

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

250 Student Union

February 13, 1996

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

HIGHLIGHTS

New Lobbying Reporting Requirements	1
Administrative Cost Savings	1
Transportation of Hazardous Materials.....	2
Report Of Status Of Faculty Council Recommendations	3
Reports of Standing Committees.....	3
Faculty Council Election Update.....	3
Grades Earned by Students Studying Abroad Recommendation.....	3
Issues Relative to Extension Courses Recommendation	4
Reporting of Faculty Participation in Undergraduate Program Recommendation	6
Liaison Representative Reports.....	8

Dr. Allison moved acceptance of the January 16, 1996, Minutes. Dr. White seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Upon request, President Halligan suggested modification of the Agenda to conduct officer nominations prior to committee reports. Dr. White moved approval of the agenda as modified. Dr. Peters seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved as modified.

SPECIAL REPORT: NEW LOBBYING REPORTING REQUIREMENTS — Emily Elliott

Ms. Elliott distributed a handout detailing New Congressional Gift Restrictions and a handout concerning new federal lobbying rules. The new lobbying rules do not add new restrictions on lobbying activities but do require reporting of lobbying activities. An electronic data base will be developed from the reported information. Ms. Elliott is the registered lobbyist for OSU and will be responsible for reporting OSU's lobbying activities. Reports must include issues lobbied, who was lobbied and an estimate of expenditures in the lobbying process. Reported expenditures include not only costs of stamps, letters, phone calls and travel, but also preparation time and secretarial assistance time. Contacts with any member of Congress or federal agency officials at or above the level of deputy assistant secretary or general must be reported. It includes lobbying about grant funds as well as legislation and regulation. Such contacts should be reported to Ms. Elliott and she will ask for information needed to compile her report. If faculty members have suggestions about how to make compliance as painless as possible, they should direct them to Ms. Elliott. Responding to inquiries, testifying before Congress and asking for information are not lobbying. If you ask them to do something, that is lobbying. Ms. Elliott stressed that the fact that lobbying activities have to be reported does not mean you should not lobby. Many other institutions spend considerably more money on lobbying than OSU does. Questions about the rules should be directed to Emily Elliott, Special Assistant to the President/Director of Federal Relations, 107 Whitehurst, OSU, phone, extension 49100, E-mail, elliott@okway.okstate.edu. The new law was passed December 19, 1995, and took effect January 1, 1996.

SPECIAL REPORT: ADMINISTRATIVE COST SAVINGS — Harry Birdwell

Vice President Birdwell distributed a 1995 report from the Oklahoma Regents for Higher Education concerning Administrative Costs at Oklahoma Public Colleges and Universities. From FY92 to FY95, the percentage of budget for administration within the state has declined 13.4%. Our costs

went down a little more than that. Compared to other states, Oklahoma's colleges and universities rank lower in the percentage of budget for administration expenses. We have made a significant reduction in the amount of our administrative costs that are born by state dollars. We have given 8.5% salary increases over the last two years with no new dollars. The 5% raise last year was funded mostly by administrative cost reductions. This year, part of the 3.5% raise came from tuition increases.

In FY92, total administrative operating costs were \$29,987,849. By FY95 these total administrative costs were cut to \$25,031,073. Over 100 FTE's have been eliminated. Certain units have been restructured and some offices have merged (such as two VP offices). From FY92 to FY95, administrative costs in the administrative budget offices were cut as follows: President's Office, 14 percent decrease; Provost Office, 11 percent decrease; VP for Business and Finance, 18 percent decrease; and VP for Research, 11 percent cut. Some administrative costs were funded from non-state funds such as contributions, grants and other sources. There was a 27 percent cut in state funding to the office of Vice President for Student Affairs because many of those programs are now funded through the Student Union. The cost-cutting activities have not stopped. If cuts are made too deeply, the efficiency of the university may be jeopardized.

