4-4-2011

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, April 4, 2011

Faculty Senate

April 4, 2011, 2:45 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of the Minutes of March 7, 2011**
    http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/SenMinMar-11.pdf

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

4. **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**
    Guest Report: Senate Bill 5 Update - AAUP

5. **Old Business**
    (Note: Links will not be activated until March 24.)
    A.   CECS Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/CECS-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/CECS-Programs-SingleFile.pdf

    B.   CEHS Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/CEHS-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/CEHS-Programs-SingleFile.pdf

    C.   COLA Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/COLA-Programs-Portfolio-2.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/COLA-Programs-SingleFile-2.pdf

    D.   COSM Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/COSM-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/COSM-Programs-SingleFile.pdf

    E.   LC Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/LC-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/LC-Programs-SingleFile.pdf

    F.   RSCOB Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/RSCOB-Programs-Portfolio-2.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/RSCOB-Programs-SingleFile-2.pdf

    G.   UH Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/UH-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/UH-Programs-SingleFile.pdf

    H.   Academic Policy: Repeating Courses and Replacing Grades Policy
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/RepeatingCoursesAndReplacingGradesPolicy.pdf

6.   New Business
   A.   School of Graduate Studies Name Change to *Wright State University Graduate School*
   C.   Combined Degree Programs – Graduate Credit for Undergraduates (Attachment A)
   D.   Conflict of Interest Policy (Attachment B)

7.   Written Committee Reports and Attendance (Attachment C)
   A.   Faculty Budget Priority Committee: Jacqueline Bergdahl
   B.   Faculty Affairs Committee: Sue Terzian
   C.   Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav
   D.   Buildings & Grounds Committee: Mateen Rizki
   E.   Information Technology Committee: Barbara Denison
   F.   Student Affairs Committee:
   G.   Student Petitions Committee: Kathleen Kollman

8.   Council Reports
   A.   Research Council (Attachment D)

9.   Announcements
   A.   Nominations, including self-nominations, for Faculty President-Elect are currently being accepted until Monday, April 18, 5:00 p.m. Qualifications for the office of Faculty President are stated in the Faculty Constitution located at: http://www.wright.edu/academics/fhandbook/

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

   B.   Next scheduled Faculty Senate meeting: May 2, 2011, 2:45 p.m., **E156 Student Union**.

10.   Adjournment

ATTACHMENT A

Combined-Degree Programs
Graduate Credit for Undergraduates

An undergraduate/graduate combined-degree program provides an opportunity for an undergraduate student to begin working toward a masters degree in his/her senior year, and to complete the bachelors and masters degrees in less combined time than it would take to complete them separately; it is an accelerated program designed for high-performing students. A student must meet the academic standards defined below and be accepted to participate in the combined-degree program.

Students pursuing both the bachelors' and masters' degrees at Wright State, or students, under partnership agreements, pursuing bachelors' degrees at other institutions and masters' degrees at Wright State, can participate in approved combined-degree programs. Departments, colleges, and other units wishing to create combined-degree programs must have proposals for those programs approved by the Graduate Council and UCAPC. Such proposals must be based on undergraduate and graduate programs already approved and offered—that is, a combined-degree program proposal cannot be used to create a new degree program.

When submitted, proposals must include:

• Title of the program and college/school and department responsible for administering the program.

• A description of existing requirements for both bachelors' and masters' degrees.

• A description of the proposed program requirements explaining how the program satisfies the requirements of both the bachelors' and masters' degrees.

• A list of graduate courses that will be allowed to count towards both bachelor's and master's degrees.

• Any additional eligibility requirements beyond the minimums described herein.

• Course inventory & course modification requests if courses are being created or modified as part of the proposal.

• Letters or statements of support from all potentially affected departments.

• A resource impact review, assessing the needs of the program pertaining to staffing, space, computer and library resources.

For a student enrolled in a combined-degree program, a maximum of 12 semester credit hours or 18 quarter credit hours of graduate level courses can be used to satisfy both the bachelor's and the master's degree requirements. Units proposing combined programs with a higher number of common credit hours will need to secure approval through the process described above. It is a general expectation that students will take graduate level courses only

after attaining senior status as undergraduates; programs that wish to design a curriculum that differs from this expectation should make sure to explain their reasoning in the proposal.

To participate in a combined-degree program, students must meet all of the following qualifications:

• 3.2 cumulative grade point average on all undergraduate work, including undergraduate credits earned at other institutions and transferred to Wright State, upon attaining senior standing.

• Undergraduate advisor's approval.

• Permission of the chair of each department in which graduate credit is desired.

Students admitted into an approved combined degree program do not have to formally apply to take graduate courses. The Program Director of the combined degree program will forward to the School of Graduate Studies Admissions Office the names of the students that desire to take graduate courses for graduate credit. The School of Graduate Studies will make the appropriate arrangements with the Registrar's Office to allow these students to register for graduate credit. Students admitted to a combined degree program will be admitted as provisional graduate students to the School of Graduate Studies, pending completion of the requirements for their bachelors degree.

If students have studies in progress at the time permission to take dual-listed courses is requested for the next term, any approval of the application is provisional and based upon the meeting of all required standards at the end of the current term. Permission will be revoked upon failure to meet these standards.

Students who are pursuing an undergraduate degree at Wright State University or another accredited university may, under certain circumstances, take graduate courses for graduate or undergraduate credit outside of the combined-degree program. Students must complete the Senior Permission Form and obtain all required signatures. Reapplication is required for any subsequent period. In addition, students must indicate their desire for undergraduate or graduate credit. No changes will be granted to the type of credit selected after the course(s) have been completed. Courses taken for undergraduate credit may be applied, with the academic unit's approval, toward undergraduate degree requirements.

Non-degree undergraduate students are not permitted to register for graduate courses.

