

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

250 Student Union

January 16, 1996

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ackerson, Allen, Allison, Anderson, Bertholf, Dolezal, Finn, Harris, Horn, Knobbe, Lau, Lawry, Marks, Mayer, Moretti, Morgan, Paustenbaugh, Richards, Scott, Smith, Stone, Tilley, Trapp, Warde, White, and Williams. Also present: Beer, Byford, Collins, Darcy, Fite, Keener, Maase, and Watkins. Absent: Leong, Peters, Schwarz, and Wilkinson

HIGHLIGHTS

Report Of Status Of Faculty Council Recommendations	1
Staff Advisory Council Liaison Report	2
Reports of Standing Committees	2
Preliminary Plans for Student Safety Training Modules	2
Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure Questions and Answers	3
Faculty Council Election Information	7
Liaison Representative Reports	8

The agenda was amended to move the report of Dennis Byford, Staff Advisory Council, to earlier in the meeting. Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the January 16, 1996, revised Agenda. Dr. Allison seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved as revised. Dr. Allison moved acceptance of the December 12, 1995, Minutes. Dr. Warde seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Halligan

1. 92-03-01-FAC ***Fixed Terms for Administrators:*** Under study.
2. 94-12-01-SALR ***Composition of Future Information Technology Committee:***
Dr. Collins presented a draft of a proposed structure. The committee is proposed to have 10 members, including the Vice Presidents, faculty and students. Committee members will need some expertise. They recommend that an emeritus faculty member serve as the coordinator for input from various constituent groups to the committee. They hope to have position descriptions by Feb. 1. Comments or questions should be addressed to Dr. Collins or Dr. Moretti.
3. 95-03-02-FAC ***Selection and Appointment of University Ombudsperson:***
Carolyn Hernandez is collecting information on the subject. Dr. Trapp reported that a one day mediation training session was held for about 25 faculty members.
4. 95-05-01-AR ***Motion to Recommend Completion of Academic Program Review:***
The report is being reviewed and should be out in about two weeks.

5. 95-06-03-SALR ***Motion to Accept the Policy on Use of Electronic Mail:***
Dr. Bertholf is reviewing the changes recommended by Legal Counsel.
His committee will work with the ACAC committee.

STAFF ADVISORY COUNCIL LIAISON REPORT — Dennis Byford

February 10 they will consider a draft policy on shared sick leave. They also passed a resolution to add a Treasurer position.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

A. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES: Joe Williams — Update

The committee is considering three issues. The first issue involves grades for students who study abroad. Currently, a pass/fail grading system is used. A proposal has been made to allow a letter-grade alternative. Secondly, the committee has had a request to identify problems with current enrollment procedures. They are surveying advisors concerning their views about the enrollment process. Finally, they are considering commencement issues. President Halligan will meet with the committee on Thursday. Dr. White said she teaches a senior class which meets on Saturday and apparently has a final exam scheduled on the day of commencement. Dr. Allison said a problem also exists concerning TV courses and UCT. In some of those cases, grades must be submitted before students complete the course or take the final exam. Dr. Williams requested that information about these types of problems be forwarded to him.

B. BUDGET: Don Peters — No Report

C. CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY: Lynne Richards — Update

Jeff Anderson discussed plans to make safety training modules available to students on the computer network. Currently, there is no known policy concerning student classroom safety training. Faculty use of the computer modules would be voluntary. The planned modules will provide basic training and additional information may need to be covered by instructors. Dr. Angevine and Dr. Anderson met with physical plant employees to discuss safety training currently available on the internet for employees. They also met with CIS representatives concerning the feasibility of such a project. There is currently a problem with student access via home modems, so for now access will probably be restricted to on-campus access. He has contacted OSU Legal Counsel about whether there are any potential legal problems. He distributed a draft of a survey that is being sent to department heads for distribution to faculty, which asks what type of safety modules they might like to have available to their students. Preliminary modules will be pilot tested this spring so that the system will be ready for implementation in the fall of 1996.

D. FACULTY: Ed Lawry — Update

Some faculty members have raised concerns about a memo sent from the Provost October 26, 1995, regarding reappointment, promotion and tenure. The concern does not seem to be widespread. The College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Council expressed concern. As a result of these concerns, the committee asked Dr. Keener to respond to some questions as follows:

1) What is the general purpose of the memo? Is it a directive to Deans? Are Department Heads also bound by it? Are faculty required for example to write the self-assessments the memo calls for or can they forego this exercise without jeopardizing their candidacy? Or is it suggestions about what might expedite or clarify the reappointment process?

