

Wright State Faculty Senate
MINUTES
February 22, 2016

I. Call to Order

Faculty President Carol Loranger called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

- | | | |
|------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| ✓ Alvarez-Leefmans, F. | ✓ Garber, Fred | ✓ Reo, Nicholas |
| ✓ Bashaw, Marie | ✓ Gillig, Paulette | ✓ Sabo, Carl |
| ✓ Boyd, Brian | ✓ Hamister, James | ✓ Schieltz, Bev |
| ✓ Cao, Caroline | ✓ Hertzler, Marie | ✓ Schultz, Michelle |
| ✓ Carrafiello, Susan | Kawosa, Burhan | ✓ Wooley, Dawn |
| ✓ Cowan, Allison | ✓ Kenyon, Lisa | Zhang, Will |
| Cubberley, Mark | ✓ Kleven, Gale | |
| ✓ Davis, Stephanie | ✓ Krane, Dan | ✓ Loranger, Carol |
| ✓ Doom, Travis | ✓ Loranger, Dennis | ✓ Petkie, Doug |
| ✓ Ellis, Corey | ✓ McGinley, Sarah | Hopkins, David |
| ✓ Eustace, Rosemary | ✓ McLellan, Marjorie | ✓ Sudkamp, Thomas |
| Farmer, Berkwood | ✓ Milligan, Barry | ✓ Winkler, Jonathan |
| ✓ Farrell, Ann | ✓ Mirkin, L. David | ✓ Riley, Cynthia |
| ✓ Flanagan, Erin | ✓ Pollock, Sean | ✓ Nethers, Bryan |

II. Approval of Minutes

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/FS_Minutes_2016_01Jan.pdf

The minutes of the January 25, 2016 meeting were approved.

III. Report of the University President or Provost

A. Wright State Branding Initiative

<https://www.wright.edu/faculty-senate/meeting/46921#tab-minutes>

Dr. Steve Gabbard, Associate Brand Manager, gave a presentation regarding the Wright State Branding Initiative and a proposed new University Logo. (Presentation files and an audio recording are accessible via the above link.)

B. Report from Provost Sudkamp

Dr. Sudkamp

- 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 Trustee 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

Per a motion at the January 25, 2016 meeting, the following bulleted questions were developed by the Senate Executive Committee and submitted to the President and Provost for a response at today's meeting.

- 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?
- 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?

Dr. Sudkamp:

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?

Dr. Sudkamp:

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.

- 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.

Research Discussion

Senator Doom: Many in the University community became aware, during the most recent Board of Trustee's meeting, that Wright State's Carnegie research rating has fallen from a score of R2 (Higher Research Activity) to a score of R3 (Moderate Research Activity) as reported on their website. <http://bit.ly/1oJwLl>

According to the Fall 2015 Research Council Report, it appears that over the last 5 years, there has been a 41% decline in Main Campus expenditures while there has been a rise in pass through grants that fund contingent research scientist that leaves faculty with the question "What is our research mission and what steps are underway to change our research growth?" <http://bit.ly/1nc5reD>

Dr. Sudkamp: Dr. Robert Fyffe is investigating the Carnegie rating and it appears that their numbers are not correct in the areas of externally funded research compared to other schools classified as R2 or R3.

The research mission is addressed in Wright State's 5-year Strategic Plan Goal 3. <http://bit.ly/1XVBGfn> Senator Doom quoted research expenditures but Wright State has lots of faculty where scholarship is the goal not research dollars. The goal of Wright State research is to keep a vibrant level of scholarship throughout the University and to move us to a higher level of recognition and preeminence and to achieve that we need all levels of scholarship including the funded research which provides infrastructure and support for research for engineering and sciences through F&A overhead.

Dr. Fyffe: The Research Council report included other factors, such as fluctuating financial aid levels and the loss of OhioLINK dollars. The definitive level of research expenditures and research activity awards, as reported in the National Science Foundation's Higher Education Research & Development Survey data (NSF HERD), are on the way up. The Senate's Select Committee on Research Initiatives has requested research expenditure data and will be reviewing it soon.

Regarding the Carnegie rating, there are errors in Wright State's profile on the Carnegie website including not listing the School of Medicine, and not recognizing the fact that Wright State has multiple PhD programs. The ranking is complicated and not purely based on research expenditures; it takes into account other factors such as number of graduates, number of faculty, and the number of non-faculty doctoral workers. If there is a red flag in the ranking, it is potentially with the non-science & engineering research expenditures. Social sciences are included in the science and engineering component but the humanities, education, and business research are a standalone category and Wright State had a very poor level of activity in these fields in the 2014 NSF HERD data which the Carnegie ranking uses.

The University has requested clarification from Carnegie on all of these issues, and has begun to validate the listed data. Wright State is not alone in being downgraded, Montana State was also recently downgraded from R1 to R2.

Senator D. Loranger: Senator Doom has suggested that research expenditures have gone down, was this decline brought about by a change in criteria?

Dr. Fyffe: The reduction is real, for instance we lost \$15million in OhioLINK funding. What Research Council is most concerned with is the research expenditures themselves, not the total amount of funding that is expended and tracked through Research and Sponsored Programs. Research expenditures were down but are going up again.

