

6-4-2012

Faculty Senate Meeting Agenda and Minutes, June 4, 2012

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



Part of the [Educational Leadership Commons](#)

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

All retiring, returning and new Senators are invited to attend a reception hosted by President Hopkins, beginning at 1:30 p.m. in the Skylight Lounge (outside of E156 Student Union) prior to the Senate meeting.

Faculty Senate

June 4, 2012, 2:15 p.m., E156 Student Union

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of the Minutes of May 7, 2012**

<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senmin/documents/May12SenMin.pdf>

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

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

Resolution:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Faculty Senate that Wright State University is considering a major change to its internet portals,

And, whereas the Senate's Information Technology Committee has expressed concerns regarding the process by which Computing and Telecommunications Services (CaTS) has evaluated alternative solutions on large-scale computing and telecommunication projects in the past,

And, whereas the Senate expects that CaTS will have a transparent and well-documented process that gives the Information Technology Committee sufficient time to provide feedback on this project as well as all subsequent major undertakings,

Be it resolved that:

CaTS should develop and adopt a formal process for embarking upon computing and telecommunication projects that will directly affect the work of substantial numbers of faculty. Included in that process should be a written report submitted to the Senate's Information Technology Committee during the academic year and prior to the commitment of University resources that: 1) outlines an assessment of needs, 2) enumerates potential solutions and their relative merits, 3) justifies the selection of a specific solution, 4) describes a testing and implementation strategy, and 5) outlines a timeline for deployment.

CaTS is expected to deliver the assessment of needs (step one) to the Senate

Information Technology Committee one month prior to embarking upon steps 2 through 5. In emergency situations CaTS may undertake projects more quickly but will immediately inform the chair of the Information Technology Committee and the President of the Faculty (or their designees) of the nature of the emergency and the reasons for urgency.

5. Old Business

A. Wright Way Policy 1107: Research Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosure Policy – Research Council (Attachment A)

B. Policies and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer – FAC (Attachment B)

Items C. through M. – UCAPC

C. COSM: Applied Mathematics Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/AppliedMathematicsCombinedBSMS.pdf>

D. COSM: Applied Statistics Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/AppliedStatisticsCombinedBSMS.pdf>

E. COSM: Mathematics Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/MathematicsCombinedBSMS.pdf>

F. CECS: Control Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/ControlMinor.pdf>

G. CECS: DSP Wireless Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/DSPWirelessMinor.pdf>

H. CECS: Electronics Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/ElectronicsMinor.pdf>

I. CECS: Microwave Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/MicrowaveMinor.pdf>

J. CECS: VLSI Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/VLSIMinor.pdf>

K. CECS: BME Curriculum A Traditional Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/CombinedBMECurriculumATraditionalBSMS.pdf>

L. CECS: BME Curriculum B PreMed Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/CombinedBMECurriculumBPreMedBSMS.pdf>

M. CECS: ISE Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/CombinedISEBSMS.pdf>

Dismissal of retiring Senators. Seating of new Senators.

6. New Business

A. Ratification of Committee Assignments 2012-13 – Executive Committee (Attachment C)

B. Ratification of Senate Meeting Dates 2012-13

September 10, 2012

October 8, 2012

November 5, 2012

December 3, 2012

January 14, 2013

February 4, 2013

March 11, 2013

April 15, 2013

C. Doctor of Organizational Studies – Graduate Council

Full Proposal -

<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senage/documents/EdDFullProposalv7432012.pdf>

Program of Study -

<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senage/documents/DOSProgramOfStudy.pdf>

UCAPC Links Activated June 2

D. CECS Honors Programs

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/HonorsProgramsCECS.pdf>

E. CEHS Honors Programs

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/HonorsProgramsCEHS.pdf>

F. COLA Honors Programs

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/HonorsProgramsCOLA.pdf>

G. COSM Honors Programs

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/HonorsProgramsCOSM.pdf>

H. CEHS Youth and Community Engagement Minor

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/YouthAndCommunityEngagementMinor.pdf>

I. RSCOB Economics Combined BSB-MS

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/EconomicsCombinedBSBMS.pdf>

J. RSCOB Economics Combined BA-MS

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/EconomicsCombinedBAMS.pdf>

K. COSM Biology/Life Science Education

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/LifeSciencesEducationBS.pdf>

L. COSM Applied Physiology

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/AppliedPhysiologyBS.pdf>

M. Lake Campus Bachelor of Technical and Applied Studies, BTAS

7. **Written Committee Reports and Attendance** (Attachment D)
 - A. Faculty Budget Priority Committee: Dan Krane
 - B. Faculty Affairs Committee: Cheryl Conley
 - C. Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee: Tom Sav
 - D. Buildings & Grounds Committee: Mateen Rizki
 - E. Information Technology Committee: John Gallagher
 - F. Student Petitions Committee: Kathleen Kollman

8. **Council Reports**
 - A. Athletics Council – Larry Prochaska (Attachment E)
 - B. Graduate Council – Andrew Hsu (Attachment F)
 - C. Research Council – (Attachment G)

9. **Announcements**
 - A. Next scheduled Faculty Senate meeting: September 10, 2012, 2:15 p.m.,
E156 Student Union.

10. **Adjournment**

ATTACHMENT A

Research Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosure Policy

Policy Number: 1107

Date Issued: New/May, 2011

References:

Authority: Vice President, Research and Graduate Studies

1107.01 INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the policy is to promote objectivity in research by establishing standards that provide a reasonable expectation that the design, conduct, and reporting of research will be free from bias resulting from financial conflicts of interest.

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 ([OVPRG](#)) 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.

1107.02 APPLICABILITY

This policy applies to all faculty, staff and students at the University.

Specific guidance and requirements regarding Public Health Service (PHS)-funded research are noted in this document (or provided in Appendix A).

1107.03 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.

John & Pam Zambenini 4/25/12 5:15 PM

Formatted: Level 1

WSUadm 4/12/12 3:21 PM

Formatted: Left, Level 1

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM

Comment [1]: Added to establish the purpose of the policy in the opening paragraph.

WSUadm 4/16/12 10:20 AM

Comment [2]: Additional requirements for PHS-funded researchers are noted in the main document where applicable and spelled out in detail in Appendix A.

WSUadm 12/13/11 4:30 PM

Deleted: 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.

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

Management Plan means a written plan developed to manage conflicts by eliminating or reducing the Financial Conflict of Interest so that the design, conduct or reporting of research is free from bias or the appearance of bias.

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 and interests (e.g., patents, copyrights), upon receipt of income related to such rights and interests.
2. For PHS-funded investigators, any reimbursed or sponsored travel (i.e., that which is paid on behalf of the investigator so that the exact monetary value may not be readily available) related to their institutional responsibilities.
3. 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

WSUadm 12/13/11 4:33 PM
Formatted: Font:Bold

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [3]: Added the definition of the Management Plan.

Christian LaMantia 12/5/11 12:40 PM
Deleted: Intellectual property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights), royalties from such rights, and agreements to share in royalties related to such rights.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [4]: Revision based on language change in the PHS Final Rule.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:13 PM
Deleted: A

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:13 PM
Deleted: PHS-funded

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [5]: New. Defines another “significant financial interest” for PHS researchers.

appointed by the University, including intellectual property rights assigned to the University and agreements to share in royalties related to such rights; income from investment vehicles, such as mutual funds and retirement accounts, as long as the investigator does not directly control the investment decisions made in these vehicles;

- b. Income from seminars, lectures, or teaching engagements sponsored by a Federal, state or local agency, an Institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an Institution of higher education;
- c. Income from service on advisory committees or review panels for a federal, state or local government agency, an Institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an Institution of higher education.
- d. For PHS-funded investigators, travel, that is reimbursed or sponsored by a Federal, state, or local government agency, an Institution of higher education, an academic teaching hospital, a medical center, or a research institute that is affiliated with an Institution of higher education.

Institutional Responsibilities means an investigator's professional responsibilities on behalf of the University including, research, consultation, teaching, professional practice, and service.

Research means a systematic investigation designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. It includes basic 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.

1107.04 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

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [6]: Clarifying language from the PHS Final Rule.
 Deleted: as long as the investigator does not have a financial interest in the sponsoring entity

Christian LaMantia 8/27/11 4:17 PM
 Deleted: f

Christian LaMantia 8/27/11 4:04 PM
 Deleted: or

Christian LaMantia 8/27/11 4:03 PM
 Deleted: i

Christian LaMantia 8/27/11 4:02 PM
 Deleted: i

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [7]: Clarifying language from the PHS Final Rule.
 Deleted: or

Christian LaMantia 8/27/11 4:04 PM
 Deleted: or

Christian LaMantia 8/27/11 4:04 PM
 Deleted: i

Christian LaMantia 8/27/11 4:04 PM
 Deleted: .

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [8]: Clarifying language from the PHS Final Rule.
 Deleted: T

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:14 PM
 Deleted: by a PHS-funded Investigator

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:14 PM
Comment [9]: New. Special requirement for PHS-funded researchers from the PHS Final Rule.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:15 PM
 Deleted: but not limited to, activities such as

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:15 PM
 Deleted: research

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [10]: Simplified the language.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:15 PM
 Deleted: institutional committee memberships,

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:15 PM
 Deleted: on panels such as Institutional Review Boards or Data and Safety Monitoring Boards.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:16 PM
 Deleted: research

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.

1107.05 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 training in a timely manner as required by the sponsor or University;
- 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.

1107.06 DISCLOSURE

Each year an investigator must disclose in writing all significant financial interests (SFIs) that are relevant to an 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

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:17 PM
Deleted: required

Christian LaMantia 11/7/11 1:51 PM
Deleted: the

WSUadm 4/12/12 3:40 PM
Deleted: -

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).

