

FACULTY SENATE NEWSLETTER

FSM: Feb. 22, 2016

College of Engineering & Computer Science

Pub: March 4, 2016

From the Provost's Report

Higher Learning Commission

- The University is a month away from its reaccreditation visit from the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) on March 21st & 22nd. The University's assurance argument (formerly known as self-study), federal compliance report, and its Lake Campus location report were submitted on February 22nd.

Mission Awareness Campaign

<https://www.wright.edu/about/mission-vision-and-values>

The first HLC Criterion requires the university to show that it aligns its operations and resource allocation with its mission. There will be a campaign to remind Faculty, Students, and Staff of the University Mission Statement through email and the distribution of Mission-themed t-shirts, coffee mugs, and pens. The thought to keep in mind is "How do I support the University mission?"

- The HLC visit will be composed of a seven person team and will be on campus for all Monday, March 21, and the morning of Tuesday, March 22. Tuesday afternoon and Wednesday morning the team may ask to follow up on items of concern that they identified the previous days. The exact schedule isn't known at this time and will be determined after peer review team reads the University's assurance argument.

Legislative Initiatives

- A University Taskforce will be charged to ensure implementation of the Board of Trustees approved "5% Challenge", Wright State's program that gives an undergraduate in-state student the opportunity to reduce cost of attendance by 5% and to ensure the implementation of the requirements in the Governor's Taskforce for Affordability and Efficiency.

- A campaign will be launched to get textbook orders submitted in a timely manner to be able to provide students with less expensive ways to purchase their books. Barnes & Noble reports that the University was only around 10% compliance for Fall Semester 2015.

- The Ohio Department of Higher Education (ODHE) has produced new recommendations for remediation-free standards in mathematics and English. The recommendations have been sent to appropriate departments for review.

- The Campus Completion Committee will be working on a new Campus Completion Plan that must be approved by the Board of Trustees and submitted to the Ohio Department of Higher Education by June 30th.

- On February 22nd the Chancellor of ODHE announced several proposed initiatives including:

- Allowing up to 10 bachelor degrees to be taught at Community College
- Developing a 3+1 model where students can attend Community College for 3 years then finish their degree at a four year institution
- Require the Chancellor to adopt rules specifying which College Credit Plus courses are eligible for funding
- Allow co-requisite remediation pilot for College Credit Plus
- Integrating financial literacy education into existing campus service programs

Consultant Questions

As a result of last month's Senate discussion regarding the hiring of consultants, thirteen questions regarding policy and practice for hiring consultants were drafted and forwarded to the administration. Provost Sudkamp responded to them during the Provost report.

- What are the guidelines for initially determining what kinds of issues merit the possible use of external consultants (vs. in-house services, university committees, etc.)?
- Who is involved in that decision, and what is the process?
- Once an issue is identified as possibly meriting the use of a consultant, what are the guidelines for finally deciding whether such use of a consultant is justified?
- Who is involved in the final decision to hire a consultant, and what is the decision process?
- Who is involved in the final decision to authorize such costs, and what is the decision process?
- How are the specific sets of deliverables and milestones developed and where are they published?
- What are the parameters for determining what initial consultancy costs are justified relative to the specific deliverables and milestones?
- Who is involved in the final decision to authorize such additional costs, and what is the decision process?

(Cont. Column 2)

Executive Committee Report

Earlier this month, the Executive Committee and Faculty Budget Priority Committee (FBPC) requested the following information to be addressed by the administration by March:

- Progress reports and working drafts of the comprehensive financial plan being developed at the Board of Trustees request to the FBPC in advance of the June deadline, to facilitate Faculty input.

- An account of actual income and expenditures at the present time as compared to the balanced budget presented at the June 2015 Budget workshop.

- A report listing all administrative stipends from July 1, 2012, to the present, including any adjustments to these during the time period. We are particularly interested in the purpose for which each stipend were given and whether the stipends are on-going for a limited term function (if so, the inclusive dates).

In regard to stipends, the EC has also asked to be informed if there is a policy governing stipend amounts and for determining amount of stipend or increases to stipends beyond annual cost of living or merit. The administration has agreed to provide the material requested.

Master Plan/Capital Plan Funding Resolution

A resolution that the Capital Plan be amended to focus on renovation of existing space instead of demolition of existing buildings was approved and forwarded to the administration.

State Support of Higher Education in Ohio Resolution

A resolution affirming the joint resolution of the Ohio Faculty Council and the Ohio Faculty Senate of Community and Technical Colleges reminding state policy makers that the fraction of Ohio's expenditures in support of higher education is significantly less than that of most other states was approved by the Senate with minor edits and forwarded to the administration.

Old Business

Non-Academic Dismissal Policy

The Non Academic Dismissal Policy was approved and adopted by the Faculty Senate. The policy establishes the basis for post-dismissal advising for students dismissed from a college but not from the university, enabling students to transition more seamlessly to a new program in a different college.

Provost's Report Cont.

- Once a consultant is hired, what are the parameters for determining whether the contracted work has been performed according to expectations, agreements, deliverables, cost-effectiveness measures, and milestones?
- What are the provisions for dismissing consultants when it is determined that they are not performing according to expectations, agreements, deliverables, cost-effectiveness measures, and milestones?