Approved: University Curriculum and Academic Policy Committee _____

Approved: Graduate Council _____

Approved: Faculty Senate _____

Wright State University
Research Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosure Policy

---

INTRODUCTION

This policy establishes guidelines to assist investigators in managing external professional activities or relationships so as not to interfere with their primary duties to the University nor compromise the educational interests of University students with whom they work.

It is not the intent of this policy to eliminate or prohibit all situations involving potential conflicts of interest. Rather, the policy is intended to enable investigators to recognize situations that may pose a financial conflict of interest, to provide a process for disclosing these situations to the University and for working with the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies to manage these situations.

The University believes that with clear guidelines and principles, and with appropriate supervision and monitoring, it is possible for interaction between outside entities and the University to take place in a manner that prevents real or perceived bias.

APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to all faculty, staff and students at the University. Should Public Health Service (PHS) funds be subcontracted by the University to a subrecipient institution without a conflict of interest policy, the University's policy shall apply to the subrecipient.

DEFINITIONS

Investigator means the project director/principal investigator and any other person, regardless of title or position, who is responsible for the design, conduct, or reporting of research, or proposal for funding, including persons who are subcontractors, collaborators, or consultants.

Financial Interest means anything of monetary value or potential monetary value held by the Investigator, the Investigator's spouse and/or dependent children.

Significant Financial Interest means, except as otherwise specified in this definition:

1. A financial interest consisting of one or more of the following interests of the Investigator (and/or those of the Investigator's spouse and/or dependent children) that reasonably appears to be related to the Investigator's institutional responsibilities:

a. With regard to any publicly traded entity, a *significant financial interest* exists if the value of any remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure and the value of any equity interest in the entity as of the date of the disclosure, when aggregated, exceeds $5,000. For purposes of this definition, remuneration includes salary and any payment for services not otherwise identified as salary (e.g., consulting fees, honoraria, paid authorship, travel reimbursement). Equity Interests includes any stock, stock option, or other ownership interest, as determined through reference to public prices or other reasonable measures of fair market value.

b. With regard to any non-publicly traded entity, a *significant financial interest* exists if the value of any remuneration received from the entity in the twelve months preceding the disclosure, when aggregated, exceeds $5,000, or the Investigator (or the Investigator's spouse or dependent children) holds **any** equity interest.

c. Intellectual property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights), royalties from such rights, and agreements to share in royalties related to such rights.

2. The term *significant financial interest* **does not** include the following types of financial interests:

a. Salary, royalties, or other remuneration paid by the University to the investigator if the investigator is currently employed or otherwise appointed by the University as long as the investigator does not have a financial interest in the sponsoring entity;

b. Income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by a federal, state or local agency, or an institution of higher education;

c. Income from service on advisory committees or review panels for a federal, state or local government agency, or an institution of higher education.

Institutional Responsibilities means an investigator's professional responsibilities on behalf of the University including, but not limited to, activities such as research, research consultation, teaching, professional practice, institutional committee memberships, and service on panels such as Institutional Review Boards or Data and Safety Monitoring Boards.

Research means a systematic investigation designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. It includes basic research and applied research and product development. It includes activities sponsored through a research grant, career development award, center grant, individual fellowship award, infrastructure award, institutional training grant, program project or research resources award.

FINANCIAL CONFLICT OF INTEREST

A financial conflict of interest (FCOI) means a significant financial interest that could directly and significantly affect the design, conduct or reporting of research. Examples include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Investigator (and/or an Investigator's spouse and/or dependent children) entering into a paid consultancy with an outside entity that has an interest in the investigator's University-based research;
- Using students or employees of the University to perform services for an outside entity in which an investigator (and/or an Investigator's spouse and/or dependent children) has an ownership interest or from which he/she receives any remuneration;
- Investigator (and/or an Investigator's spouse and/or dependent children) receiving royalties or non-royalty payments related to ongoing research;
- Investigator (and/or an Investigator's spouse and/or dependent children) having an equity interest (e.g., stocks, stock options, warrants) related to ongoing research;
- Serving as an officer, director, or in any other fiduciary role for an outside entity that is financially interested in the investigator's University-based research, whether or not remuneration is received for such service.

This policy addresses individual financial conflicts of interest; however, the University may also have conflicts of interest in research whenever the financial interests of the University, or of a University official acting within his or her authority on behalf of the University, might affect - or reasonably appear to affect - University processes for the conduct, review, or oversight of research. If institutional conflicts of interest are identified *via* the disclosure process described below, they will normally be addressed in a manner that is consistent with this Policy.

INVESTIGATOR RESPONSIBILITIES

Investigators are responsible for the following:

- Reading and understanding this policy;

- Disclosing significant financial interests to the University by completing appropriate forms on or before a specified date or before submission of the grant/contract application;
- Completing any required training in a timely manner;
- Updating disclosure statements as changes occur, so that the statement on file is current and accurate at all times when an award is pending or in force; and
- Complying with any and all Management Plan provisions and monitoring requirements, as applicable.

DISCLOSURE

Each year an investigator must disclose in writing all significant financial interests (SFIs) that are relevant to the investigator's institutional research responsibilities or within 30 days after he/she becomes aware of new SFI or after a financial conflict of interest has been eliminated.   Investigators are required to complete the annual disclosure form even if they have no financial interests to report. Transactional disclosure is also required at the time a research proposal is submitted to the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and when a protocol is submitted to an external Institutional Review Board (IRB), the University's IRB or the University's Laboratory Animal Care and Use Committee (LACUC).

REVIEW

Designated members of the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (VPRG) conduct an initial review of all disclosures. If necessary, they obtain additional information from the investigator and other individuals to help determine whether the SFI disclosed is related to a proposed or existing sponsored project or program. A VPRG designee then formally identifies activities that require further review. Barring unforeseen circumstances, the process of information collection and review will be carried out in an expeditious manner.