For PHS-funded investigators, any reimbursable or sponsored travel, as required by the sponsor, must be disclosed. The disclosure must include the purpose of the trip, the identity of the sponsor/organizer, the destination, and the duration. The University will review this disclosure and determine whether further information is needed to ascertain whether travel constitutes an FCOI with PHS-funded research. Disclosure of travel must occur no more than 30 days after the last day of the trip.

1107.07 REVIEW

The OVPRG conducts an initial review of all disclosures. If necessary, the OVPRG obtains 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. Barring unforeseen circumstances, the process of information collection and review will be carried out in an expeditious manner. The OVPRG then formally identifies activities that require further review and refers such cases to the Outside Interest Committee (OIC).

The OJC 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;
- Risks to the rights of students and trainees participating in research; and
- Appearance of conflict of interest.

If a financial conflict of interest is identified, the OIC will determine whether the research can be undertaken with appropriate University management.

1107.08 OUTSIDE INTEREST COMMITTEE

The OIC is a small standing University committee that works with investigators and the OVPRG 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 three faculty members of the university's Research Council and the OVPRG. Ad hoc members with subject matter expertise may be appointed by the OVPRG, as needed. Ex-officio membership may include

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:19 PM
Deleted: (see definition above)

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:19 PM
Deleted: Investigators who are involved in PHS-funded research

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:21 PM
Deleted: :

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:21 PM
Deleted: (i. e., monetary value)

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:21 PM
Deleted: determine

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [11]: New language for PHS-funded researchers.

WSUadm 4/12/12 3:42 PM
Deleted: Designated members of the Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies (

WSUadm 4/12/12 3:42 PM
Deleted:)

WSUadm 4/12/12 3:42 PM
Deleted: they

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:27 PM
Deleted: A VPRG designee then formally identifies activities that require further review and refers such cases to the Outside Interest Committee.

WSUadm 4/12/12 3:43 PM
Deleted: A

WSUadm 4/12/12 3:43 PM
Deleted: designee

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [12]: Relocates a sentence and uses the "OVPRG" acronym to replace "designee."

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:37 PM
Deleted: outside Interest Committee

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [13]: Moves the determination factors from the end of the old section.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:37 PM
Deleted: Outside Interest Committee

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [14]: Eliminates two levels of review.

Christian LaMantia 11/7/11 1:25 PM
Deleted: There will be two levels of review... [1]

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:38 PM
Deleted: Outside Interest Committee

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:38 PM
Deleted: Office of the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies

WSUadm 4/16/12 10:20 AM
Deleted: designee

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, OIC 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.

1107.09 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. The OIC will work with the OVPRG, the investigator, and the investigator's supervisor to resolve potential or apparent financial conflicts of interest and finalize the Management Plan. The final, formal Management Plan will be signed by the investigator, the investigator's supervisor, and the OVPRG.

These Plans will be developed collaboratively and 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);
- Severance of relationships that create the actual or potential conflict of interest; or
- If it proves impossible to reach an acceptable Management Plan, funds will be returned to the sponsor.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:38 PM
Deleted: Outside Interest Committee

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [15]: New.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [16]: New.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:32 PM
Deleted: E

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:32 PM
Deleted: or

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [17]: New.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:32 PM
Deleted: .

Boilerplate Management Plan language will be made available on a publicly accessible website. The investigator, his/her chair and the appropriate dean or senior official will be given a copy of the final Management Plan. Any questions or concerns about the Management Plan should be forwarded to the OIC for consideration. **1107.10**

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.

1107.11 VULNERABLE POPULATIONS

Human Subject Research

Special precautions must be taken to protect human subjects who participate in University research. The IRB must review and approve any Management Plan for human subject research to proceed.

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.

1107.12 APPEAL

If an investigator wishes to appeal the Management Plan, an appeal may be made to the 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

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [18]: Previously addressed working with the investigator to develop the Plan.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:33 PM
Deleted: Normally an investigator will be provided with a draft of the Management Plan to review and comment before it is finalized.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [19]: New.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [20]: Level 1 and Level 2 eliminated.

WSUadm 12/11/11 2:19 PM
Deleted: 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.

WSUadm 12/11/11 2:19 PM
Deleted: -

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:39 PM
Deleted: 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.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [21]: Simplified.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:39 PM
Deleted: The IRB may also require additional safeguards.

Christian LaMantia 11/7/11 2:06 PM
Deleted: -

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:39 PM
Deleted: Outside Interest Committee (OIC)

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.

1107.13 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.

1107.14 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.

1107.15 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.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [22]: Detailed PHS requirements moved to Appendix A.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [23]: Renumbered.

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:40 PM
 Deleted: **PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (PHS) FUNDED RESEARCH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS**

WSUadm 12/14/11 12:40 PM
 Deleted: - ... [2]

Christian LaMantia 8/27/11 4:54 PM
Formatted: Font:(Default) Arial, 12 pt

Christian LaMantia 11/7/11 2:28 PM
Formatted: Font:Bold

Christian LaMantia 11/7/11 2:36 PM
Formatted: Font:(Default) Arial, 12 pt

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [24]: Renumbered.

WSUadm 4/16/12 10:28 AM
Formatted: Default Paragraph Font, Font:(Default) Calibri, 11 pt

Unknown
Field Code Changed

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [25]: Renumbered.

1107.16 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.

1107.17 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.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [26]: Renumbered.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [27]: Renumbered.

APPENDIX A

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE (PHS) FUNDED RESEARCH REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

This Appendix details the requirements for all Investigators engaged in PHS-funded research.

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)
- Whether the financial interest was managed, reduced or eliminated
- Value of the financial interest
- Description of how FCOI relates to PHS-funded research and the basis for the University's determination that the financial interest conflicts with such research.
- Key elements of the Management Plan

Annual updates are also required for the duration of the research project and must include:

- Status of the FCOI
- Changes to the management plan

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;
- Complete a retrospective review of investigator's activities and the PHS-funded research project within 120 days of a non-compliance finding to determine if there was bias in the design, conduct, or reporting of such research; and
- If bias is found, notify the PHS Awarding Component promptly by submitting a mitigation report.

WSUadm 4/12/12 4:28 PM
Comment [28]: Detailed PHS guidance.
 WSUadm 12/14/11 12:41 PM
Formatted: Centered, Level 1

WSUadm 3/12/12 4:22 PM
Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.5", No bullets or numbering

Public Disclosure

In accordance with PHS regulations, the University will respond to requests regarding financial conflicts of interest by written response within five business days of a request. The response shall include the investigator's name, position relative to the research project, the name of the entity in which the SFI is held, 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 agreement terms from subrecipients that they have a conflict of interest policy that conforms to the requirements of all applicable regulations, including time periods to meet disclosure and/or financial conflict of interest (FCOI) reporting requirements.

If any subrecipient does not have such a conflict of interest policy, then the University shall require that Subrecipient follow the University's (WSU's) 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 written agreement terms required by the University shall contain the provision that subrecipients will report to the University as the awardee Institution, any identified FCOI in sufficient time to allow the University to report the FCOI to meet reporting obligations described above.

Required Training for Investigators

Investigators must complete the University's FCOI training requirements prior to engaging in research related to any PHS-funded grant or contract and at least every four years, and immediately under the designated circumstances:

- This policy changes in a manner that affects Investigator requirements
- An Investigator is new to the University
- The University finds that an Investigator is noncompliant with this policy or their University- approved management plan.

ATTACHMENT B

Search form

Search Wright State

Search

• *UniversityCampus LifeEmployee ConnectFaculty* **Faculty Rights and Responsibilities**

Policies and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Approved by Faculty Senate May 5, 2008.

Approved by the Provost June 2, 2008.

This policy applies to Lecturers who are eligible for promotion to Senior Lecturer.

I. **Definitions**

A. The **Promotion Document** is the information that the candidate seeking promotion submits to the department chair summarizing his or her case for promotion. It consists of the following items:

1. The candidate review statement (Appendix A)

2. Evidence of outstanding teaching and service during the candidate's career at Wright State University

a. Annual performance evaluations for at least the ~~six~~ five most recent years as a Lecturer

b. Optional additional evidence of outstanding teaching and service

3. Evidence of leadership during the candidate's career at Wright State University

a. List of leadership activities, including dates

b. At least two internal or external letters of support that speak directly to the value of the candidate's leadership contributions

c. Other optional evidence of leadership

4. Other items that may be required or suggested by approved college criteria (see Section II. C)

B. The **Promotion File** consists of the Promotion Document and the following items that are added during the review process.

1. A written statement of the department chair
2. The form shown in Appendix B used to record votes and recommendations
3. A record of the College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee's vote and recommendation
4. The recommendation of the college dean made in consultation with the provost
5. Rebuttals and supporting material (if any) filed by the candidate

C. **Senior Lecturer Promotion Committees** are composed of Senior Lecturers and tenured faculty members who review promotion cases at the college level and make recommendations to the college dean.

II. **Criteria for Promotion to Senior Lecturer**

A. To be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer, a Lecturer must have served six years at the Lecturer rank and during that time have demonstrated a record of:

1. Sustained outstanding performance in teaching and service, as defined in Section B, below.
2. Leadership within the university, the discipline and/or the community as described in Section C, below.

Evidence of the candidate's leadership may come from any time during his or her academic career but must include leadership contributions while a Lecturer at Wright State University.

B. Teaching and Service

Outstanding teaching and service are documented by annual performance evaluations and other available evidence as needed or desired. Teaching and service are evaluated according to criteria governing Lecturers in the departments and the colleges. The amount of recent teaching may be limited, and effective completion of administrative responsibilities may be substituted for service work expected of non-administrative faculty.