Answer:

There are no formal guidelines or policies to determine internal or external consultant usage. The decision to hire, authorize costs, set milestones, cancel contracts, and assess consultant work are all currently determined by the sponsor, the funding unit, and the ability to fund the project. (Subject to the Board of Trustees regulations detailed below.)

Contracts are bid, professional services would be specified in the RFP or ITN. Contracts that aren't bid on would be negotiated between the sponsor, unit, and consultant.

The University is working on developing a policy for contract and MOU signature authorization that would require Dean, VP, or Provost/President signature approval based on total cost thresholds.

- What procedures are employed to execute a competitive bidding and evaluation process?

Answer:

Depends on the cost of the contract and the services rendered; professional services versus consulting. (See Wright Way Policy 5401)

<http://www.wright.edu/wrightway/5401>

Contracts over \$25k must be bid, and contracts over \$50k must be advertised, however search firms and consultants are exempted. The difference between professional services and consultants is that if the person/firm being hired does some of the work it is considered a professional service, and if the person/firm only makes recommendations then they are considered to be a consultant.

If we consider the question on a pure consulting grounds, then the Board of Trustees regulations specify that any contract over \$250k needs to be taken to the Board for notification and any contract over \$500k requires Board approval. (cont. on column 3)

Your Senate At Work

As a result of discussion of concerns related to the hiring process for the position Associate Vice President for Multicultural Affairs, the Senate Executive has written to the President and Provost requesting that the university declare a failed search and consider whether a hire in this area is in the best interests of the university at this time.

As a result of faculty and WSU community input on the branding initiative's proposed new logo, the Senate Executive has written to the President and Provost recommending that the university make good use of the market research it has already funded, but to delay or drop implementation of a new logo at this time. The recommendation cited aesthetic and cost reasons for not going forward with a logo and font redesign. The Senate Executive commends Senator Dawn Woolley for soliciting and compiling the community's input.

Provost's Report Cont.

- What accountability is required of WSU decision makers who are responsible for vetting or monitoring such contracts when the contracted work within their purview falls short of expectations, agreements, deliverables, cost-effectiveness measures, milestones, and the university's standards of excellence?

The only accountability and recourse is through annual performance evaluations.

Dr. Sudkamp concluded that the next steps are to complete the signature authorization policy, review the consultant exemption in WWP 5401, and determine if internal & external consultants should have different guidelines in order to encourage considering internal faculty consultants before looking outside the University.

Q & A

Senator Milligan asked if Faculty Senate could be involved in the future policy development. Dr. Sudkamp indicated that the contract group and legal counsel should complete the policy development, and then the administration will submit to the Senate Executive Committee for feedback.

In response to two-thirds of the members resigning in protest from the M.A.C.E. Associate VP Search Committee, Senator Cao raised questions regarding if there are guidelines or policies governing executive searches, and if so do they allow for search committees to be composed of only staff members. Senator Cao went on to ask if there are policies for replacing search committee members on the fly.

Provost Sudkamp & Shari Mickey-Boggs, Human Resources Associate Vice President, stated that there are no formal policies governing search committees but HR maintains a list of search committee best practices. Associate Vice President Boggs also added that she would have probably suggested that specific search in question be considered a failed search if she had been consulted. Dr. Sudkamp concluded that some form of formalized guidelines or policy would help during future similar situations. Faculty President Loranger added that last year the Senate was asked by M.A.C.E. to supply a faculty member to a search committee, but then M.A.C.E. rejected the Senate's nominee. Dr. Loranger continued that faculty should be included in search committees when the position interfaces with faculty on a high level. Senator Pollock, Faculty Director of the Center for Teaching and Learning, echoed Dr. Loranger's comments and asked if a faculty member has been added to the search committee. Senator Hertzler indicated that she was aware of one faculty member being added to the committee.

Q&A with VP Fyffe appears in the [minutes](#) of the Senate meeting

Wright State University Branding

Wright State University initiated a rebranding program in mid-2013 at the request of the Board of Trustees. Dr. Steve Gabbard presented a brief history of the process to the Senate. Beginning with extensive market research in 2014 and continuing with a new logo and positioning statement, the branding team is now developing the first advertising campaign for a fall 2016 launch. In the meantime, the branding team continues its efforts to be inclusive, as Dr. Gabbard will be presenting "the brand story" to internal constituencies throughout the spring and early summer. Faculty were invited to review and comment on the new logo and statement, although Dr. Gabbard reported the Trustees have signed off on them.

Faculty Line

Senate Elections

The deadline for Faculty Senate election nominations was Friday, February 26, 2016. Qualtrics ballots will be distributed via email by Wednesday, March 9, 2016. The deadline for all ballot submissions is 5:00 p.m. Friday, March 18, 2016.

Faculty Senate meeting dates, agendas, and minutes: www.wright.edu/administration/senate.

By Faculty Senate Interns: Arica Rohn and Jonathan Dillon

CoECS Senators



Dr. Caroline Cao
Professor, BIE Professor
Biomed Industrial & Human Factor Engineering
Caroline.cao@wright.edu



Dr. Fred Garber
Professor
Electrical Engineering
fred.garber@wright.edu



Dr. Travis Doom
Associate Chair, Professor
Computer Science
travis.doom@wright.edu