There will be two levels of review:

- Level 1: The review group will include the VPRG designee, the investigator, and the investigator's supervisor. The group will work together to resolve potential or apparent financial conflicts of interest by implementing reasonable controls. These controls will be formalized in a Management Plan, which will be signed by the investigator, the investigator's supervisor, and the VPRG designee at the successful conclusion of the review.

If no acceptable conclusion is reached at the Level 1 review phase, the Level 2 review will be implemented. The Investigator, at his/her discretion, may choose to have the disclosure reviewed immediately at the Level 2 stage.

- Level 2: An Outside Interest Committee, which is a standing University committee, will work with the VPRG designee, the investigator, and the investigator's supervisor to resolve potential or apparent financial conflicts of interest and finalize a Management Plan. The final, formal Management Plan will be signed by the investigator, the investigator's supervisor, and the VPRG designee.

Whether a Level 1 or Level 2 review, the convened group will review the collected information to determine whether a financial conflict of interest exists by considering the following:

- Impact on integrity of research data;
- Risks to rights and safety of animal and/or human research subjects;
  - Note: All disclosures related to human subjects research will be assigned a Level 2 review.
- Risks to the rights of students and trainees participating in research; and
- Appearance of conflict of interest.

OUTSIDE INTEREST COMMITTEE

The Outside Interest Committee is a small standing University committee that works with investigators and the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies to resolve potential or apparent financial conflicts of interest by implementing reasonable controls. It also provides oversight for the implementation of this policy and makes recommendations for all future modifications.

The "core" committee will be composed of up to three members of the University's Research Council and the VPRG designee. Ad hoc members with subject matter expertise may be appointed by the VPRG, as needed.   Ex-officio membership may include representatives from the Office of General Counsel, the Office of Technology Transfer and Development, the Institutional Review Board (IRB), and the Laboratory Animal Care and Use Committee (LACUC), when appropriate.

In addition to this policy, Outside Interest Committee actions shall be in accordance with formal administrative procedures that are typically reviewed and approved by the Provost in consultation with the Faculty Senate. However, any revision to this policy that affects the terms and conditions of employment of Bargaining Unit Faculty requires

instead the approval of the University and of AAUP-WSU. All such revisions become effective upon their receiving the required approvals.

MANAGEMENT

Management means to take action to address a financial conflict of interest, which includes reducing or eliminating the financial conflict of interest, to ensure that the design, conduct or reporting of research is free from bias or the appearance of bias. Typically, written Management Plans are developed according to the nature of the conflict of interest and of the sponsored research, and whether the investigator is conducting bench, animal or human subject research. Examples of conditions or restrictions that may be employed to manage conflicts include:

- Public disclosure of significant financial interests (e.g., when presenting or publishing the research), if appropriate to the discipline;
- Disclosure of significant financial interests directly to participants involved in human research;
- Appointment of an independent monitor capable of taking measures to protect the design, conduct, and reporting of research;
- Modification of research plan;
- Change of personnel or personnel responsibilities or disqualification from participation in all or a portion of the research;
- Reduction or elimination of the financial interest (e.g., sale of an equity interest); or
- Severance of relationships that create the actual or potential conflict of interest.

Normally an investigator will be provided with a draft of the Management Plan to review and comment before it is finalized. At either Level 1 or Level 2 review, the proposed Management Plan will be made available to the appropriate dean or senior official. If the dean or senior official is unable to agree to the terms of the Management Plan, the matter will be referred to the Provost. The Provost's decision will be final.

MONITORING

Investigator compliance with Management Plans will be regularly monitored by the University to assure compliance and provide appropriate institutional oversight. The frequency of monitoring will be dictated by sponsor requirements, as well as Management Plan provisions.

VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

Human Subject Research

Special precautions must be taken to protect human subjects who participate in University research. Normally, an investigator with a financial conflict of interest will not be allowed to participate in such research. However, if an investigator provides a compelling justification, it will be reviewed to determine if a waiver of this policy is appropriate. The IRB must review and approve any Management Plan for human subject research to proceed. The IRB may also require additional safeguards.

Students and Trainees

Students and trainees, hereafter referred to as "students," may perform research related to an investigator-owned company only through a written sponsored research agreement or formal internship agreement through the University. Such agreements shall not limit a student's normal right to intellectual property and research data, allow for inappropriate publication delays, or hinder the normal progress of attainment of the applicable degree.

Special provisions for students employed by a company or outside entity where an investigator has a financial interest will be specifically called out in the investigator's Management Plan.

APPEAL

If an investigator wishes to appeal the Management Plan, an appeal may be made to the Outside Interest Committee (OIC) within 10 business days of receipt of the final plan. Should the investigator not file a written appeal with the OIC by such time, then the investigator shall be considered to have waived his/her right to appeal that and the determination of the OIC shall be final. If the investigator's appeal is denied by the OIC, then he/she may make a subsequent appeal to the Provost.   The Provost shall notify the investigator within 10 days as to whether the appeal is granted or denied. During the pendency of any appeal to the OIC or Provost, the investigator must either (a) agree to abide by the initial recommendations of the OIC; or (b) remove himself/herself from the research; or (c) not expend any funds under any award from a sponsor for the conduct of the research at issue. The Provost's decision will be final.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (PHS) RESEARCH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Prior to expenditure of any funds or within 60 calendar days for any interest that the University identifies as conflicting subsequent to the University's initial report under a PHS-funded research project, the University must provide the PHS Awarding Component with a Financial Conflict of Interest (FCOI) report regarding the related

FCOI and implemented Management Plan. This report must include the following information:

- Grant/Contract Number
- Project Director/Principal Investigator (PD/PI) or contact PD/PI
- Name of investigator with FCOI
- Nature of the FCOI (e.g., equity, consulting fees, or honoraria)
- Value of the financial interest
- Description of how FCOI relates to PHS-funded research
- Key elements of the Management Plan

Annual updates are also required for the duration of the research project.