C. Leadership

Leadership in teaching, service and scholarship includes either **major initiatives** with substantial and ongoing impact, five or more **significant leadership contributions that form a pattern of continuing engagement**, or an equivalent combination of the two. In addition, individual colleges may develop alternative criteria appropriate to the work in their disciplines. Such criteria for approval must be approved by the Dean of the college, the University Faculty Affairs committee, and the Provost.

The following lists are illustrative only and are intended as a guide to determine whether an individual faculty member has met the requirements for promotion to Senior Lecturer. One item from the **major initiatives** list might in itself be sufficient to confirm the individual's leadership or might only be sufficient if combined with two to four of the items from the **significant leadership contributions** list. Similarly, all items on the lists will not be of equal value. Some factors that might impact the value are:

- -
 - The impact of the effort expended,
 - The relative prestige (of awards, publications, etc.), or
 - The differing levels of responsibility.

The candidate's combined activity and achievement must be of high quality, must exceed routinely assigned teaching and service, and must include demonstrated leadership.

1. **Major initiatives** with substantial and ongoing impact include the following types of activities or the equivalent:

- -
 - Developing and sustaining a study abroad experience for students,

- Obtaining substantial internal or external funding or grant monies,
- Spearheading a major university project,
- Coordinating a major campus event involving several units within the university

and continuing for multiple years,

- Advising a significant organization or student activity that results in regional

and/or national recognition,

- Developing and editing a professional periodical,
- Writing and publishing a text book or ancillary materials adopted by multiple

universities;

- Writing and publishing a scholarly book, article or discipline specific publication.

2. **Significant leadership contributions** should include a *variety* of the following types of activities or the equivalent:

-

-

-
- Developing a new course;
- Developing internships or service learning courses, projects and partnerships;
- Advising an Honors project;
- Obtaining moderate internal or external funding or grant monies;
- Providing formal and substantial faculty mentoring;
- Promoting student success through documented initiation of innovative strategies

or a superior commitment to student advising;

- Receiving a university honor or recognition;
- Directing/coordinating a college or department program;
- Effectively chairing an active college or university committee;
- Actively serving on a college or university committee that is highly active and

productive;

- Coordinating a college, campus or community event or a policy or process

change within the college;

- Promoting alumni relations or engaging in fundraising
- Exercising leadership that draws on professional expertise outside the university
 - Receiving a community honor or recognition;
 - Holding an office in a professional or community organization;
 - Effectively chairing a major government or community board;
 - Effectively serving on a major government or community board that is highly

active and productive;

- Providing professional consultation to community groups, government agencies or businesses;
- Presenting a competitively selected scholarly paper or serving as a reviewer in the competitive selection of scholarly work;
- Guest editing a professional journal.

III. Participants in Decisions of Promotion to Senior Lecturer

All grants of promotion to Senior Lecturer are made by the Wright State University Board of Trustees based on review and recommendations from the following committees and individuals.

- A. Department Committee
- B. The candidate's department chair
- C. A College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee consisting of the dean as a non-voting member and five voting members
 -
 - Three of the voting members will be of Senior Lecturer rank and will be elected by the college's fulltime, non-tenure track faculty. A college that does not have sufficient Senior Lecturers may staff the committee by first electing Senior Lecturers from another college. When that is not possible, substitutes may be elected from among the tenured faculty within the college. Each substitute must be from a different department. Two of the voting members will be members of the College Promotion and Tenure Committee, chosen by that committee.
 - The voting members of the committee will elect a chair from among the voting members.
- D. The candidate's dean
- E. The provost
- F. The university president

IV. Procedures for Granting Promotion to Senior Lecturer

To initiate the Promotion Process, a faculty member must submit the Promotion Document to the department chair by October 1. The document becomes part of the candidate's Promotion File and may not be altered after the candidate has submitted it, without permission of the candidate and the department chair. Once the promotion process has begun, only the candidate may terminate the process. To do so, the candidate must submit written notice of withdrawal to the dean, who will then convey this information as appropriate.

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

- By November 15, the Department Chair will review the Promotion Document and prepare a letter recommending for or against the promotion. The letters from the department committee that reviewed the Document and from the Department Chair will be added to the candidate's Promotion File. The candidate will have twenty (20) working days to add a rebuttal letter to the file.
- By February 1, the College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee will review the candidate's file and make its written recommendation. If the Committee reviews materials that are not part of the individual's promotion file, the chair of that committee will promptly make such materials available to the candidate. The Promotion Document cannot be altered after it has been voted on by the College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee.
- The college dean will inform the candidate promptly of the decision and vote of the College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee. The candidate will have ten (10) working days to add a rebuttal letter to the file.
- By March 15, the college dean in consultation with the provost will review the file and prepare a letter recommending for or against the promotion. The college dean will inform the candidate promptly of the decision and provide the candidate access to his or her file, which will include the department chair and dean recommendations and the Committee's recommendation and vote.
- By March 31, the provost will forward all recommendations for promotion to Senior Lecturer to the university president for consideration and recommendation to the Board of Trustees. The Board of Trustees announces all promotions.

If the candidate disagrees with any of the statements or conclusions in the file, the candidate may submit a letter of rebuttal and supporting evidence at the points in the process indicated above. In addition, the candidate may use a rebuttal to report the acceptance or publication of a work of printed scholarship and/or the awarding of a grant or honor listed in the Document as under consideration. The rebuttal letter(s) and supporting evidence will be added to the candidate's promotion file and will be given full consideration at all subsequent stages of the promotion process. The candidate has the right to view the promotion file at any time during the process and after its completion.

Appendix A

Candidate Review Statement

The Candidate Review Statement specifies items to be included in the Promotion Document

Name of Candidate: _____

Department and College: _____

I hereby submit these materials as my Promotion Document in support of my candidacy for Senior Lecturer. My Promotion Document consists of the following:

Candidate Review Statement (Appendix A)

Candidate Curriculum Vitae

Evidence of outstanding teaching and service

•

○

- Annual performance evaluations for the past ~~six~~ five years
- Other optional materials

Evidence of leadership

•

○

- List of leadership activities, including dates
- At least two internal or external letters of support that speak directly to the value of the candidate's leadership contributions
- Other optional materials

Any other items that may be required or suggested by colleges

Signature of Candidate

Date

Appendix B

Record of Promotion Votes and Recommendations

Name of Candidate: _____

Dept. and College: _____

Date Appointed as Lecturer: _____

Type of Action: Promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer

Record of Actions	Recommendation		Vote	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Department Committee				
Department Chair				
College Committee				
Dean's recommendation				

College Committee

Name

Name

Name

Name

Name

Approved by Faculty Senate May 5, 2008.

Approved by the Provost, June 2, 2008.

Transitional Provision for College Senior Lecturer Promotion Committee

Since there will be no senior lecturers for the first year that the policy is operational (2008-2009), the promotion committee will be comprised as follows:

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

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

ATTACHMENT C – May 29, 2012 - DRAFT
2012-2013 FACULTY SENATE & COMMITTEES

OFFICERS OF THE FACULTY

David Hopkins, WSU President
Dan Krane, Faculty President
Tom Sav, Senate Parliamentarian

Steven Angle, Provost
Dan Krane, Faculty President-Elect
Pam Zambenini, Senate Secretary

FACULTY SENATE 2012-13

Faculty President
Krane, Dan**
Faculty President Elect
Krane, Dan**
President
Hopkins, David
Provost
Angle, Steven

Constituency A (CEHS)

Agiro, Christa (14)**
Self, Eileen (14)

Constituency B (RSCOB)

Brown, Kevin (13)
Bukovinsky, Dave (13)**
Naidu, Sirisha (14)

Constituency C (COLA)

Kollman, Kathleen (14)
Loranger, Carol (13)**

Constituency D (COSM)

McGinley, Sarah (14)
Mejia-LaPerle, Carol (13)
Milligan, Barry (13)
Pollock, Sean (14)
Wilson, Sean (replacing Erin
Flanagan as runner-up for 2013 of
2011-13 term only) (13)

Constituency E (CEHS)

Higgins, Steven (13)
Petkie, Doug (14)
Rooney, Thomas (13)**
Schneider, Tamera (14)
Steele-Johnson, Debra (13)
Vadeboncoeur, Yvonne (14)

Constituency F (BSOM)

Berberich, Steven (14)
Gillig, Paulette (14)
Mirkin, L. David (14)
Redko, Cristina (13)
Roman, Brenda (13)**

Constituency G (LAKE)

Constituency H (CONH)

Constituency I (CECS)

Constituency J (SOPP)

Williams, Julie (13)**

Senate Executive Committee**
Krane, Dan; Chair, Fac. Pres.
Krane, Dan; Fac. Pres.-Elect
Agiro, Christa; CEHS
Bukovinsky, Dave; RSCOB
Cubberly, Mark; LAKE
Doom, Travis; CECS
Holland, Cindra; CONH
Loranger, Carol; COLA
Roman, Brenda; BSOM
Rooney, Tom; COSM
Williams, Julie; SOPP

FACULTY BUDGET PRIORITY

COMMITTEE JULY 1-JUNE 30 APPT.
Krane, Dan; Fac. Pres.
Krane, Dan; FP-Elect
Arms, Deborah; CONH
Bergdahl, Jackie; COLA
Cope, Tim; BSOM
Fichtenbaum, Rudy; RSCOB
Garber, Fred; CECS
Goldstein, David; COSM
Kich, Marty; LAKE
McNutt, Mindy; CEHS
; SOPP

FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

(1 NBUF from each college-
except SOM/SOPP/One is Chair)
McGinley, Sarah; COLA, Chair
Canfield, Annette; CONH
Chesen, Alan; RSCOB
Knigga, Greta; CEHS
Pedler, Steven; LAKE
Starkey, Vanessa; CECS
Wendeln, Marcia; COSM