Several savings were recognized in the benefits arena. This year state legislation was passed to permit OSU and OU to insure themselves outside the state insurance fund for Workers' Compensation. A savings of \$400,000/year on Workers' Compensation was realized because of this. A third party claims administrator was engaged. There is now a 1-800 number and when someone is hurt, if the supervisor calls that number, the worker will be contacted within 24 hours concerning care alternatives. It is anticipated this will save \$750,000-\$900,000 this year in litigation and other costs. This year OSU also lowered health insurance premiums 5 percent. Not only did this help employees who were paying the premiums, but it also saved the university \$400,000 on its share of premium payments. Since Computing Information Services (CIS) completed its payments on the mainframe computer in 1995, almost \$1 million was saved by not having to make that payment.

SPECIAL REPORT: TRANSPORTATION OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS — Butch Hiatt

Mr. Hiatt, Manager, University Mailing Services, reported on efforts to bring OSU into compliance with DOT rules. A committee appointed for this purpose is working with the Campus Facilities, Safety and Security committee, Research Council, Legal Counsel and other entities to comply. There are two problems. First, training is required for persons shipping dangerous goods. We can either train everyone who might ever transport hazardous materials, or we can develop a special unit to prepare shipments of dangerous goods when notified. One aspect that cannot be handled very well through use of a special unit is individual transportation of goods. If a faculty member drives to the airport or some other location on university business and transports a dangerous good, the faculty member must first be trained and tested. Dangerous goods include fertilizers and pesticides, dry ice, and chemicals such as formaldehyde. The ad hoc committee has recommended increasing awareness of the rules and revision of university policies and procedures. They are also developing a questionnaire to see what types of training are needed. They will probably recommend development of a training video and brief test to certify drivers who transport dangerous goods. Once they have developed a draft recommendation, they will ask for our feedback. Dr. Horn asked whether consideration was giving to putting this responsibility under the existing hazardous materials unit. Mr. Hiatt said recommendations will probably include adding a module in Right to Know information and training 3 or 4 people from University Mailing plus Greg Fox. University Mailing will handle documentation and packaging of dangerous goods. This will not involve hiring anyone new. If faculty members plan to transport or ship materials that they think might be hazardous, they should contact Barbara Dobson or Mr. Hiatt for assistance.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Halligan

1. 92-03-01-FAC **Fixed Terms for Administrators:** Still under study.
2. 94-12-01-SALR **Composition of Future Information Technology Committee:**
V.P. Collins distributed a draft proposal and requested appointment of a Faculty Council committee to review it and respond with comments.
3. 95-03-02-FAC **Selection and Appointment of University Ombudsperson:**
Drs. Hernandez, Trapp, Williams, and Lawry will meet to discuss possible approaches.
4. 95-05-01-AR **Motion to Recommend Completion of Academic Program Review:**
Interim Provost Keener distributed copies of the document to Faculty Council officers. Two copies are available in the Faculty Council Office (312 PIO). Copies will also be distributed to members of the Academic Program Review Committee and the Long-Range Planning Committee, Academic Deans and Department Heads, the Library (Special Collections/University Archives), and other locations.
5. 95-06-03-SALR **Motion to Accept the Policy on Use of Electronic Mail:** Dr. Bertholf reported that his committee along with the Academic Computing Advisory Committee had reviewed the revised policy and felt it had not changed markedly from the previous draft which Faculty Council temporarily approved last June, although two areas that needed clarification were noted. (See SALR committee report, page 7).

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

A. RULES AND PROCEDURES: Glen Dolezal — Update

Nominations were solicited from the council members for candidates for the office of Vice Chair. The person elected as Vice Chair will serve one year in that position and then will assume the role of Chair of the Faculty Council for 1997-98. David Buchanan and Marcia Tilley were nominated as candidates for the Vice Chair position. Additional candidates may qualify by petition by obtaining signatures of 50 faculty members by March 11 (March 10 falls on a Sunday). Nominations were also solicited for candidates for the position as Secretary of Faculty Council. Dennis Bertholf and Don Peters were selected as candidates for this position. The Secretary serves a three-year term. Also, as stated above, additional candidates may qualify by petition by obtaining signatures of 50 faculty members by March 11.

B. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES: Joe Williams — Update

Dr. Williams presented two recommendations. The first recommendation is as follows:

Title: Grades Earned by Students Studying Abroad (96-02-01-AS&P)

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: continuing students who elect to study abroad be given the opportunity to request that the grade earned be reported on the student's OSU transcript as either a pass/fail grade or a letter grade. The request for a letter grade must be made prior to the commencement of the study abroad experience.

Rationale: Currently no written policy exists that states how grades earned by students studying abroad are recorded. It has been an accepted practice in the registrar's office to report grades received as a "P" or "F". This recommendation is being made to give students an option of having grades earned reported as a "P" or "F" or actual letter grade received when

and if grades given by the foreign institution can be translated into a letter grade. The current practice has resulted in students losing financial aid as a result of the P/F grade reporting system. Likewise, some students prefer to have the actual grade earned reported when possible.

This motion passed unanimously.

The second recommendation is as follows:

Title: Issues Relative to Extension Courses (96-02-02-AS&P)

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: the administration review the following issues with respect to extension course administration, programming, and offerings:

1. Quality of course content
2. Accessibility to learning resources
3. Procedural issues
4. Economic issues related to college and faculty

Faculty Council suggests a task force composed of faculty and administrators be appointed to review these issues and report problems and possible solutions to higher administration of Oklahoma State University.

Rationale:

1. Quality of Course Content

While these courses may meet the guidelines for the number of contact hours needed for credit hours, some faculty are concerned that they do not meet the stated recommendations for out-of-class assignments. The general guideline is that two hours/week of out-of-class work is expected for every one hour of credit. This is not always possible for very intensive extension courses.

An additional concern is that for-credit extension courses may not have the same rigor as the same course taught from the course catalogue. Courses which have the same prefix and number should have equal work requirements, regardless if one is offered and taught as a summer, evening, or extension course. Faculty are also concerned about the number of classes that are offered through extension that could be offered through the regular class schedule.

2. Accessibility to Learning Resources

Faculty are concerned that in some cases students enrolled in extension courses may not have access to library, computer, and/or laboratory resources necessary for completing assignments. This problem may become greater as outreach teaching programs increase and are extended into more distant locations as the use of high tech presentation and delivery media systems increase.

3. Procedural Issues

Additional concerns were expressed regarding for-credit extension courses. First, there is currently no prescreening to ensure that students enrolled in extension courses meet OSU entrance requirements. Students are usually enrolled in such courses without anyone first checking if they are in "good" academic standing and/or have a "clean" bursar's bill. Nor are students informed that if they do not meet OSU's enrollment guidelines, they are not entitled to

course credit. It is not uncommon for students to request course credit after the course is completed.

Second, all instructors of extension courses should meet OSU guidelines required for teachers. To teach a graduate course, an individual must be a member of the Graduate Faculty. Extension should ensure that its instructors, no matter where the class is offered, meet OSU guidelines. This has not always been the case. Finally, there are no uniform procedures for the management of grades. New policies are needed to ensure the existence of academic excellence in extension courses.

4. Economic Issues Related to Colleges and Faculty

Issues have been raised concerning who benefits from dollars generated through extension courses. Economic issues might impact the integrity of extension courses. It is to the colleges' benefit to generate income by offering extension courses. Guidelines are needed to suggest how "extension generated" income is spent by colleges. In many cases faculty receive overload pay for teaching extension courses. The administration should insure that faculty who teach extension courses and receive overload pay are not neglecting regular teaching/research duties as a result of the reward system.