If a significant financial interest (SFI) is not disclosed or reviewed in a timely manner, the University must review the SFI, determine if it is related to PHS-funded research; determine whether a financial conflict of interest exists, and, if so:

- Implement a Management Plan for ongoing research; and
- Implement a mitigation plan to determine whether any bias exists in previously conducted research.

Disclosure *via* University Website

PHS also requires that information regarding the financial conflicts of interest noted above be made available *via* a publicly accessible web site. At a minimum the web site shall include, the investigator's name, position relative to the research project, nature of the SFI, approximate dollar value of SFI, or a statement that the value cannot be readily determined.

Subrecipients

For PHS research that involves subcontractors, subgrantees or subawardees (collectively "subrecipients") at other institutions, the University requires written assurance from subrecipients that they and the individual investigators who work for them have a conflict of interest policy that conforms to the requirements of all applicable regulations, including, but not limited to those set forth at 45 CFR Part 94 and 42 CFR Part 50, Subpart F. If any subrecipient does not have such a conflict of interest policy, then the University shall require that Subrecipient follow this policy, and Subrecipient's failure to promptly do so upon request from the University shall be considered to be grounds for immediate termination by the University of any applicable subcontract or subaward. Any assurance required by the University shall contain the provision that

subrecipients will report to the University as the awardee Institution, any identified financial conflict of interest. The University will require a specific assurance from the other institution that any such financial conflict of interest has been managed. The University, in turn, will report the financial conflict of interest to PHS as described above.

RECORD RETENTION

The University will maintain records of all financial disclosures and all actions taken by the University with respect to each financial conflict of interest for at least three years after the termination or completion of the award, and in the case of federally funded research, at least three years from the date of submission of the final expenditures report.

REGULATORY AND LEGAL OBLIGATIONS

Investigators should be aware that as a result of their financial interest or fiduciary role in an outside entity/company they may have additional obligations under various state and federal laws, in addition to this policy. These laws include, but are not limited to, the following:

State

- Ohio Revised Code (Sections 102.03, 2921.42 and 2921.43)

Federal

- Public Health Service (PHS) 42 CFR, part 50, subpart F and 45 CFR Part 94
- National Science Foundation (NSF) Grantee Conflict of Interest Policies
- U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) 21 CFR 54
- Federal Office of Management & Budget Circular A-21
- Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)

Investigators should also be aware that research sponsors may have additional requirements regarding financial interests that would be defined in the grant or contract.

CONFIDENTIALITY

All information related to the review and management of financial interests is strictly confidential. The information is only made available to the persons within the University charged with the review of an individual case, including the appropriate Dean or administrative official. The University also must release information related to financial conflicts of interest and their management to the sponsor, as required by the sponsor's regulations or policies.

ENFORCEMENT

Possible violations of this policy include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Intentionally or recklessly providing incomplete, false, or misleading information on the disclosure form;
- Failing to make required disclosures; or
- Failing to provide information requested by the University to adequately review a financial interest and/or manage an identified conflict of interest.

The University may take appropriate disciplinary action against covered individuals who violate this policy. This disciplinary action may include, but not be limited to:

- Written reprimand
- Suspension
- Non-renewal of appointment
- Involuntary termination of employment

Disciplinary action under this policy for non-bargaining unit faculty shall be consistent with and subject to applicable provisions of the University's Human Resource Policies or applicable sections of the Faculty Handbook. For bargaining unit faculty, any disciplinary action shall be consistent with and subject to applicable sections of the Collective Bargaining Agreement between AAUP-WSU and the University.

POLICY REVISIONS

Any revision of this policy requires the approval of the President, Provost and the Faculty Senate. However, any revision to this policy that affects the terms and conditions of employment of Bargaining Unit Faculty requires instead the approval of the University and of AAUP-WSU. All such revisions become effective upon their receiving the required approvals.

ATTACHMENT C

Senate Committee Reports
April 4, 2011

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – Jacqueline Bergdahl

Faculty Affairs Committee – Sue Terzian

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Mateen Rizki

Information Technology Committee – Barbara Denison
IT Committee Minutes, March 4, 2011

Present: Barbara Denison, RSCoB; Rebecca Teed, COSM; Roger Carlsen (for Maggie Veres), CEHS; Sherrill Smith, CONH; Nancy Garner, History; Kathi Herick, Library; Paul Hernandez, Larry Fox, Scott Rife, CaTS; Dan DeStephen, CTL, Marian Hogue, Registrar; Galen Crawford, Costa Alimonos, Student Government

I.   Web Accessibility

The Senate Executive Committee requested that the IT Committee look into a report in the Chronicle of Higher Education. The first link addresses accessibility to technology by sight impaired students on college campuses. The second link specifically ranks multiple institutions of higher education, in which Wright State University is ranked quite low, in Best and Worst Colleges for Blind Students.

http://chronicle.com/article/Blind-Students-Demand-Access/125695/
http://chronicle.com/article/BestWorst-College-Web/125642/

Information Technology is requested to respond to the articles and investigate if Wright State is lacking in accessibility through technology and how Wright State can better serve our sight impaired students through improved access.

Jeff Vernooy, Office of Disability Services, had planned to attend our meeting but was unable. We will invite him to meet with us early spring quarter. It was also recommended that George Heddleston of Communications and Marketing be invited.

The second article was based on study results that looked at the public websites of universities and also the College of Liberal Arts. Scott Rife briefed us on some CaTS findings. CaTS maintains the Portal and the Self-Service. Communications and Marketing maintains wright.edu. Scott consulted with Jerry Hensley of CaTS who has expertise in this area. Wings tested OK with Jaws, the screen reader. Wings Express is accessible. Communications Express is not accessible but the calendar feature is not used much by students.