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM &

ACADEMIC POLICY COMMITTEE

Rizki, Matt; CECS, Chair
Davis, Stephanie; CEHS
Kich, Martin; LAKE
Mercer, Richard; COSM
Mirkin, David ; BSOM
Pollock, Sean; COLA
Sav, Tom; RSCOB
Schieltz, Bev; COSM
Smith, Sherrill; CONH
Twill, Sarah; COLA
; SOPP
Non-voting UCAPC Members:
Edwards, Jean; UGEC(Ex-off/n-v)
Law, Joe; WACC Ex-off/n-v
; Stu.Gov. (n-v)
; Stu. Gov. (n/v)

BUILDINGS & GROUNDS

COMMITTEE - EC SELECTS

Ramey, Linda; CEHS, Chair
Chinov, Stefan; COLA
Herbert, Laura; CONH
Hitzler, Pascal; CECS
Reo, Nicholas; BSOM
Schieltz, Bev; COSM
Wood, Bill; RSCOB
; SOPP
; LAKE
Ex-officio Members:
Brainerd, Marian; Registrar
Clem, Mary; CATS
Davidson, Vicky; Fac. Plan.
; Stu. Gov.
; Phys. Plant

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

COMMITTEE - EC SELECTS

Gallagher, John; CECS, Chair
Benjamin, Matt; COLA
Bowling, Ann; CONH
Cool, David; BSOM
Deibel, Jason; COSM
Schiller, Shu; RSCOB
Veres, Maggie; CEHS
Zhang, Weiqun; LAKE
; SOPP
Ex-off/Non-voting Members:
Foster, Stephen; Univ. Lib.
Hernandez, Paul; Dir., CATS
Brainerd, Marian; Registrar
Burks, Matt; SG. Undergrad. Stu.
; Stu. Gov., Grad. Student

OTHER APPOINTMENTS

BOT ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

Krane, Dan; Fac. Pres.
Krane, Dan; FP-Elect
Raymer, Mike; Fac. Appt.

SENATE REPRESENTATIVE TO

ATHLETICS COUNCIL

Mejia-LaPerle, Carol; Senator
(12-14)
Hance, Dennis; Sen. Rep. (11-
13)

COMMENCEMENT

Lumpkin, Joan, Ch; RSCOB(11-
14)
Hayes, Karen; COLA (12-15)
Johnson, Doris; CEHS (12-15)
Redko, Cristina; BSOM (10-13)
Rowley, Eric; COSM (10-13)
Stephenson, Pam; CONH (12-
15)
; Stu. Gov.
; Stu. Gov.
; Stu. Gov.
Mileo, Theresa; (Ex-officio)
Krane, Dan; FP (Ex-off/NV)

HONORS

Hartzler, Lynn; COSM, Chair
Chen, Yanfang; BSOM
Helms, Ron; CEHS
Ilagan, Perla; CONH
Kich, Martin; LAKE
Reynolds, David; CECS
Strombeck, Andrew; COLA
Todorova, Zdravka ; RSCOB
; SOPP
Students Appointed by Honors:
; Student
; Student
; Student
; Student
; Stu. Gov.
Ex-officio Members:
Carrafiello, Sue; Honors Prog.
Krane, Dan; FP (Ex-off/NV).

ACAD. INTEGRITY HEARING PANEL

1); Khamis, Harry; COSM, Chair
2); Hammerschmidt, Chad; CECS
3) McNamera, Gretchen, COLA
4) Patel, Nimisha; CEHS
5) Sahiar, Farhad; BSOM
6) Hess, Marjorie; LAKE
7) Cherrington, Candy; CONH
Krane, Dan; FP (Ex-off/NV)

UNIVERSITY APPEALS PANEL

1) Twill, Sarah; COLA, Chair
2) Durr, Marlese; COLA
3) Lawhorne, Larry; BSOM
4) Rigling, Brian; CECS
5) Teed, Rebecca; COSM
6) Stalter, Ann; CONH
Krane, Dan; FP (Ex-off/NV)

JUDICIAL REVIEW PANEL

1) Bulen, Dennis; LAKE
2) Conley, Cheryl, COSM
3) Feldmeier, John; COLA
4) Liu, Meilin; CECS
5) Morris, Mariana; BSOM
6) Mosier, Will; CEHS
7) Ribak, Judy; CONH

RESEARCH COUNCIL 2012-13

Choudhury, Enamul; COLA (12-
14)
Fowler, Barbara; CONH (11-13)
Gruys, Melissa; RSCOB (12-14)
Kazimierczuk, Marian; CECS (11-
13)
Kleven, Gale; CSOM (11-13)
Lopez, Osvaldo; BSOM (12-14)
Miura, Yoko; CEHS (12-14)
Whittingham, Martyn; SOPP (11-
13)
Zhang, Weiqun; LAKE (12-14)

ATTACHMENT D

Senate Committee Reports June 4, 2012

Faculty Budget Priority Committee – Dan Krane **Year-end Report**

Committee members: Enamul Choudhury (CoLA), Tim Cope (BSoM), Fred Garber (CECS), David Goldstein (CoSM), Marty Kich (Lake), Dan Krane (Faculty President, chair), Mindy McNutt (CEHS), and Tom Traynor (RSCoB).

The Faculty Budget Priority Committee is charged examining all fiscal affairs of the University and recommending fiscal priorities to the Faculty Senate and University administration. During the course of the 2011-2012 academic year the committee met regularly (usually twice a month) to review and comment on the University's new budget model (Mission Driven Allocation, MDA) as it was being developed. The committee also reviewed the University's current budget. This report is intended to primarily be a summary of committee's discussions and recommendations regarding the University's new budget model.

In brief, the MDA budget model should be a significant improvement over the University's current budget model in terms of its transparency at all levels. The manner in which funds are distributed (and collected) in the model in its current state is more closely linked to promoting efficiency than effectiveness. The committee has identified a number of features of the MDA model that may incentivize undesired behaviors. MDA in its current state will rely heavily upon an expectation of good leadership both on the part of the central administration, the MDA's governing committees and the Faculty Senate. Administrators must be committed to the University's stated mission and the success of our students. Four committees that will oversee the budget, evaluate funding proposals and the operation of cost centers, and resolve budget disputes must have strong faculty representation. The Faculty Senate must be vigilant in its role as guardian of the curriculum and discourage colleges from creating courses for their majors that would be better taught by content-experts in other colleges.

What follows is a summary of the committee's discussions and observations during the course of its deliberations.

MDA Goals

- Increase budgeting transparency
- Expect revenue to exceed cost where possible (in "responsibility centers") – by as much as reasonably possible
 - Increase efficiency in colleges
 - Increase entrepreneurial activity in colleges
 - Generate strategic initiative funds
- Increase independence of colleges
- Increase efficiency in non-academic units

Primary Question and Comments from the Committee:

- How do academic quality and other mission specific goals dovetail with this model?
- MDA has the potential to achieve its stated goals, but an excessive focus on profit could cause it to work against the University's mission as in the following examples:
 - Over-incentivized cost cutting could lead to reduced quality (over reliance upon adjunct faculty, larger class sizes, etc.)
 - Over-incentivized revenue enhancement could hurt affordability or increase the use of resources on non-academic (or barely-academic) activities that generate profit.

- Over-incentivized short-term financial result could reduce long-term sustainability (ex. – will failing students be given passing grades to prevent the elimination of a program, which then harms the University’s reputation and long-term ability to attract high quality students, or students in general, in later years?).
- The committee emphasized throughout its discussions with the administration that the budget model needed to be closely tied to the University’s mission. The change in the model’s name (from “Responsibility Centered Management” to “Mission Driven Allocation”) is an acknowledgement of that need but tangible changes to the parameters of the model itself have not yet been made (though a few are being explored by a work group).

Key Specific issues:

- Although MDA can’t be implemented without budget transparency, MDA is not the only budget model that would provide budget transparency. The University’s current budget model (a traditional base budget model) does not lend itself to transparency except at the very highest and very lowest levels.
- The high strategic initiatives contribution (16% of instructional revenue) could interfere with the colleges’ pursuit one of the stated advantages of MDA: to be able to invest in new initiatives/entrepreneurial activities on their own (increased college independence). They will effectively need approval from the Provost for these activities via subvention negotiations in that colleges should expect to be in a deficit each year that will be reconciled by the use of subvention funds. A substantial majority of the subvention funds (as much as 13 to 14% of the University’s budget) will be used in such a way.
- Some colleges are simply in a better position (e.g. CEHS and CoLA) to generate net revenue than others (e.g. CECS and SoPP). Thus, the percent of each college’s revenues that can be contributed to the strategic initiatives fund is bound to differ in the long run. The central administration should consider setting realistic differential strategic initiatives contribution rates for the colleges.
- The higher the percentage of instructional revenue that needs to go to the strategic initiatives fund, the greater the likelihood that undesirable outcomes will occur. The search for further profits could elicit the kinds of mission incompatible problems alluded to above, such as:
 - Excessive use of adjunct faculty simply to reduce costs
 - Development of low quality – high revenue academic programs that increase profit in the short-run but decrease profit in the long-run by diminishing WSU’s reputation
 - Excessive competition between colleges in the form of colleges teaching courses outside their areas of expertise primarily for the associated revenue stream or the expenditure of college funds to draw students who are already at WSU away from one college to another
 - Excessive growth of class sizes
- MDA diverts instructional revenues from the colleges earning them to subsidize activities conducted at other colleges (such as funded research). While this may have the benefit of encouraging desired outcomes (such as more funded research), the administration needs to keep track of the budgetary distortions created by these revenue diversions in order to understand which departments might actually be covering their costs before some of their funds are diverted.
- The diversion of 25% of tuition from the college teaching a course to the college of each student’s major may encourage excessive use of adjuncts to teach classes predominantly serving other college’s students
- The diversion of 40% of SSI funding from colleges that don’t generate much funded research to colleges that do will encourage more effort to get research grants, but will just hurt colleges with little funding opportunities.
- The faculty of each college should consider either setting up a committee similar to the Faculty Budget Priority Committee to review MDA budgets at the college level or include those duties in the charge of an existing committee as colleges review their bylaws. The chair of such a college-

level committee would be an excellent representative of their college to the Faculty Budget Priority Committee.