The purpose of the memo is to kick off the promotion and tenure process at the university level. Dr. Keener recognizes that in many departments this process cannot wait that long. The memo is a communication to the Deans that calls attention to procedures and information that needs to be checked and conveys the importance of the decisions that need to be made and their role in that process. It is also an opportunity for Dr. Keener to express what he would like to see in the process. He does expect candidates to complete the self-assessments and participation statements. For the most part the candidates have done so in the past. If they do not, he generally, after the decisions are made, asks the Deans why that happened. They generally provide a satisfactory answer.

2) Do you feel the Deans understand the purpose of the memo in the same way? And why is the memo not distributed to Department Heads and faculty as well? Dr. Keener said he thinks the Deans understand this. They have never raised any questions with him. Occasionally a Department Head will call the Provost's Office for a clarification. The memo is not sent to department heads or faculty because the Deans are responsible for the promotion and tenure process within each college and there are slight variations from one college to another. Much of the information in the memo addresses the role of the Dean. If Dr. Keener's memo was sent directly to faculty or departments, this might lead to confusion. It is a line of communication issue.

3) Appendix D is very clear that the rules governing reappointment, tenure and promotion should be clearly established with significant counsel from some appropriate faculty group. Do you feel that changes in this yearly memo need not receive such counsel, or do you believe that what is said in such a memo does not establish new rules? If you believe the latter, what force do the memo's statements in the imperative mode have? Do you believe that central administration can make additions or changes to the RPT rules without faculty counsel as required by Appendix D?

Dr. Keener does not believe that these are new rules. The three items that were requested are not the critical issues in the decision process but are important items to both the candidate and the university in general. Neither the central administration nor the faculty should change the rules without substantial consultation with the other group. On the other hand, line administrators have a right to request information that they believe is important to the decision that they are going to have to make and to justify to their constituencies.

4) Who do you believe is responsible for setting the substantive criteria (not the procedures) for reappointment, promotion and tenure, the Department, the Dean, the Provost, the President, the

Board of Regents? Dr. Keener believes all of these people interact with faculty constituencies at various levels to develop performance standards. Department Heads work with departmental faculty to develop department standards. As you move up the line, the issues become more global.

5) The memo seems to require that documentation, additional to what is asked for on the "buff" form be included in the file. If a candidate is to be judged by such additional documentation, doesn't that change the substantive criteria for the action? If they are not to be judged by the additional documentation, should it be required?

Dr. Keener believes the additional documentation is an opportunity for the candidates to reflect on their accomplishments and bring some perspective on the relationship of those accomplishments to the total mission of the university. The purpose of the promotion and tenure process is to recognize and celebrate the long-term relationship and benefit of the candidate's association with the university. The information provides the candidate the opportunity to tell people what their perspective on their career at OSU has been. Tenure is an important time for the candidate and the university community and should not be a time when the only consideration of the candidate is counting up a bunch of numbers. It is a natural time to reflect upon their performance and its relevance to the overall mission of the institution. Dr. Keener thinks these statements bring a measure of importance and meaning that augments what normally goes into the documentation folder.

6) How will changes in this memo affect candidates for reappointment and tenure who have never had to fulfill these requirements in the past because they understood their job requirements not to have included these new requirements?

The self-assessments apply to the people who participated in the activity. All we are asking them to do is to reflect on what they have done. The participation is very broad in nature. Dr. Keener has never been able to identify any instance when a faculty member has not participated in the undergraduate experience in some way. If such an instance should arise in this process, he would call the Dean and the Department Head and have a discussion about why that happened. Maybe there would be a valid reason, but he cannot imagine what that might be.

An ad hoc committee has been formed to develop a procedure letter about how the reappointment, tenure and promotion process should proceed. Dr. David Thompson chairs the committee and Dr. Lawry, Dr. Sue Williams, Dean Holt, and Dr. Don Wagner are members. Any recommendations will be brought to Faculty Council for discussion.