J. O. Grantham noted that there is a national trend toward offering more extension courses. Dr. Knobbe noted that we voted to accept grades from overseas institutions, yet we want uniformity in administration of extension courses. He offered an amendment to the recommendation to expand the review to include all academic courses. He asked if we did not already have an office designed to ensure that extension courses are properly handled. He also pointed out that summer courses are a different experience than those taught during the academic year. Dr. Allison seconded the motion to amend. He asked how we check on-campus courses to see if adequate outside work is required. Dr. Williams noted that the recommendation only suggested appointment of a task force to look at the issues, both existing and potential problems. Dr. Stone concurred that it was probably premature to object prior to analysis of the issues. Dr. Horn said he felt that given the number of concerns and the issues, that appointment of a task force was the best approach. Dr. White pointed out that we have college curriculum committees to look at these issues related to academic courses, but we do not have a similar system for extension courses. Administrators sometimes fail to consider scheduling and other issues that are more apparent to faculty. Dr. Moretti said that faculty empowerment to supervise courses should rest with departmental faculty. Urgencies and quick decisions may have caused extension to slip somewhat from faculty purview. Dr. Wilkinson noted that regular courses have to go through a fairly extensive review by curriculum committees. Sometimes extension courses are new courses made up by a faculty member and approved by an extension director or department head without other faculty review. They may be excellent or they may not be. Dr. Harris suggested that we should have individual college task forces rather than a university-wide task force. Dr. Williams responded that there are some issues that cross college boundaries. Several council members argued against expanding the review to all courses. The amendment was defeated. The main motion to appoint the task force to review issues related to extension courses was passed by a vote of 16 in favor of the motion, 7 opposed.

C. BUDGET: Don Peters — Update

The Budget Committee has not met, but participation in ex officio committees continues. Faculty are urged to review their commitments to the specific funds in TIAA/CREF. Returns in 1995 ranged from less than 5% to over 30%. Be sure to take time to visit the Benefits Fair April 8 and 9.

The Staff Compensation Commission is nearing final report time. Entry level salaries, equity, and salary compression are also issues with this group. The University Budget Committee is

not scheduled to meet until March 18, but hopefully the Deans and Executive Group will continue efforts at addressing salary compression at OSU.

The Financial Systems Task Force is functioning through several subcommittees. Electronic Forms seem to be hung up on the cost of making Lotus Notes available across campus with appropriate training. BRS/SLB -- An analyst has been hired to lead this project and component areas show activity. OSU is nearing the stage where we there will be participation in a consortium to acquire the GAMS (Grant Application & Management System) pre-award system developed by USC and NC State. OSU will participate with an expanded consortium in the development of the post-award system.

D. CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY: Lynne Richards — No Report

E. FACULTY: Ed Lawry — Update

On behalf of the committee, Dr. Lawry introduced the following recommendation:

Title: Reporting of Faculty Participation in Undergraduate Program (96-02-03-FAC)

Whereas some fear and confusion is present among faculty when they consider what weight the imperative to take part in the undergraduate program has in the reappointment, promotion and tenure process, and

Whereas there is still some uncertainty among faculty about what counts as sufficient participation in the undergraduate program, and

Whereas the faculty in general support the spirit of dedication to the undergraduate program and wish to document its implementation as a way of keeping faith with the people of Oklahoma,

Therefore,

THE FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDS TO PRESIDENT HALLIGAN THAT: the requirement that faculty self-report their participation in the undergraduate program be removed from the Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure process and be relocated in the Assessment and Development process.

Justification:

We believe that many faculty are puzzled that the issue of participation in the undergraduate program suddenly appeared in the middle of the RPT process, and are afraid that its appearance could presage an arbitrary use of the program to negatively affect RPT decisions.

We further believe that the University ought to error on the side of caution in changing any part of the RPT process, given the importance of it to faculty and implications of its going wrong even in a small number of cases.

We further believe that both the message of what participation in the undergraduate program means and the encouragement and documentation of it would be enhanced if it were moved to the A&D process. As opposed to the relatively small number of faculty who are involved in the RPT process each year, a much greater number of faculty are engaged in the A&D process. If the question about the undergraduate program were raised in every A&D action, the University would be able to gather much more significant data about how this commitment is being met, and there will be a lot more discussion about its character and importance among faculty.

In order to promote the understanding and commitment to participation in the undergraduate program and allay fears about its role in the RPT process, we think its proper place is within the departmental A&D process.