The Committee's Questions and Comments on Each of the Major Features of the MDA Budget Model

Strategic Initiatives Fund

- Creates a pool of resources to support academic initiatives (currently proposed to be 16% of the instructional budget – roughly \$48 Million)
- By creating a cost/responsibility that most colleges can't meet with their current budgets, an incentive is created for colleges to generate more profit.
 - Colleges may increase cost efficiency (cost reductions that don't impact quality or quantity served)
 - Colleges may expand existing programs or pursue new programs that increase revenue net of cost

Questions/Issues

- This may be the most important part of MDA because it appears to have the most potential to induce desired or undesired activity
- The current plan is to have colleges face a tax (strategic initiative contribution) they can't afford – at least not in the first few years – then negotiate with the provost to receive the as much of the shortfall back as possible (subvention). On its surface, this does not appear to allow the colleges to pursue one of the stated advantages of MDA: to be able to invest in new initiatives/entrepreneurial activities on their own. They will effectively need approval from the Provost for these activities via the subvention negotiations in a way that is not very different from the current budgeting process.
- It appears that in practice, colleges will not be put in a deep financial hole for a few years as MDA is first implemented because many of the shortfalls will be forgiven through subvention. What about after that if a college's best reasonable expectations appear to continuously fall short of goals?
- Will the strategic initiatives fund be used to support non-academic initiatives?
- Will MDA incentivize that costs be cut in a manner that reduces quality such as:
 - Excessive use of non-research faculty and adjuncts
 - Class size increases that harm instructional quality
 - Reduced research support funding by college deans?
- Will low-quality low-cost programs be developed just to enhance profit for a college?
- Will college level academic resources be allocated to non-academic activities just to turn a profit for the strategic initiatives pool?
- Is 16% (\$48 Million) the right level for this contribution? Of that approximately \$48M all but \$2 to \$4M will be returned to colleges as subvention leaving a relatively small amount for strategic initiatives.
- What about programs or expansions that cover all costs but not all of the strategic initiatives contribution. In other words, these increase profit (net revenue) to the university, but decrease profit to their college because they cover all costs except a portion of the 16% tax? Eliminating these programs would paradoxically reduce the university's net revenue.
- What about programs that increase profit to the university but not to their college because 40% of the associated SSI funds are redirected to colleges that do more grant supported research? Again, eliminating these programs would paradoxically reduce the university's net revenue.
- Will MDA encourage excessive silo behavior so colleges or departments can maximize their profit, or will it encourage more collaboration?

Possible Alternatives:

- Make the tax smaller than 16%

- Tax the profit rather than the revenue and reduce the tax rate as profit grows or find some other way to share the profit with the colleges before the 16% threshold is met
- Set tax rates for each college based on reasonable expectations for each college. Some colleges just face higher costs and their revenue options are constrained by the tuition policies.
- Rather than starting with the full tax which most colleges will request back in subvention negotiations, start with a manageable tax that is increased from year to year based on reasonable expectations
- Reduce the tax in response to satisfaction of effectiveness/quality goals. The committee has worked on finding a way to hardwire this in to the budget model but has not been able to find an approach that did not also have a potential to incentivize undesired behaviors.

All of the above could reduce the likelihood that colleges would pursue activities that hamper our ability to meet the University's mission in order to satisfy arbitrary financial goals. It is important to remember that economic principles point out that each incremental 1% increase in the strategic initiatives fund contribution requirement will be progressively less beneficial to the University and become increasingly costly to individual colleges in terms of forgone opportunities and/or reduced program quality.

- Can we identify useful ways for colleges to be rewarded for effectiveness/quality?

75%/25% split of tuition (75% to college teaching a given student and 25% to college of student's major)

- Encourages colleges to accept and advise students at an earlier point in their college careers
- Helps cover the overhead costs of advising students
- Are there any other justifications?

Questions/Issues:

- Justification seems weak (not worth the benefits) to some faculty in the college of business
- Will this result in excessive use of adjunct faculty for courses taught to students of other colleges?
- Will this encourage excessive recruiting of students to colleges before they are ready to commit to a college?
- Will this encourage colleges to develop required courses that really should be taught by subject matter experts in other colleges? (note that the strategic initiatives tax probably also creates/amplifies this same incentive)

Possible Alternatives:

- 10%/90% (or similar) split if a course is taught by an adjunct
 - Discourages colleges from using adjuncts to teach courses taken by large numbers of other colleges' students (it's effect on classes taken by large numbers of a college's own students is neutral)
 - Might this over-incentivize too little adjunct faculty usage (what is the optimal split)?
- Mitigate the adjunct incentive. In the absence of an adjustment of the 75%/25% proposed above, specifically redirect the financial gain of adjunct use by the University charging the College (after the fact) for each course taught by an adjunct, the difference between the average faculty course-cost and the adjunct cost. The resulting funds will be directed to the general University scholarship fund.
- Exclude the split for freshman or courses taken predominantly by freshman
 - Discourages excessive efforts to get students to declare a major too early

60%/40% split of state subsidy funds (60% to college teaching a given student and 40% to colleges based on funded research)

- Encourages funded research activity by allocating funds to colleges that are successful at acquiring those funds
- This split might incentivize colleges to employ full-time faculty who are more likely to participate in research activities than part-time faculty/adjuncts
- Any other justifications for this split?

Questions/issues:

- State Share of Instruction is still a significant part of the budget (approximately 30%), so this split matters – but with rapidly decreasing subsidy support, one has to wonder how long it will matter
- Note the above comment about revenues leaking from their source to sources of funded research. This could cause bad decisions if a college decides to kill a program that is profitable to the University but not to its college simply because of the revenue redirect.
- The committee has not discussed this issue very much relative to the others. We may have overlooked some important impacts.

Service Unit Costs

Service units will be evaluated regularly by a large committee that will include employees from multiple parts of the University

- Provides the University with an opportunity to regularly evaluate whether these units provide the services asked of them
- Provides the University with an opportunity to regularly evaluate the efficiency with which these units operate
- Many different types of University employees will be represented on the committee

Questions/Issues:

- While many different groups will be represented on the committee, will they have sufficient expertise to make decisions about the service units' performance?
- It seems to charge colleges for these units based on average total cost, but going forward the only added costs these units face will be variable costs. Failing to account for this will give more funds to service units than necessary and will discourage innovation by overcharging for it.
- MDA isn't really needed in order to use this procedure

Other Issues

How to appropriately reimburse departments or colleges for activities that are part of the mission but have higher costs?

- Honors courses and Honors program
- Matrix departments
- Writing Intensive courses in the WSU core
- Interdisciplinary programs across colleges
- Clearly some courses (those with labs and those at advanced-levels) are more expensive to offer, yet this is nowhere reflected in the WSU-MDA. Why has the OBR credit-hour weight system (which is now in use and would help compensate for some of these issues) not incorporated at least in part?

Faculty Affairs Committee – Cheryl Conley

The primary goal of the FAC in 2011-2012 was to establish a non-tenure track workload policy which was to be workload and revenue neutral as we convert from quarters to semesters. An initial document was submitted to the Faculty Senate in February 2012 which contained language drafted from a workload policy promoted by the Council of Deans. This policy contained a requirement for a 24 semester hour teaching workload in addition to customary service. The FAC members were concerned about this workload as it would not allow time for service requirements, thus may impede the faculty member's eligibility for promotion. Faculty Senate members were contacted by concerned non-tenure track faculty and the policy was tabled at the Faculty Senate. The FAC members met with Dan Krane and Henry Limouze and continued working on another workload policy. The FAC felt strongly that this policy should be drafted in the same manner as that for bargaining unit faculty, meaning that the teaching workload was broken down by college and by courses taught (not by number of semester hours). They recognize that there are a number of courses in which the required labs or recitations do not have semester hours

associated with them but certainly demand faculty time. There is also a difference among the colleges in teaching requirements as evidenced in the BUFM workload policy. Based on the BUFM policy (which was deemed acceptable by administration) , the FAC added two more courses to the non-tenure track teaching workload. Since tenured faculty are expected to teach up to two more courses if not actively involved in research, this seemed to be a fair and equitable workload policy. This draft was passed in the Faculty Senate (with minor changes) in a rare roll call vote in the April meeting. Dr. Limouze reported in the May Faculty Senate that administration had developed an “interim” workload policy for non-tenure track faculty to go into effect in Fall of 2012. This policy had not been submitted to the FAC for any input but the language was very similar to that which was tabled at the Faculty Senate in the February meeting (24 semester hour workload with customary service). Dr. Limouze indicated that he will be visiting each college to provide a forum for non-tenure track input.

The FAC had submitted a request for an amendment to the non-tenure track promotion document. Eligibility for promotion to senior lecturer occurs at year 6. As such, documents supporting promotion should consist of 5 years of evaluations not 6. This request went to the Faculty Senate in May and was accepted as old business for the June Faculty Senate meeting. It is anticipated that this amendment will pass.

Finally the FAC suggests that the non-tenure track faculty promotion document be changed so that faculty who are excellent teachers could be promoted to Senior lecturer without the required service component. It is expected that the FAC will be addressing this as well as the workload agreement in 2012-2013.

Undergraduate Curriculum & Academic Policy Committee - Tom Sav

UCAPC Report to be activated June 2.