Dr. Sudkamp: Part of the baseline for Research & Sponsored Programs comes from sponsored programs. I am the principal investigator for the Choose Ohio First scholarship program which is run through RSP at \$600k/year, so that would not be research but is part of the baseline for RSP expenditures.

Senator Garber raised further concerns regarding the direct expenditures as reported in the Fall 2015 Research Council Report, faculty competition with RSP/WSRI agents, and apparent lack of issues at other state institutions such as Ohio State. Dr. Fyffe responded that the mission and activities of WSRI are now very much aligned to try to get faculty involvement and support. Faculty President Loranger concluded the conversation by stating that the Select Committee on Research Initiatives would continue working with Dr. Fyffe while they investigate these topics.

M.A.C.E. Search Committee

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.

IV. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

- A. Faculty President Loranger announced that the Executive Committee and Faculty Budget Priority Committee have requested the following items from the administration for delivery in March:
 1. Progress reports and working drafts of the Comprehensive Financial Plan being developed at the Board of Trustee's request.
 2. An account of actual income & expenditures at the present time as compared to the balanced budget presented at the June 2015 Budget Workshop.
 3. Report listing all administrative stipends and adjustments from July 2012 – Present. The report should state the purpose for each stipend and adjustment, and indicate if the stipend is ongoing or for a specific amount of time.

- B. Dr. Loranger announced that the report of the Undergraduate Curricular Review Committee from the January 25, 2016 has been reviewed by the Executive Committee and forwarded to the Wright State CORE Assessment Ad-Hoc Committee

C. Master Plan / Capital Plan Resolution (B&G / FBPC)

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/MasterPlanResolution_2016_02Feb_16.pdf

Dr. Loranger introduced a resolution from the Building & Grounds Committee and Faculty Budget Priority Committee regarding funding for items in the Master Plan Update presented to the Senate in Fall Semester 2015. Dr. Jim Menart, Chair of Building & Grounds, then read the resolution and reviewed the justifications for the resolution from his presentation at the January 25, 2016 Senate meeting.

Senator Doom expressed his approval for the resolution. After an opportunity for discussion, Dr. Loranger called for a vote on the resolution. The resolution was approved.

D. State Share of Instruction Resolution (Ohio Faculty Council)

Ohio Faculty Council Resolution:

<https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/SSIresolution.pdf>

Wright State Resolution:

<https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Mar/meeting/WSUSSIresolution.pdf>

Dr. Loranger introduced a resolution from Senator Dan Krane, Chair of the Ohio Faculty Council, in support of a recent OFC resolution. Senator Milligan pointed out that “represents” & “espouses” should be changed to their singular forms. After an opportunity for discussion, a vote was held and the resolution was approved with the stated minor corrections.

V. Old Business

A. Non Academic Dismissal Policy (UAPC)

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Jan/meeting/UAPC_NonAcademicCollegeDismissalPolicy%28v6%29_2016_01Jan_22.pdf

A motion was made and seconded to approve this item. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

VI. New Business

A. Academic Policies (UAPC)

1. CEHS – Rehabilitation Services Admissions

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/UAPC_Rehab_Services_Direct_Admit.pdf

A motion was made and seconded to move this item to Old Business at the March 14, 2016 Senate meeting. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

B. Curricular Items (UCC)

1. Forensic Studies Minor (14460)

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/14460_SOC_ForensicStudies_Minor_Combined_0.pdf

A motion was made and seconded to move this item to Old Business at the March 14, 2016 Senate meeting. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

2. Veteran Services Minor (14506)

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/14506_RHB_VeteranServices_Minor_Combined_v3_0.pdf

A motion was made and seconded to move this item to Old Business at the March 14, 2016 Senate meeting. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

3. Arts Management Certificate (12222)

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/12222_LA_ArtsManagement_Combined_0.pdf

A motion was made and seconded to move this item to Old Business at the March 14, 2016 Senate meeting. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

4. Honors: Leadership Studies in Education and Organization

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/Honors_%20Document%2011-23-15_0.pdf

A motion was made and seconded to move this item to Old Business at the March 14, 2016 Senate meeting. There was no discussion. The motion carried.

VII. Written Committee Reports and Attendance

A. Building & Grounds

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/BG_Minutes_2016_01Jan_08.pdf

B. Information Technology

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/IT_Minutes_2015_12dec_03.pdf

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/IT_Minutes_2016_01jan_20.pdf

C. Undergraduate Academic Policies

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/UAPC_Minutes_2016_01Jan_15.pdf

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/UAPC_Minutes_2016_01Jan_22.pdf

D. Undergraduate Curriculum

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/UCC%20Minutes_December10%201_1.pdf

E. Undergraduate Student Success

https://www.wright.edu/sites/default/files/uploads/2016/Feb/meeting/USSC_Minutes_2015_12Dec.pdf

VIII. Council Reports

IX. Announcements

A. Senate Elections

<https://www.wright.edu/faculty-senate/about/faculty-membership-senate-elections>

- Nomination deadline: Friday, February 26, 2016
https://wright.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_07MjBZyj4MDc1Ap
- Ballots distributed via email: The week of Monday, March 7, 2016
- Ballot deadline: 5:00pm on Friday, March 18, 2016

X. Adjourn

Next scheduled Faculty Senate Meeting: March 14, 2016
--