Dr. Peters moved to amend the motion to change "participation in the undergraduate program" to "participation in student programs." He noted that some departments do not have undergraduate students. Dr. Horn also expressed concern about this issue. Dr. Harris seconded the motion to amend the motion. Dr. Mayer pointed out that the genesis of the Provost's memo was a focus on undergraduate participation. This proposed amendment would defeat that purpose. Dr. Lawry agreed that amendment of the motion would not serve the purpose of the original request. Dr. Finn explained that a medical degree is an undergraduate degree even though it is a professional degree. Consequently, faculty in the medical program do deal with undergraduate students. Dr. Lawry suggested that we are not saying everyone has to do certain things. We are just talking about moving discussion of this issue to the A&D process rather than in the RPT process. Annual A&D reports still are part of the RPT packet and would be available for review in that process, but it might have a different weight. Dr. Trapp said he felt that in order for the three missions of the university to integrate, you need participation by everyone. Even graduate programs can participate because they recruit undergraduate students and they advise undergraduate programs about appropriateness of their requirements. Dr. Lawry said that by moving the requirement to the A&D process, department heads can work with faculty to find ways they can participate. Dr. Moretti noted that at this level, there is still the possibility of remediation. Also, by moving the consideration to the department level, the problem of having a second set of criteria at the Provost level that may be different than departmental criteria is avoided. Adopting the motion is a way of phasing in the requirement and communicating it more effectively. The proposed amendment failed. The original motion passed unanimously.

F. LONG-RANGE PLANNING: Peter Moretti — No Report

G. STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES: Dennis Bertholf — Update

The Library now has a web page that includes information about hours and other information. Dr. Wes Holley has received funding from University Assessment to look at the Noel Levitz instrument to see if it helps to identify potential dropouts so that their problems can be circumvented. The committee is interested in the results of this study.

The committee will take the issue of course offerings in information and electronic access to the General Education Council. They feel it might be beneficial to evaluate what types of training students are receiving in this area and whether additional education might be desirable.

Concerning the policy on Use of Electronic Mail, Faculty Council approved temporary implementation of a proposed policy last June. Since then, Scott Fern has recommended some proposed revisions to the interim policy because of statutory requirements. The SALR committee and the ACAC have reviewed the proposed changes. Two potential problems which they noted were: 1) the need for clarification of what constitutes unopened E-mail and 2) the prohibition against encrypting without permission from CIS. Some computer programs such as Netscape encrypt messages automatically. They will take these comments back to the administration. In the meantime, OSU is operating under the interim policy as revised by Legal Counsel.

H. RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS: Steve Marks — Update

Next month they plan to bring a resolution to Council on accumulation of annual leave. President Halligan reported that yesterday he was invited to give testimony to the Oklahoma

legislature about OSU's priorities. He told them our first priority was faculty and staff raises and the second priority was resolving OTRS issues. It took a lot of years to create this problem and it will take a lot of years to solve it.

LIAISON REPORTS:

Staff Advisory Council — Becky Schlais

They are considering a shared sick leave policy and will review a draft at their next meeting. They are also sponsoring the Cowgirl basketball game Sunday and Head Start kids. Additionally, they are working on nominations for next year's SAC positions.

Athletic Council — Margaret White

The Athletic Council now has a new mission statement. She thanked Athletic Director, Terry Don Phillips, for hosting a reception for Athletic Council members and the coaches prior to the KU game. Funding is still an issue. Subcommittees are working on recommendations as a result of the NCAA self study. Dr. White also announced that a state record was set for attendance at the last Cowgirl basketball game.

Emeriti Association — J. O. Grantham

Mr. Grantham thanked President Halligan for addressing their group at their January meeting. Plans are proceeding concerning expansion of the Golden Oaks of Stillwater.

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

Dr. Moretti announced that the next issue to be considered by this group is Business. Each College of Business (OSU and OU) will be asked to show differentiation, cooperation and complementarity.

Old Business: None

New Business:

Dr. Lawry announced that a wonderful Masterworks Concert was held February 12, 1996, and President Halligan agreed.

Dr. Allison moved that the meeting be adjourned. Dr. White seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is March 12, 1996.

Marcia L. Tilley, Secretary