<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/13minutes.htm>

Buildings & Grounds Committee – Mateen Rizki

Information Technology Committee – John Gallagher

http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/documents/IT_May_2_2012_Minutes.pdf

Student Petitions Committee – Kathleen Kollman

The Undergraduate Petitions Committee met on Friday, April 13, at 9:00 a.m. in room E107 Student Union. Present were the following members:

M. Baumer (UC)	E. Poch (registrar—ex officio)
N. Drake (registrar—ex officio)	L. Pulley (CoNH)
C. Hartwell (RSCoB)	T. Wischgoll (CECS)
J. Howes (CoSM)	S. Young (SGA)
K. Kollman (CoLA—chair)	W. Zhang (Lake)

The committee considered 32 student petitions from 7 entities.

Approved at college and university levels: 11

- CECS: 6
- CoLA: 2
- CoNH: 1
- Lake: 1
- UC: 1

Denied at college and university levels: 19

- CECS: 4
- CoLA: 2
- CoNH: 4
- CoSM: 2
- RSCoB: 1
- UC: 6

Approved at college level but reversed and denied at university level: 1

- Lake: 1

Denied at college level but reversed and approved at university level: 1

- UC: 1

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m. The next regularly scheduled meeting is Friday, May 11 at 9:00 a.m.

The associated Refund Appeals Committee will next meet on Friday, April 27, for routine business.

ATTACHMENT E

University Athletics Council Steering Committee, 2011-2012 Year End Report

Chair: Lawrence J. Prochaska, Frederick A. White Distinguished Professor of Professional Service, Professor and Vice Chair of Education, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology

Vice Chair: Jeffrey John, Associate Professor of Communication

At-large member of the Athletics Council: Mill Miller, Associate Professor of Biological Sciences

Athletics Director: Bob Grant (ex officio, non-voting)

Past Chair: Dan E. Krane, President of the Faculty and Professor of Biological Sciences

Introduction:

The Steering Committee of the University Athletics Council is charged with: establishing Athletics Council committees, appointing members to Athletics Council committees, preparation of agenda for Athletics Council meetings, and review of the annual budget for the Athletics Department. The Steering Committee of the Athletics Council traditionally meets one week prior to each of the eight regularly scheduled meetings of the Athletics Council as well in June to prepare its final report.

Activities of the Athletics Council:

The Athletics Council is the primary point of interaction between the faculty and staff of the University and the Athletics Department. Year end reports are summarized below and copies of each report are included.

The Gender Equity committee of the Athletics Council reviewed Athletics Department budget with an eye towards examining equity in spending for men's and women's teams. The committee found many improvements in the past year. There are now lights on the softball field with permanent restrooms and the soccer field is fully turfed and has changing areas and restrooms. The biggest problem that the Gender Equity committee found was there was a lack of compliance in strict headcount proportionality in scholarship funds (women receiving much more than men); however, one root cause is the sport scholarship guidelines issued by NCAA which favors higher number of scholarships for women's teams than men's teams. There also in salary imbalance in women's and men's administrative salaries and perks. The committee will work over the summer to develop a survey for student-athletes to be given in Fall, 2012.

The Academic Affairs committee approved 19 fifth year scholarships for a total of \$120,495. Student-athletes continued to have a GPA of greater than 3.0 (for the 29th consecutive quarter) and an average GPA higher than the average WSU student population in each quarter of 2011-12. More than 131 athletes, 16 spirit squad members, and 40 student-trainers were recognized by the Athletics Council and the Athletics Department for maintaining GPAs above 3.0 at half time of a men's basketball game in the winter quarter.

The Steering Committee asked the Administration for financial details of the Rinzler project and asked Gender Equity to audit utilization of the facilities for Fall quarter, 2012. Salient details are

attached and the Gender Equity Committee found that the facility was being used as proposed (mostly for student activities). The Steering Committee asked the Athletics Department to provide the Council with a report on the Department's standing in the Horizon League McCafferty Trophy (all sports competition) for the past five years (attached). The committee also solicited the Athletics Department to provide team by team missed classes analysis for the past five years and the data showed that there was no dramatic increase in student athlete's classroom absences due to athletic competition (attached).

The Constitution and by-laws committee of the Athletics Council recommended a number of minor changes to the by-laws to accommodate the quarter-semester transition.

The Student Welfare Committee reviewed the exit interview process. Exit interviews will still go through Growth Dynamics for surveying. One survey will go to student-athletes who have exhausted eligibility and another will go out to returning student-athletes. The committee also reviewed Athletic Training's Drug Testing Program. The Department's Life Skills program is progressing satisfactorily.

The Diversity Committee reviewed the 5 year Minority Opportunity plan which consists of graduation rates, retention, and the percentage of diverse student athletes. The Diverse Student-Athlete and SAAC reception at President's house will take place on May 14 with approximately 75 attendees.

Two *ad hoc* committees of the Athletics Council include mechanisms to promote community and student attendance at Wright State athletic events. They are the "Blackboard to Backboard Challenge" where students entered the names of faculty and staff that motivated them to attend a men's or women's basketball game and the "Pregame Lecture Series". Approximately 170 entries were received in the Blackboard to Backboard program and a refined program next year will target four specific men's and women's games. There were two Pregame Lectures by Dr. Anderson from Liberal Arts and Dr. Klingbeil from Computer Science with approximately 120 people in attendance.

Summary:

The Athletics Council is focused on the academic success and well being of Wright State student athletes. This is clearly occurring with continuing success. One concern that the Council has expressed is a University missed class policy for student athletes. In the coming year, the Council will work with the Senate to write and pass a policy which gives student athletes on trips for competition excused absences from missed classes. Other issues the Council will address are the Blackboard to Backboard and Pregame lecture programs. Benchmarks will be set to monitor the success of the programs. For the B2B program, the Council will identify faculty with large classes to encourage students to attend athletics events. The President of the Faculty will attempt to have the program announced during Freshman Convocation and in freshman seminars to stimulate a culture of student attendance at WSU athletic events. Attempts will be made to track people who attend the Pregame Lecture series.

WRIGHT STATE UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING

April 18, 2011

DRAFT MINUTES

I. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 p.m.

Voting members and alternates present were: G. Alter, M. Bargerhuff, L. Caron, A. Chamberlain, D. Cipollini, R. Dodge, R. Grandhi, L. Hong, A. Hsu (chair), J. Jean, M. Mamrack, D. Miles- Curry, D. Petkie, L. Ream, D. Roby, E. Self, C. Sulentic, T. Tarpey, J. Tipps, P. Vermeersch, S. Watamaniuk, E. Wolf

Non-voting members, alternates and other attendees were: B. Ayres, J. Bantle, G. Crawford, E. Gilles (scribe), D. Johnson, E. Reinsch-Friese.

II. Approval of Minutes

It was moved and seconded that the minutes of the February 28, 2011 meeting be approved as written. Motion carried unanimously.

III. Report of the Dean (A. Hsu)

- a. **Combined Degree Programs** – The policy for combined degree programs has been presented to and approved by UCAPC. The Faculty Senate is currently reviewing it. The policy was presented as “new business” at the April 4 meeting and will be voted upon as “old business” at the May 2 meeting.
- b. **Memorandum of Understanding – Domestic:** (1) Indiana University East: A Letter of Intent has been signed and the overall structure is in place. The next step is to begin conversations with two of the programs, biology and criminal justice. (2) Wilmington College: A Letter of Intent has been signed by Wilmington and has been sent to WSU for final approval and signatures. (3) Cedarville and Central State: Initial discussions have taken place. **International:** Dr. Hsu is currently negotiating with several international universities.
- c. **Budget Allocations for Graduate Tuition Scholarships** – The formula has not really changed since it was presented at the previous Graduate Council meeting. The formula is expected to evolve; college/program input is welcome. Dr. Hsu intends to convene a “working group” with the Assistant/Associate Deans to gain additional input. The goal is to encourage increased enrollment, research, degree completion, etc.
- d. **Graduate Open House** – The last Open House was held March 9, 2011 with 204 in attendance. 110 applications were submitted. Last year, 230 attended and 128 applied. We are seeing a downward trend over the past year, possibly due to the fact that we have no advertisements between the Open Houses. To fill this void, we are launching a marketing campaign for May through September. The funding for this campaign is coming from the increase in the graduate admission application fee. The fee is currently \$25; after July 1, it will be \$40. The School of Graduate Studies will keep the

\$15/application and will use it for advertising. The main goals are to increase Wright State's reputation in the southwest region and to increase enrollment.

- e. **Graduate Faculty Appointment** – Working with the new policy approved at the February 28 Graduate Council meeting, the Dean of Graduate Studies approved 59 nominees as “regular” and 6 as “adjunct”. Under the new policy, the roles of the Dean and the Membership Committee have been reversed. The Dean reviews the nominations that meet all the criteria for membership; the Membership Committee reviews the nominations that do not meet all the criteria, i.e. lacks terminal degree, experience, research, etc. All of the nominations submitted this quarter met the membership criteria and only needed the Dean's approval.