Dr. Keener said he would be happy to talk to candidates who are having problems writing these assessments, although he would like them to try to write something first. These items are a chance for faculty to tell something different than how many classes were taught or how many articles were written. No one has ever been turned down for promotion because they did not have a self-assessment. The worst thing that would happen is that Dr. Keener might ask the Dean to explain why there was no self-assessment. These statements give some feeling for who the person is. It is sort of an educational experience for the rest of us as well as a time for the individual to reflect. These are not the overriding criteria for tenure and promotion, but that does not mean we cannot ask you to comment about them. It may be a change in focus.

Dr. Horn supported the ideas conveyed in the memo. It is important for faculty to understand the expectations of the central administration. In particular, he expressed appreciation for the fact that the memo allowed for differences in expectations based on areas of research and nature of appointment. He suggested that the departmental RPT committees should make suggestions to people going through the process if they feel the self-assessments are not adequate. President Halligan has made it clear since he came that there is an expectation for faculty members to be involved in the undergraduate experience.

Dr. Keener noted that he recognized that part of the problem is the timing of the memo. When he first was named Interim Provost, the memo went out in January. This year, the memo was sent October 26. His office is working on trying to send this information out earlier in future years.

Dr. Lawry asked if the memo was intended to specify a minimum number of publications. Dr. Keener said he recognized that it was the function of the department to establish the guidelines for minimum number and quality of publications - all the sorts of things that go into deciding whether we want to make a long-term commitment to the candidate.

Dr. Warde said he had received several comments from the Arts and Sciences faculty. Because the memo comes from the Provost, it is viewed as a change in policy.

Dr. Keener said he is only asking for information. That is not a change in policy. There have been two things that have changed public perception of what this university is all about: 1) No rookies on rookies and 2) the expectation that all faculty will be involved in the undergraduate experience. We always have cared about undergraduates but we have not always presented it well.

Dr. Mayer said that when people are up for tenure they tend to read such statements as if there are dark meanings and tend to read them with considerable anxiety - "does this mean something new is being asked of me?" Even small changes in wording can cause this effect. Only over the long term can you really judge whether this is a hard and fast rule and something has changed. Also, there are bound to be a few people who came here thinking that undergraduate education was not a big part of their job responsibility. Now when they are coming up for tenure, the emphasis seems to have changed. People coming up for tenure would probably like to hear that the fact would not be held against them.

Dr. Keener noted that we have some faculty members who are hired on pretty much 100% research appointments. They might only teach graduate courses. But many of these people have undergraduate students working in their labs or advise undergraduate clubs or are involved in recruiting undergraduate students. This is participation. It is not a restrictive concept. The level of participation would vary depending upon the primary nature of the appointment.

President Halligan said that he wants to be at a university where undergraduates are important and where everyone feels that they should somehow participate in the undergraduate experience. Participate is a very broad word. We have people who have 100 percent cooperative extension appointments. This can be a challenge for them. But they can interact with clubs, they can serve as faculty associates in the residence halls, there are many ways they

can participate. It is very important to him. It is important for us and it is important for this campus.

Dr. Lau noted that there may be people who are great teachers and great advisors who are not good at writing flowery, self-promoting documents. Is it not enough to list what they have done without having to write a flowery self-assessment? All but one faculty member in the College of Business actually teach undergraduate classes so participation is not an issue.

Dr. Stone noted that you can read a list of accomplishments and speculate about the underlying goal, but it would be nice if the person could tell you what the general goal was. While you and your colleagues may understand it, the Provost must consider people in many areas. This is something we should have and in fact, we should ask new hires to write a statement concerning where they are going.

Dr. Lawry noted that the Faculty Committee supports this idea as a policy of the university. It was a call to renew our commitment to undergraduates and the response of faculty in general has been positive. Members of the committee have suggested that maybe we would do better to move the interest and information about this issue to the annual Assessment and Development process rather than at the end in the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure process. If we do this in the appraisal process, it would be easier to document in the RPT process. He asked for faculty comments about whether the committee should bring a resolution to this effect to the Council.

Dr. White said she has a written statement of teaching philosophy which she periodically reviews and this helps maintain a focus. Where do you see your role within the organization? Dr. Horn said he also thought that was a good idea. Dr. Mayer said that such a change would need to be reflected in the departmental and college documents. Over time we can change the culture, but it needs to be tied to the appraisal and reward system. Dr. Finn said at the OSU medical school they have an educator's portfolio which includes, plan, philosophy, etc. He will make that document available to the Faculty Committee.