Dan DeStephen reported that desire2Learn is quite accessible and a big improvement over WebCT.

Wright.edu has many iframes and is managed loosely. In addition, faculty are responsible for their own content. Wright.edu has a text only link to reach a text version of the website that screen readers could easily interpret. Usablenet software is used to convert the site to web only. Scott and Communications and Marketing speculated that the testers used by the study author did not utilize the text only option.

The wright.edu website will be migrated to the content management system, Drupal. Mark Anderson has joined Communications and Marketing to be the new web lead. Accessibility rules can be set up with Drupal to check the content being uploaded by users. The migration to Drupal will probably take two to three years.

After discussion, the committee will invite George Heddleston and Mark Anderson to our next meeting. The committee also recommends that the Text-only link be more prominent on wright.edu. The IT Committee recommends that Communications and Marketing should do an inquiry into how the study was performed and reply on behalf of Wright State.

The first article explained accessibility problems with Kindle readers. CTL does not recommend Kindles for that reason.

II.   Learning Management Systems

Galen Crawford, Student Government Senator, distributed a resolution passed by Student Government. Student Government has requested that the Faculty Senate support a resolution that the university move to one course management system (CMS), rather than utilizing multiple systems.   Students feel that it is confusing to have to manage multiple systems when retrieving course materials or submitting assignments. EC would like for the IT Committee to investigate these issues and provide guidance or solutions.

The committee discussed a number of the issues of multiple learning management systems (LMS). Currently the university is supporting WebCT, Pilot, and Course Studio. In winter quarter, students and faculty saw their courses visible in both systems whether being utilized or not. Spring quarter, WebCT will not be available. Faculty have control over when and if to release the Pilot classes. Syllabi should specify where course materials are being stored.

There was also a discussion that students want to access syllabi in advance of the Pilot course being opened to get information to order books online or just research the course. Marian Hogue asked about a syllabus archive. Student Government had worked on one in the past but it was labor intensive and CaTS said that a secure archive would be needed to undertake this project. CaTS reported that CaTS could turn Course Studio off. It was also reported that the incremental effort to support Course Studio is negligible since it is integrated with Banner. Before any kind of recommendation could be made on the use of Course Studio, extensive faculty input would be needed. Scott Rife reported the following the Fall and Winter 2010 statistics on the usage of Course Studio.

Fall 2010 Stats	Winter 2011 Stats
Unique Students: 19098 Unique Instructors: 1276	Unique Students: 17955 Unique Instructors: 1214
courses with files attached: 794	courses with files attached: 678

# of files uploaded: 20213	# of files uploaded: 16367
courses with photos attached: 72 # of photos uploaded: 422	courses with photos attached: 43 # of photos uploaded: 419
Courses with links added: 186 # of links added: 1259	Courses with links added: 173 # of links added: 907
Courses with news items added: 16 # of news items added: 103	Courses with news items added: 7 # of news items added: 163

In addition to the usage above, faculty make use of the ability to email their class with Course Studio. Since Pilot emails are not forwarded to the campus emails, Course Studio is the best alternative to email a class. There was not a recommendation to discontinue use of Course Studio.

There is effort to make Pilot a first place to check for course information. Kathi Herrick reported that the Library is working with CTL to make Electronic Course Reserves an easy to use part of Pilot since faculty also use ECR as a repository. Elluminate is now integrated with Pilot both for setting up class meetings and for students to attend.

Dan DeStephen reported a relatively new issue is that book publishers are selling their own sites as LMS. They are encouraging faculty to use the publisher website for course material repository, test taking, and assignment submissions. Pilot does have widgets to insert in a course to link to the publisher's LMS if it is being used by the faculty member.

Faculty may also be using their personal website as a repository. Roger Carlsen reported that he uses Moodle, the open source CMS or LMS since the K through 12 community uses it extensively and his graduating teachers will be using it.

Galen was asked about student feedback in support of the Senate Resolution. He reported that 3000 students had been surveyed through the list serv. CaTS offered to work with Student Government if they wanted to post some questions on the Wings polling platform.

The IT Committee will follow up next quarter for feedback once WebCT is discontinued.

III.   CaTS Update

Paul Hernandez reported that contrary to rumors, the TV Center is not closing. In light of the budget pressures, there is a study of the Media Production Center to analyze all functions, usage and cost. It is likely that the TV broadcast in the classroom will be discontinued. This is not the campus RF system.

IV.   Center for Teaching and Learning

Dan DeStephen requested that the committee continue discussion of the draft guidelines for online classes during university closures. A brief discussion was held. It will be difficult for faculty to require accessing online materials during the scheduled class time while the university announcement includes "All classes are cancelled." The committee discussed other possible wording but agreed that long caveats would not translate well to the TV crawl announcements.

V.   Registrar

Marian Hogue reported that there have been challenges exporting grades from Pilot to Banner. The issue is with P/F grading and making sure that the grading standard is adhered to. CTL, CaTS, and the Registrar are working on this. If it is not resolved in the next week, faculty may need to enter quarter grades in Banner. CTL may be able to help with large classes. In WebCT, the export of the gradebook worked well. Part of the Pilot issue is the use of percentages rather than letter grades.

Marian also reported that the change of grade workflow is successfully in production.

VI.   Next Meeting

Barbara Denison will survey the committee for spring quarter teaching schedules before scheduling the next meeting.

