been suggested that degree programs that exceed a certain amount of time will be asked to explain why this is necessary. The goal is to have close to 120 credit hours to get students moving through the program.

Senator: I'm concerned about the time-block, as we're going from a 15-minute break between classes to a 10-minute break and people walking across campus.

Dr. Sav: If you refer to the current time-block model, you exit class at 10:50 and begin at 11:00, exit class at 1:20 and begin at 1:30. We currently have a 10-minute break on MWF, TTH allows for a longer break.

Senator: I'm concerned about students with physical limitations, especially if there are more students on campus now and it is more crowded and difficult to get around.

Dr. Sav: Prior to 2003, we had 10-minute breaks between classes, so we're returning to that. Yes, it is more difficult and a tighter schedule.

Dr. Sudkamp: That was discussed and the reason for the 10-minute break has to do with classroom utilization. Fifteen minutes breaks would mean one less classroom hour that we can schedule. We are concerned about having enough classrooms as it is. What you say is correct, but the issue is having enough classrooms.

Senator: Has a longer calendar for degree completion, which includes summers, been considered?

Dr. Sudkamp: I don't know the impact. While students would be here longer for tuition, the new state SSI has a formula for timely degree completion and I don't know the weightings.

Senator: Page 2 of the Semester Academic Calendar: "within the constraints of professional accreditation" – my interpretation is that every program must be exactly the minimum credit hours.

Dr. Sav: I believe it says strongly encouraged, not required.

Senator: I take it to mean that unless you can strongly justify a reason, every program should be exactly the minimum.

Dr. Sudkamp: It has not been decided at what point you will be asked to justify why a program is over the minimum. If an academic unit has a program that is 123 credit hours, it probably would not be an issue, but 140 credit hours would. Where the line is drawn, we don't know. We won't tell academic units not to go over the minimum because they understand what the student and program needs are, but programs over a four-year time period require justification. The statement says "try" to keep it close to 120 hours, which is 15 semester hours, which equals five classes per semester. Please speak with your constituents and bring those to this body. While every effort has been made to distribute information, it doesn't mean it has reached every one yet.

7. Committee Reports

A. See Attachment B to the October 5, 2009 Senate Agenda.

<http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/Oct09SenAgnCombined.pdf>

Oral Report from Buildings & Grounds: Chair Matt Rizki distributed a draft of the Capitol Plan, but it is not clear if there is money coming from the state to support the plan. Associate Vice President for Facilities Planning, Vickie Davidson, provided the Capitol Plan to the Buildings & Grounds Committee, which the B&G Committee is told represents a summary of items that percolate up from various constituencies on campus, including Deans. The two gray, line items represent a change being recommended by the B&G Committee and recommends that a classroom building be included in the plan as an actual line item. The auditorium line item is not struck out, but is viewed as part of the classroom building to include auditoriums, classrooms of various sizes (TBD), breakout meeting rooms, etc. B&G would like the Senate to take up the motion to place a classroom building on the Plan and keep it on the Plan until building is complete.

Rob Kreitzer, of Parking Services, reported to B&G on parking. Approximately three or four years ago, the Senate made a motion to build 500 new parking spaces on campus. The increased enrollment this fall forced 294 cars to park at the Nutter Center, which required extra busses costing approximately \$25k per week. One hundred and seventy eight cars parked in the Meijer parking lot with about 100 still parking there. This equals about 472 cars parked off main campus, which amounts to the 500 spaces Senate requested several years ago. We are requesting the classroom now, to accommodate more students in the future.

We are currently making trade-offs because we have failed to provide an adequate buffer for our goals, which means quality suffers.

B&G received a request from facilities to review lighting upgrades in classrooms, which amounts to a 30% energy savings. The new lights are quite adequate and B&G has recommended that all lights be changed. The necessity of continual dimmable lights in classrooms was discussed, but the B&G Committee feels it is sufficient to have toggle switches to drop the light level one-step. We will recommend that there be a standard of configuration for consistency across campus.

8. Council Reports

None.

9. Special Reports

None.

10. Announcements

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:10 p.m. The next meeting will be on Monday, November 2, 2009, 2:45 p.m., in E156 Student Union.

/pz