E. LONG-RANGE PLANNING: Peter Moretti — Update

Dr. Moretti distributed a copy of the minutes. The process is more difficult than they originally thought. The committee would appreciate any faculty input as they proceed.

F. RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS: Steve Marks — Update

Anne Matoy met with the committee. There are lots of changes happening in the legislature. They will keep us updated.

G. RULES AND PROCEDURES: Glen Dolezal — Update

It is election time again! At the February meeting, nominations will be accepted for Vice Chair and Secretary. It helps if individuals in those roles have had Faculty Council experience

although that is not required. Candidates must have been on the faculty for at least three years and hold the rank of instructor or above. If you have nominees, please contact them first to ensure that their nomination is acceptable. Additional nominations for Vice Chair and Secretary can be made after the meeting by obtaining 50 signatures on a petition by March 1.

Nine Council members are “short-timers.” We will need to elect new representatives for the following positions:

- Group I — Biological Sciences
- Group II — Humanities
- Group III — Physical Sciences
- Group IV — Social Sciences
- Group V — Teacher Education
- College of Arts & Sciences
- College of Agriculture
- College of Human Environmental Sciences
- College of Veterinary Medicine

Nominations for these positions require a petition signed by five faculty which must be turned in before March 10. All individuals serving as interim replacements for vacated positions are eligible for nomination.

Dr. Trapp announced that revisions have been recommended in the Conflict of Interest Policy so that disclosures are only required from faculty submitting grants to agencies that require disclosures and instead of annual disclosures, those disclosures would only be required at the time the grant is submitted. The Executive Committee of Faculty Council felt that these changes were consistent with their prior recommendations. This is still an interim policy. If you have questions or editorial comments, you should submit them to Ed Knobbe or V.P. Collins. Dr. Allison suggested that the disciplinary sanctions should no longer be required now that the requirements only apply to grant submitters as required by regulation. Faculty who are interested in applying for grants will comply with the policy in order to obtain the grant funds. That represents adequate inducement without additional sanctions. He also suggested that some additional modifications may need to be made to ensure consistency throughout the policy. Dr. Collins said they would welcome suggestions for improvements.

**H. STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES: Dennis Bertholf —
No Report**

LIAISON REPORTS:

Peter Moretti — Council On Graduate Education and Research (COGER)

A meeting was held December 10, 1995, at the offices of the State Regents for Higher Education, in Oklahoma City. The goals of the committee were interpreted to mean downsizing and elimination of duplication, even though that was contrary to the written mandate. OSU and OU have tried to show that their engineering programs were cooperative and complimentary. Dr. Halligan addressed Economic Development Issues. The idea of cooperation and improvement has been well-received. Bob McCormick spoke on the issue of investing to make the state better. The case was made very

well that OSU and OU in nonathletic areas can cooperate and compliment each other. This was approved by consensus. One implication of cooperation is that it will put pressure on us to have a uniform joint calendar. We have lost a number of students when they learned that the calendars were different at the two schools. There is still some insistence on program cancellation and there is continuing resistance by the Chancellor to expand the study to all institutions in the state with graduate programs. The process continues and they will probably move on to consider other programs.

Margaret White — Athletic Council

The Athletic Council approved a change in its mission statement, discussed proposed changes in the NCAA guidelines, had a report on the first Big 12 bump, and received a revised organizational chart for the Athletic Department. The main issue for the next meeting will be the funding philosophy for athletics. Dr. White encouraged everyone to attend the next Cowgirls (#17) basketball game against Colorado (#11). If attendance increases, OSU may have a chance to host a first round and possibly a second round of the tournament. President Halligan said that in December the Big 12 Presidents had a conference call concerning whether to allow partial qualifiers. OSU favored having some limitation on the number of partial qualifiers allowed. Ultimately, the Big 12 Presidents agreed to a limit of two partial qualifiers per school.

Bob Fite — Emeriti Association

Representatives at Golden Oaks are promoting buyins for continual life care. They expect some construction to begin in March for cottages, but the owners would like to fill the present structure before they start building additional structures.

Dr. Allison moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. White seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 4:48 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is February 13, 1996.

Marcia L. Tilley, Secretary