Student Affairs Committee -

Student Petitions Committee – Kathleen Kollman
The Undergraduate Petitions Committee met on Friday, March 11, 2011, at 9:00 a.m. in room E107 of the Student Union. Present were the following members:

N. Drake (registrar—ex officio)	P. Reed (SGA representative)
C. Hartwell (RSCoB)	A. Russell (CoNH—substitute for C. Aubin)
J. Haught (CoLA—substitute for K. Kollman)	S. Solomon (registrar—ex officio)
B. Hobler (Lake)	D. Thomas (SGA representative)
J. Howes (CoSM—substitute chair)	T. Wischgoll (CECS)
T. McMillan-Stokes (UC)	

There was no representative or substitute sent in place of A. Lyons (CEHS).

The committee considered 42 student petitions from 7 entities.

 Approved at college and university levels: 12
-    RSCoB: 1
-    CoSM: 3
-    UC: 2
-    CoLA: 4
-    CoNH: 2

Denied at college and university levels: 25
-    RSCoB: 3
-    CoSM: 3
-    UC: 14
-    Lake: 1
-    CECS: 1
-    CoLA: 3

Approved at college level but reversed and denied at university level: 4
- CECS: 1
- CoLA: 1
- CoNH: 2

Approved all parts of request at college level but reversed and denied part of request at university level: 1
- CoLA: 1

 The next regularly scheduled meeting is Friday, April 15 at 9:00 a.m.

The associated Refund Appeals Committee will next meet on Friday, March 25 for routine business.

ATTACHMENT D

RESEARCH COUNCIL
REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE
APRIL 4, 2011

RSP Report
The preliminary report of grants and contracts through February 2011 for FY11 indicate that awards are ahead of this time last year. WSU has recorded 449 external awards for a total of $76.7M through February 2011; this figure includes $7.1M in State Share of Instructional (SSI) funds routed through Research and Sponsored Programs (RSP). In February 2010, WSU had recorded $70.8M in awards, including $7.8M in SSI funds.

Funding coded as "basic" or "applied" research through February 2011 is down when compared to the same time last year. The overall number of proposals submitted thus far in FY11 is fairly even when the two years are compared.

RSP's search for a new software package for electronic research administration and compliance is near the end. The top two vendors have provided their "best and final" offers, which are being evaluated. A recommendation will be made to the Provost. If approved, an implementation plan will be developed, including installation of modules and training

Presentation on Export Control
Reid Smith, Director of Technology Transfer and Development, Export Control Administrator, and International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR) Officer for the University, gave an overview of "Export Control in Academia." In the last decade much more attention has been given to research conducted at university sites. The federal government provides an exemption to Export Control regulations for colleges and universities when the supported work meets the definition of "fundamental research." The exclusion for public domain information is very important for universities, and this exemption should be applied whenever possible as it provides a lot of protection from export regulations. Universities lose this protection when they accept restrictions on publications or agree to restrictions of participation by foreign nationals. The sanctions for non-compliance to regulations are very serious, including both civil and criminal penalties.

Lake Campus Research Opportunity
The blue-green algae problem at Grand Lake St. Mary's may provide an opportunity for WSU faculty and other experts to collaborate on research related to water quality. Lake Campus Interim Dean Dr. Bonnie Mathies discussed the potential for collaboration and indicated that a number of individuals from State, Federal, and local agencies have already visited the campus to view the Lake and discuss the problem. Dr. Mathies proposed that Lake Campus host a "think tank" to bring together algal bloom experts from around the world for two to three days to discuss the situation and develop a research agenda of potential topics for exploration. There are several possible grant opportunities available to faculty interested in the research topic.

Dr. Mathies reported that about half of the initial startup expenditures to create a Think Tank Workshop have already been raised. Dr. Mathies also requested that Research Council members provide names of experts in this area of research so that they can be invited to participate. The approach of summer could mean the resurfacing of the algae and planning for that eventuality would be a great benefit.

Dr. Jack Bantle reiterated the importance of the collaborative effort and the benefits to establishing a research station at the Lake. The research gleaned from the work at Grant Lake St. Mary's could help other communities with lakes in the same condition.

Conflict of Interest Policy Update

Ms. Ellen Reinsch Friese and Dr. Bantle reported that they had presented the draft Conflict of Interest Policy to the Council of Deans. That version included the clarifications requested by representatives of the AAUP. The next steps for approval are the Faculty Senate and the Cabinet, with the goal of issuing this as a Wright Way Policy. Ms. Friese will attend a Conflict of Interest Forum in April sponsored by the American Association of Medical Colleges with a goal of seeing how other institutions are managing conflicts of interest. WSU's Conflict of Interest consultant will continue to advise Ms. Friese on the content for the Conflict of Interest website, including publication of sample management plans.

Review of Research Incentive RFP

In December 2010, the Ohio Board of Regents approved the WSU "Research Incentive Investment Plan," as written. WSU's approved FY11 Research Incentive allocation is $268,140, much less than what has been previously awarded. The source of the funds is the Third Frontier Bond Proceeds. Since this could be the last year for the Third Frontier Program, it is critical to make this year's program a success.

The Investment Plan called for a "Research Incentive" competition, divided into two programs: Seed Grant and Incentive to Collaborate. Funds will be divided between the two Programs, with 2/3s allocated to the Seed Grant and 1/3 allocated to the Incentive Program. Fully-affiliated tenure track faculty or teams are eligible to apply for the program, with different levels of funding available, depending on the application. The period of performance will be one year after the award and faculty will be held to specific timeframes for spending the funds.

The competition was announced by means of the faculty listserv and specific College/School listservs for the widest possible distribution. Proposals were due February 17 and will be reviewed by a committee composed of representatives from the Colleges/Schools that submit proposals. Funding decisions are anticipated by the end of March.

Research Infrastructure

In a discussion concerning research infrastructure concerns, it was agreed that the University should provide basic needs such as lights, electricity, heat, water, etc., for externally funded research projects. Specific modifications to a room should come from the grant or departmental budget. There is still some uncertainty as to the method by which such charges are made. It is understood that Physical Plant is currently working on a written policy and procedures to provide specific guidance to departments on financial responsibility for modifications and upgrades.