IV. Committee Reports

a. Policies Committee (L. Ream)

The Policies Committee had two meetings this quarter: Friday, April 8th and Thursday, April 14th

1. **Graduate Program Concentrations and Changes to Graduate Program Degree Requirements** - This is for information only. This is a clarification to the process for adding thesis/non-thesis options — it is not new policy. When a program wants to initiate new program concentrations or options (like thesis vs. non-thesis), if the changes are less than 50% of the previously approved curriculum, the changes do not require state-level approval (meaning RACGS).
2. **Graduate Admission Policy: GPA Considerations** - The Policies Committee supports the modification of Section 1.23 (under General Requirements for Admission) to read as follows: *Students having master's or other advanced degrees, or who have previously completed 12 quarter or 9 semester credit hours at the graduate level with an overall graduate grade point average of 3.0, from , an appropriately accredited academic institution or an academic institution with high academic standards deemed appropriate and acceptable by the Wright State academic program to which the student is applying may be admitted into Wright State graduate programs in regular status regardless of their undergraduate grade point averages provided the appropriate academic departments or programs recommend them for admission.* The significant modification to the policy is the change from conditional admission to regular admission. However, programs can still choose to admit students as conditional. **L. Ream motioned to approve the graduate admission policy with GPA considerations. A. Hsu called for a vote. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.**
3. **Graduate Admission Policy: Convictions and Dismissals** - Application questions regarding convictions and academic dismissals are included in the undergraduate admission application, but they are not included on the graduate admission application. The Office of Student Conduct would like the following questions to be added: (1) “Have you ever been academically dismissed/suspended from an academic institution?” (2) “Have you ever been dismissed for disciplinary reasons from an academic institution?” (3) “Have you ever been convicted of a felony?” The Policies Committee approved this request provided that the following addition to the committee that reviews applications that have “yes” responses to any of the three questions be made: the committee should include at least one graduate

faculty member in addition to the other members named (Director of Community Standards & Student Conduct, the Director of Counseling, the Chief of Police, and the Associate Director of Graduate Admissions). **L. Ream motioned to approve the graduate admission policy regarding convictions and dismissals. A. Hsu called for a vote. Twenty in favor, one opposed. Motion passed.**

- 4. Combined BS/MS Degree Programs in Computer Science and Engineering** - The Department of Computer Science and Engineering is proposing two combined Bachelor's and Master's degree programs, one for Computer Science and one for Computer Engineering. In these new programs, up to 12 quarter hours (or 9 semester hours) of graduate level courses may be double counted and applied toward both degree requirements. Students may apply anytime before the start of their senior year and must have a minimum overall undergraduate GPA of 3.3. **L. Ream motioned to approve the combined degree programs in computer science and computer engineering. A. Hsu called for a vote. All in favor. Motion passed unanimously.**

- b. Student Affairs Committee (L. Ream for C. Brun)** – The Student Affairs Committee met one time since the last Graduate Council meeting, on April 13, 2011, to select the next two recipients of the Graduate Scholars awards. Two awards had already been accepted: Mary Good, M.S. in Applied Statistics, College of Science and Math (undergraduate at Bluffton University) and Sanjaya Wijeratne, PhD in CSE, College of Engineering and Computer Science (undergraduate in Sri Lanka). Two more awards were offered based on the committee's rankings. As of today, those two awards have been accepted: Tiffany Milligan, PsyD in School of Professional Psychology (undergraduate at University of Notre Dame) and Amanda Haag, Master of Accountancy, Raj Sooin School of Business (undergraduate at Wright State). The past year's nomination process resulted in 35 nominations from all but one college. The top candidates were chosen among 4 different colleges or schools. The successful candidates had a strong research history and were sponsored by a faculty member(s) who would continue to support the candidate's research at WSU. All successful candidates were considering WSU among other competitive university programs.

The committee has chosen to have one application deadline next year, March 1. WSU is a member of the Council of Graduate Schools that encourages students to have until April 15 to make their scholarship decisions. Making an offer to one candidate created a conflict by making the offer too early and making an offer to some students as late as April 13 may not have given them enough time to consider all choices before the April 15 deadline. The March 1 deadline seemed like a good alternative, with the committee making their decision for offer letters by March 15. The committee also favored the process this year of having students submit letters of interest for the scholarships.

Discussion: Some program directors support an earlier deadline (like February 1) so an offer can be made early. The rationale is that a later deadline may put Wright State at a disadvantage in competing with the larger universities. The conflict mentioned in C. Brun's report was an issue concerning the date by which the student needed to accept/decline the offer. Graduate Council recommends that the Student Affairs Committee re-visit the application deadline.

VI. Research (E. Reinsch-Friese)

Wright State University External Funding 3/31/11 vs. 3/31/10:

- FY11 (thru 3/31/11) - \$84,904,351 (includes \$9,458,778 SSI/ARRA)
- FY10 (thru 3/31/10) - \$78,284,993 (includes \$10,437,606 SSI/ARRA)
- 458 awards. Note: The state supported instruction (SSI) disappears next fiscal year

Funding Comparison: Cumulative Grant and Contract Awards, a comparison with the previous three fiscal years. Overall, awards are a little higher every year.

Internal Competitions: (1) Research Incentive (formally Research Challenge). Funding source: Third Frontier Bond Proceeds (\$268,140, which is far less than past years). Two components: Seed Grant (8 awarded) and Incentive to Collaborate (3 awarded). Purpose: projects related to Ohio Third Frontier program, Centers of Excellence, technology commercialization. (2) Research Initiation (\$10,000 limit) and Professional Development Grants (\$3000). 19 proposals received for research initiation, 11 for professional development. Total pool: \$73,000. Awards will be announced at May 5 Research Council meeting.

FY12 Fringe Benefit rates: Issued from Office of Controller, overall numbers are down for all groups except PERS students for next fiscal year.

Research Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosure Policy: WSU Policy that has been in effect since 1995 was revised as result of proposed new federal requirements. Draft policy has been presented to Council of Deans, Cabinet, AAUP representatives, and Faculty Senate. Awaiting Faculty Senate approval in May. Upon approval, campus awareness workshops will be scheduled.

Upcoming workshop: "Introduction to Responsible Conduct of Research" Thursday, April 28, Noon to 1:00 p.m. Presenter: Dr. Jack Bantle. Lunch provided. RSVP by April 22 to Jan Power.

VII. Graduate Student Assembly (G. Crawford)

The GSA is making some headway in its search for funds for travel grants and research grants. Galen made a presentation to the Student Organization Budget Committee in an effort to obtain \$30,000. Galen pointed out the discrepancy in funding between undergrads and grad students: \$30/undergrad student vs. \$2/grad student. Galen also announced the formation of a foundation account with the Office of Advancement titled the "Graduate Research and Travel Grants Fund." It is part of the Campus Scholarship and Innovation Campaign.

VII. Unfinished Business

None

VIII. New Business

None

IX. Discussion Items (R. Ayres)

- a. **Graduate Council: New Business Model** – This is a suggestion to conduct business similarly to Faculty Senate. New business is introduced at one meeting and is voted upon as old/unfinished business at the next. The advantage is that it gives more time to think about issues; the disadvantage is that it slows business.

In discussion, one suggestion was to present and discuss items in the meeting and then to conduct a vote electronically a couple weeks of weeks later. Another suggestion called for some business, like course approvals, to be presented and voted upon in one meeting and some business, like policies, to be presented in one meeting and voted upon at a second meeting. There was support for the two-meeting business model in that it provides an opportunity for council members to obtain feedback from their college faculty.

- b. **Graduate Council: Agenda Committee** – This is a suggestion to create a committee that would assist the Dean of Graduate Studies in setting the meeting agenda. The Dean alone is not always aware of all the issues that may need to be addressed. The Dean would chair this committee and the members could include the chairs of each of the standing committees of Grad Council (Policies, Membership, Student Affairs, and Curriculum A and Curriculum B).

X. The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m.

ATTACHMENT G
RESEARCH COUNCIL
QUARTERLY REPORT TO FACULTY SENATE
WINTER QUARTER 2012

Research and Sponsored Programs (RSP) Report

Research Council members are given a report of cumulative grant and contract funding at each meeting. Preliminary numbers for February 2012 were provided at the March 1, 2012 meeting. At that time, grants and contracts awarded totaled nearly \$74.5M compared to nearly \$70M this time last year. Awards coded as “research” were still tracking behind similar awards in 2011. Other categories of funding are consistent with last year. RSP staff members had processed 587 proposals through February 2012 versus 595 through February 2011.

The Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies emphasized the importance of stimulating the growth of research funding, as these dollars are a major contributor to the University’s Facilities and Administrative (F&A) revenue.

The implementation of the new integrated software solution for research administration is on track. The vendor for the software is InfoEd. The University’s subscription to the Community of Science (COS) funding opportunities database expired at the end of February and is being replaced by the InfoEd product, Sponsored Programs Information Network (SPIN). Mr. Mark Wysong of the Wright State Research Institute has been assigned to spend part of his effort with RSP to assist with the project management, implementation and training related to the campus-wide rollout of InfoEd.

Third Frontier and Technology Transfer

Ms. Elana Wang has joined the Office of Technology Transfer and Development as a Licensing Associate. Mr. Reid Smith, the Director of the Office of Technology Transfer and Development, updated the Research Council on recently released funding opportunities from the Ohio Third Frontier. These opportunities typically require a cost-share commitment from the University, so faculty members should notify their Office well in advance of the deadlines to plan appropriately.

Research Initiation and Professional Development Grant Competitions

Research Council faculty representatives and their respective Deans were informed of the Review Schedule for the internal competition for Research Initiation and Professional Development Grants. The deadline for completion of reviews was set for the end of March, with discussion and funding decisions to be made at the April Research Council meeting.

Financial Conflict of Interest

The Research Council approved minor changes to the draft of the revised Wright Way Policy no. 1107, “Research Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosure Policy.” The revisions will align the University with the required changes outlined in the federal government’s “Final Rule” published by the Public Health Service (PHS) and simplify the University’s process for review of disclosures. The Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies will continue to move the

document through the University channels so that it can be finalized by the August 2012 deadline set by the PHS.

Tuition “waiver” policy

The current guidance for providing tuition for graduate research assistants supported on grants that collect the University’s fully negotiated research F&A is 20 years old. Dr. Andrew Hsu, the Dean of the Graduate School, agreed to chair a subcommittee of the Research Council that will review the guidance and suggest updates. The subcommittee will report back to the Research Council and then engage the Graduate Council in the process.