Ohio Sunshine Law and Research Officers' Council
Under Ohio law, records requested by outside groups may not be redacted to block the publication of names of individual employees. Dr. Bantle addressed this matter at a meeting of the Statewide Research Officers' Council and received comments from attendees regarding the handling of such matters at other Ohio institutions. This feedback was conveyed to the Office of General Counsel at WSU.

NSF Data Management Plan Requirement
The NSF proposal requirement for a Data Management Plan went into effect in mid-January and faculty members were notified by means of a listserv announcement. If a Data Management Plan is not applicable for a specific proposed project, this must be explained in the required Supplementary Documentation at submission time.

RFPs for Research Initiation and Professional Development Grants
The announcement of the internal competition for Research Initiation and Professional Development Grants was made to the listservs and posted at the "Campus Announcements" site at WINGS. Eligible faculty may apply for Research Initiation funding, worth up to $10,000 and generally used as research "seed" funds. Professional Development grant proposals are worth up to $3,000 and awarded for more scholarly, professional development activities. Due to the elimination of seed grant funding for the Boonshoft School of Medicine faculty members, "matrix" faculty will be eligible to apply for the competition.

How to Encourage Proposal Submissions
Members of the Research Council were asked for ideas to encourage proposal submissions. Many of the suggestions revolved around the need to hire new faculty with grant writing experience and/or a proven track record of funding and to provide a better infrastructure to facilitate the conduct of funded research.

Research Misconduct Workshop
Dr. Bantle continues to regularly offer two workshops that qualify for Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR) training: "Research Misconduct" and "Introduction to RCR." All faculty, staff and students are encouraged to register; certificates documenting the training are provided to those who attend.

Research Celebration
The Research Celebration is slated for April 8, 2011. Undergraduate and graduate students are encouraged to submit their abstracts prior to the deadline. Because sponsorships are still required, the names of any possible donors should be passed along to Dr. Bantle. The Foundation will make contact with the individuals. Any monies not used directly for the Research Celebration will be set aside for student scholarships for undergraduate research.

1.   **Call to Order**
Faculty President Jacqueline Bergdahl called the meeting to order at 2:45 p.m.

✓ Berg, Susan	✓ Laforse, Bruce	Stalter, Ann*
✓ Brown, Kevin	✓ Lamping, Sally	✓ Stireman, John
✓ Davis, Stephanie*	✓ Lee, Miryoung	Wendeln, Marcia
✓ Doom, Travis	✓ Loranger, Carol*	✓ Williams, Julie*
Ebert, James*	✓ McGinley, Sarah	✓ Xue, Kefu*
✓ Endres, Carole*	✓ McIlvenna, Noeleen	
Fernandes, Ashley	✓ Mirkin, David	✓ Bergdahl, Jacqueline*
✓ Funderburk, Charles	✓ Nagy, Allen*	✓ Krane, Dan*
✓ Goldfinger, Mel	✓ Nahhas, Ramzi	Hopkins, David
✓ Gray, Bobbe	✓ Penmetsa, Ravi	✓ Angle, Steven
✓ Halling, Kirsten	Runkle, James	✓ Sav, Tom
Kich, Martin*	✓ Schieltz, Beverly	✓ Zambenini, Pam
✓ Klykylo, William	✓ Self, Eileen	

2.   **Approval of Minutes of**
Minutes were approved as written.
http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senmin/documents/SenMinMar-11.pdf

3.   **Report of the University President and Provost**
Provost Angle
•   We have had a great start to the quarter. Enrollment is up 4% over last year and we continue to maintain strong enrollment growth.
•   Work on the semester transition continues with hundreds of courses moving through the process. We thank all of you for your hard work and continued effort as we progress.
•   The Arts Gala was held this past weekend and was a great success. We were wowed by our students, and many from the community commented that the students must be mentored by phenomenal faculty to have achieved the level of excellence displayed. It is nice to have the community recognize the quality of our faculty and students.
•   The regional summit was recently held at the Lake Campus. The community is excited and enthusiastic about what the Lake Campus brings to the area.
•   We are unsure how the state share of instruction (SSI) will be effected by the Governor's proposed budget, how it will be divided between four year and two year institutions, or if the current formula will even be used. This is a difficult time but higher education is situation better than expected.
•   The Horizon League is pleased to see Butler back in the finals. The Horizon League shares in the success of others in the league and we're pleased to have defeated a team that has progressed on to the finals.

Senator Question: Has the proposed tuition increase gone into effect and what is the university doing to support those students who may not be able to afford to continue their education because of the increase?

Provost Angle: There is some probability that a portion of the increase will go to need based scholarships. We will be taking this to the Board of Trustees who is very concerned for our students. We are looking not only to provide a quality education for our students but affordability as well.

4.   **Report of the Senate Executive Committee**
        Guest Report: Senate Bill 5 – Rudy Fichtenbaum, AAUP
- SB5 has passed the House and the Senate has concurred.
- Governor Kasich has signed the bill.
- In Ohio, a bill goes into affect 90 days after signature. The Ohio Constitution allows for referendum on bills that are not tax or emergency bills.
- One thousand signatures are needed to trigger a referendum. Although not positive, this number has likely been met.
- Petition drive to commence April 9 at a rally at the State House.
- Referendum requires 230,000 signatures of eligible Ohio voters and must be collected in 44 of the 88 counties in Ohio.
- AAUP is working with Ohio AAUP chapters and other labor unions to collect signatures.

Senator Question: Will signatures be collected on campus?
Rudy Fichtenbaum: Yes, we are asking AAUP members, and others who want to participate, to join us in collecting signatures on campus.