Hanover Grants

The University’s membership in the Hanover Grants expires in 2012, and Research Council members were asked to distribute information of the grants support and writing services offered by Hanover to their colleagues. To get the full benefit of the service, requests should be for projects that are strategic, significant and substantial. A copy of the Hanover Membership Guide was sent to the Research Council distribution list, along with the specific information required for making a request for services. The requests should be sent to the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies.

Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Notice on Reforms to Cost Principles and Administrative Requirements

Research Council members were notified of a “Comment” period open in response to a notice in the Federal Register entitled “Reform of Federal Policies Relating to Grants and Cooperative Agreements; Cost Principles and Administrative Requirements (Including Single Audit Act).” OMB is interested in receiving feedback on a range of ideas for reforming requirements that govern the management of Federal financial assistance awards. This notification was provided for informational purposes and the Research Council members will be updated as the process moves forward.

**Wright State University
Faculty Senate Minutes
June 4, 2012
2:15 p.m., E156 Student Union**

1. Call to Order

Faculty President Dan Krane called the meeting to order at 2:15 p.m.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| ✓ Berg, Susan* | ✓ Lamping, Sally | ✓ Self, Eileen |
| ✓ Brown, Kevin | ✓ Lee, Miryoung | ✓ Steele-Johnson,
Debra |
| ✓ Bukovinsky, Dave | ✓ Loranger, Carol* | ✓ Stireman, John |
| ✓ Chesen, Alan* | ✓ Mejia-LaPerle, Carol | ✓ Williams, Julie* |
| ✓ Cubberly, Mark* | ✓ Milligan, Barry | |
| ✓ Doom, Travis* | ✓ Mirkin, David | |
| ✓ Flanagan, Erin | ✓ Nahhas, Ramzi | ✓ Krane, Dan* |
| ✓ Funderburk, Charles | ✓ Redko, Cristina | ✓ Hopkins, David |
| ✓ Garber, Fred | ✓ Rizki, Matt | ✓ Angle, Steven |
| ✓ Gray, Bobbe* | ✓ Roman, Brenda* | ✓ Sav, Tom |
| ✓ Higgins, Steven | ✓ Rooney, Thomas | ✓ Zambenini, Pam |
| ✓ Holland, Cindra | ✓ Runkle, James* | |
| ✓ Laforse, Bruce | ✓ Schieltz, Beverly | |

2. Approval of Minutes of May 7, 2012

Minutes were approved as written.

<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senmin/documents/May12SenMin.pdf>

3. Report of the University President and Provost

President Hopkins

We will have a record number of graduates at Spring Commencement on June 9. We hope you can join us for breakfast at 8:30. Many people are working hard to make sure that all of our graduates are able to participate and there will be overflow seating in the Student Union.

Thank you to the many of you who worked so hard to obtain the student success goals.

Dr. Mark Polatajko addressed the university at our annual Budget Presentation. The outlook is better than in years past, even with basing our projections on a flat enrollment growth.

Enjoy your summer and we'll look forward to the fall semester when you return ready and refreshed.

Associate Provost Tom Sudkamp

Our student success committees have worked very hard. There has been a complete redesign of developmental math and writing as we feel students need the opportunity to complete all developmental work in one semester.

The key to our success in the semester transition will be flexibility and the ability to make modifications as needed and be student centered. We must remember that almost 60% of our students don't fit within the government's student success numbers because they are returning or transfer students. Thank you for helping our students achieve their goals.

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

Commencement remarks will focus on highlighting our faculty. Please try to attend Commencement. There will be a reception afterwards and the students really enjoy interacting with faculty.

Thanks to the Executive Committee who worked very hard this year. Their efforts are appreciated.

Executive Committee discussed the Senate's action of separating the Cyber Security programs at its May meeting. The Committee determined that Senate acted within its authority.

The Committee heard a report from John Gallagher, Chair of the Information Technology Committee. The result is the Resolution below:

Whereas it has come to the attention of the Faculty Senate that Wright State University is considering a major change to its internet portals,

*And, **whereas** the Senate's Information Technology Committee has expressed concerns regarding the process by which Computing and Telecommunications Services (CaTS) has evaluated alternative solutions on large-scale computing and telecommunication projects in the past,*

*And, **whereas** the Senate expects that CaTS will have a transparent and well-documented process that gives the Information Technology Committee sufficient time to provide feedback on this project as well as all subsequent major undertakings,*

Be it resolved that:

CaTS should develop and adopt a formal process for embarking upon computing and telecommunication projects that will directly affect the work of substantial numbers of faculty. Included in that process should be a written report submitted to the Senate's Information Technology Committee during the academic year and prior to the commitment of University resources that: 1) outlines an assessment of needs, 2) enumerates potential solutions and their relative merits, 3) justifies the selection of a specific solution, 4) describes a testing and implementation strategy, and 5) outlines a timeline for deployment.

CaTS is expected to deliver the assessment of needs (step one) to the Senate Information Technology Committee one month prior to embarking upon steps 2 through 5. In emergency situations CaTS may undertake projects more quickly but will immediately inform the chair of the Information Technology Committee and the President of the Faculty (or their designees) of the nature of the emergency and the reasons for urgency.

- A. Moved and Seconded to Adopt the Resolution.
- B. Resolution Adopted.

5. **Old Business**

- A. Wright Way Policy 1107: Research Conflict of Interest and Financial Disclosure Policy – Research Council (Attachment A to the June Agenda.)
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.
- B. Policies and Procedures for Promotion to Senior Lecturer – FAC (Attachment B to the June Agenda.)
 - 1. Moved and Seconded to Approve.
 - 2. Approved.

Items C through N – UCAPC

1. Moved and Seconded to Approve Items C – M.
 2. Approved.
- C. COSM: Applied Mathematics Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/AppliedMathematicsCombinedBSMS.pdf>
- D. COSM: Applied Statistics Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/AppliedStatisticsCombinedBSMS.pdf>
- E. COSM: Mathematics Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/MathematicsCombinedBSMS.pdf>
- F. CECS: Control Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/ControlMinor.pdf>
- G. CECS: DSP Wireless Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/DSPWirelessMinor.pdf>
- H. CECS: Electronics Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/ElectronicsMinor.pdf>
- I. CECS: Microwave Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/MicrowaveMinor.pdf>
- J. CECS: VLSI Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/VLSIMinor.pdf>
- K. CECS: BME Curriculum A Traditional Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/CombinedBMECurriculumATraditionalBSMS.pdf>
- L. CECS: BME Curriculum B PreMed Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/CombinedBMECurriculumBPreMedBSMS.pdf>
- M. CECS: ISE Combined BS MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/CombinedISEBSMS.pdf>

Retiring Senators were dismissed. New Senators were seated.

6. New Business

- A. Ratification of Committee Assignments 2012-13 – Executive Committee (Attachment C to the June Agenda.)
1. Committee Assignments Ratified as presented.
- B. Ratification of Senate Meeting Dates 2012-13
- | | |
|--|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ September 10, 2012▪ October 8, 2012▪ November 5, 2012▪ December 3, 2012 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ January 14, 2013▪ February 4, 2013▪ March 11, 2013▪ April 15, 2013 |
|--|---|
1. Senate Meeting Dates Ratified as presented.

- C. Doctor of Organizational Studies – Graduate Council
<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senage/documents/EdDFullProposalv7432012.pdf>
<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senage/documents/DOSProgramOfStudy.pdf>
1. Moved and Seconded to Old Business for the September meeting.
 2. Approved.

UCAPC Links Activated June 2

1. Moved and Seconded to Suspend the Rules and move Items D - M to Old Business for a vote.
 2. Motion to Suspend the Rules Approved.
 3. Moved and Seconded to Approve Items D – M as Old Business today.
 4. Approved.
- D. CECS Honors Programs
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/HonorsProgramsCECS.pdf>
- E. CEHS Honors Programs
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/HonorsProgramsCEHS.pdf>
- F. COLA Honors Programs
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/HonorsProgramsCOLA.pdf>
- G. COSM Honors Programs
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/HonorsProgramsCOSM.pdf>
- H. CEHS Youth and Community Engagement Minor
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/YouthAndCommunityEngagementMinor.pdf>
- I. RSCOB Economics Combined BSB-MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/EconomicsCombinedBSBMS.pdf>
- J. RSCOB Economics Combined BA-MS
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/EconomicsCombinedBAMS.pdf>
- K. COSM Biology/Life Science Education
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/LifeSciencesEducationBS.pdf>
- L. COSM Applied Physiology
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/AppliedPhysiologyBS.pdf>
- M. Lake Campus Bachelor of Technical and Applied Studies, BTAS
Concentrations in Agriculture, Commerce, and Graphic Design and Visual Media
<http://www.wright.edu/ucapc/0012/minutes/LC-BTAS.pdf>

7. Committee Reports

- A. See Attachment D to the June 4, 2012 Senate Agenda.
<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senage/documents/SenAgnJune12.pdf>
- B. Buildings & Grounds Committee Presentation:
<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senage/documents/BGPresentationToSenate6-12.pptx>

8. Council Reports

A. Athletics Council

See Attachment E to the June 4, 2012 Senate Agenda.

<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senage/documents/SenAgnJune12.pdf>

B. Graduate Council

See Attachment F to the June 4, 2012 Senate Agenda.

<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senage/documents/SenAgnJune12.pdf>

C. Research Council

See Attachment G to the June 4, 2012 Senate Agenda.

<http://www.wright.edu/administration/senate/senage/documents/SenAgnJune12.pdf>

9. Special Reports

None.

10. Announcements

None.

11. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 p.m. The next meeting will be on Monday, September 10, 2012 at 2:15 p.m., in E156 Student Union.

/pz