Senator Question: Will forms be available for us to gather signatures?
Rudy Fichtenbaum: Yes. After the 1,000 signatures are filed, language will be drafted and once we have that language, we can provide a form for each county, as signatures must be grouped by county.

Faculty President Jacqueline Bergdahl presented a Resolution from the Ohio Faculty Council opposing Senate Bill 5. The Faculty Senate members present voted unanimously to endorse the Resolution presented at the Senate meeting. Attached.

Senate Executive Committee Report – Jacqueline Bergdahl
The Committee:
- Discussed a proposal from Dan Krane for an expanded Convocation for September 2011.
- Further discussed the Free Speech document as presented by the Ad hoc Free Speech Committee. The document has been postponed pending further discussion by the AAUP and administration.
- Charged each EC member to investigate which certificates are being granted by their respective colleges based on a report that some certificates are being issued that do not have oversight by an appropriate university group.
- Asked Herb Dragella to discuss adjustment of the approved semester timeblock with the deans, as the semester transition will bring an additional shortage of classroom space. The issue will be revisited when EC receives Dr. Dragella's input from the deans.
- Reviewed the Conflict of Interest document as part of today's agenda.
- Discussed the School of Graduate Studies name change and placed it on the Senate agenda.
- Discussed recommendations made by the Ad hoc Student Conduct Committee. The chair of the committee has been contacted for clarification of some concerns and the recommendations will be revisited at the April 18 Senate Executive Committee meeting.
- Discussed the Combined Degree Programs policy and placed it on the Senate agenda.
- Approved the agenda for the April 4 Senate meeting.

5. **Old Business**
    A. CECS Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/CECS-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/CECS-Programs-SingleFile.pdf
        1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
        2. Approved.
    B. CEHS Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/CEHS-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/CEHS-Programs-SingleFile.pdf
        1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
        2. Approved.
    C. COLA Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/COLA-Programs-Portfolio-2.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/COLA-Programs-SingleFile-2.pdf
        1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
        2. Approved.
    D. COSM Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/COSM-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/COSM-Programs-SingleFile.pdf
        1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
        2. Approved.
    E. LC Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/LC-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/LC-Programs-SingleFile.pdf
        1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
        2. Approved.
    F. RSCOB Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/RSCOB-Programs-Portfolio-2.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/RSCOB-Programs-SingleFile-2.pdf
        1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
        2. Approved.
    G. UH Quarter to Semester Program Conversions
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/UH-Programs-Portfolio.pdf
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/UH-Programs-SingleFile.pdf
        1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
        2. Approved.
    H. Academic Policy: Repeating Courses and Replacing Grades Policy
        http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/fsreport/RepeatingCoursesAndReplacingGradesPolicy.pdf
        1. Moved and seconded to Approve.
        2. Approved.

6. **New Business**
    A. School of Graduate Studies Name Change to *Wright State University Graduate School*
        1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
    B. Combined Degree Programs – Graduate Credit for Undergraduates
        See Attachment A to the April 4, 2011 Senate Agenda.
        http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/SenAgnApr11Binder.pdf
        1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.
    C. Conflict of Interest Policy
        See Attachment B to the April 4, 2011 Senate Agenda.
        http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/SenAgnApr11Binder.pdf
        1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business.

7. **Committee Reports**
    A. See Attachment C to the April 4, 2011 Senate Agenda.
        http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/SenAgnApr11Binder.pdf

        The UCAPC report was distributed via e-mail prior to the Senate meeting.
        Semester transition updates as of April 3 are available as follows:

        1. The semester course inventory and program status summary is available at
           http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/semester/approvedworkflow/SemesterCourseInventoryAndPr
           ogramStatusSummary.pdf

        2. The detailed semester updates for all courses and programs are available at
           http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/semester/semester.htm

        3. The March UCAPC Minutes (now completed) are available at
           http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0011/minutes/7minutes.htm

8. **Council Reports**
    A. Research Council
        See Attachment D to the April 4, 2011 Senate Agenda.
        http://www.wright.edu/admin/senate/senage/documents/SenAgnApr11Binder.pdf

9. **Special Reports**

10. **Announcements**
    A. Electronic voting for the 2011-13 Faculty Senate term closes Tuesday, April 5, 2011 at 5:00
        p.m.
    B. Nominations for Faculty President are being accepted until Monday, April 18, 2011 at 5:00
        p.m.

11. **Adjournment**
    The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m. The next meeting will be on Monday, May 2, 2011, 2:45 p.m., in
    E156 Student Union.

/pz

The Ohio Faculty Council

I.   Whereas, The Ohio Faculty Council (OFC), recognized by the Chancellor of the University System of Ohio (USO) and the Ohio Board of Regents (OBR), represents the Faculty Senates and their respective faculty, or faculty who participate in the governance of their institutions through assemblies which include administrative staff of all of the four-year public colleges and universities in the State of Ohio;

II.   Whereas, SB5 contains language effectively stripping all higher education faculty of their collective bargaining rights by redefining them as "managerial employees" based on their participation in core shared governance activities such as "admissions, curriculum development, subject matter and methods of research and instruction";

III.   Whereas, SB5 as it is currently written also significantly limits the rights of all other public employees, including the hourly staff of public colleges and universities to engage in collective bargaining;

IV.   Whereas, SB5 has significant potential to disrupt the collegial working relationship that has characterized Ohio institutions of higher education and to create an environment of uncertainty for both faculty and hourly staff on multiple matters;

Therefore, be it resolved that:
1.   The Ohio Faculty Council is opposed to limiting the collective bargaining rights of all Ohio Public Employees, including hourly staff at public colleges and universities;
 2.   The Ohio Faculty Council is opposed to the specific wording in SB5 that eliminates the right of faculty to engage in collective bargaining based on their participation in the governance of public universities.