

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

250 Student Union
June 11, 1996

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ackerson, Allison, Anderson, Bertholf, Buchanan, Cole, Dawson, Farr, Gethner, Harris, Horn, Krenzer, Lawry, Marks, Moder, Robinson, Schwarz, Scott, Smith, Warde, White, Wilkinson, and Williams. Also present: Beer, German, Keener, Killion, McGuire, Norman, Shriver, Sim, Todd, Watkins, and Yunker. Absent: Allen, Finn, Knobbe, Lau, Moretti, Paustenbaugh, Richards.

HIGHLIGHTS

CD Rom Intended for Use in Student Recruiting	1
Cost Accounting Policies Concerning Federal Projects.....	1
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	3
Reports of Standing Committees	4
Guidelines for After-hour and Common Final Exams Recommendation.....	4
Charges and Projected Activities of Each Standing Committee.....	4
Liaison Representative Reports	7

Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the May 14, 1996, Minutes. Dr. Horn seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the June 11, 1996, Agenda. Dr. Allison seconded the motion. Dr. White amended the Agenda by changing the Rules and Procedures report from Rich Paustenbaugh to Margaret White and Joe Williams added an update to the Academic Standards and Policies report. The Agenda was approved as amended.

SPECIAL REPORT: CD Rom Intended for Use in Student Recruiting — Natalea Watkins

Ms. Watkins enthusiastically reported that Communications Services has produced a CD ROM intended for use in recruiting undergraduate students. The CD is part of a network based in high school counselor's offices in all 50 states and 40 other countries. It is very professionally done including video, music, singing and bullets. It contains several statements by enthusiastic students who love OSU and did a terrific job of selling the university. The materials have been very well received. The alumni and the foundation staff love it and have bought hundreds of copies. The library has used it to help in hiring new librarians. The Engineering college has paid to add 15 more pages giving information about their college. The new OSU on CD ROM, including the Engineering pages, will be available in about a month and will include 55 pages. One of the beauties of this is that the disks can be reproduced for a nominal cost. There are four copies in the Faculty Council Office for faculty viewing.

SPECIAL REPORT: Cost Accounting Policies Concerning Federal Projects — Mike McGuire

Mike McGuire from Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P, was introduced by Richard Norman. Mr. Norman said that for about a year now they had been working on the OSU cost accounting standards. The goal was to minimize the impact on the faculty while giving the greatest flexibility and keeping the avenues open to get maximal benefit from the funding.

Drafts of the policies "Cost Sharing in Sponsored Research and Service Projects," "Costing Practices for Sponsored Research and Service Projects" and "Monthly Time & Effort Confirmation" were distributed. Mr. McGuire said that the objectives of this presentation are: 1) Outline the key policy changes and 2) discuss the impact of the changes to a sample research budget proposal. He said, "how we have done cost sharing before won't meet the new cost accounting standards, CAS 501." There must be consistency in estimating, accumulating and reporting costs. In the past we have not thought of cost sharing as real money. The government is now forcing us to think of it in that way. OSU's policy is to agree to cost sharing only when it is required by the sponsor or by the competitive nature of the award. What we put in the budget to get the award, we need to remember, is a committed budget and we must account for it at the end. If we include buildings and equipment as cost share then the administration has to be made aware of this because they have to take them off the indirect cost rolls. Cost sharing must be documented by the department, verifiable from OSU records, not charged to or used for matching on another project, included in the budget, allowable and allocable under A-21, and incurred during the period of the agreement. This last criterion is easier said than done. We must account for the cost sharing expenses during the period of the contract. OSU will set up a separate cost sharing account for each project. CAS 502 demands that there be consistency in allocating costs incurred for the same purpose by educational institutions and that each cost be allocated once and on only one basis. This means that institutions must be consistent in how they allocate indirect costs to both sponsored projects and to accounts that absorb overruns as well as in charging costs as direct costs. The costing practices apply to all agreements whether sponsored by an external agency or funded by the University. See the "Costing Practices for Sponsored Research" for more details on University research. Direct costs must be identifiable with a specific project. Administrative and clerical salaries, postage, general purpose software, general computing costs and office supplies are normally treated as indirect costs. The "Costing Practices for Sponsored Research and Service Projects" policy document gives examples of both circumstances when costs may be charged as direct and of unacceptable direct costing practices. The policy does allow for exceptions for special purposes and circumstances. Some projects that may require direct charging are private or state sponsored agreements, federal training grants, planning grants, and large, complex programs. Some things the government is finding that are unacceptable direct costing practices are practices like: 1) "tax" on all direct costs; 2) aggressive "chargeout" of departmental costs to projects; 3) inappropriate chargeout of administrators' salaries; 4) rotation of charges among projects; 5) charging the project with the most remaining funds, "trades" between projects; 6) tight departmental control of expenses; and 7) inconsistent budgeting. The effort reporting system here at OSU is pretty effective. We must make sure that it is looked at on a monthly basis and is certified and any variation over 5% should be retroactively adjusted to the project. There is much work in doing this since it may also require the adjustment of maybe 15 fringe benefit transactions. The total percentage effort by an individual must not exceed 100%. A sample research budget was presented that compared an FY96 budget with an FY97 budget. The major differences between them occurred in the personnel line item where \$3500 in salary and \$1050 in fringe benefits was included for a secretary in the FY96 budget but not in the FY97 budget, under supplies where \$1000 was in the FY96 budget for office supplies but not in the FY97 budget and under other costs where the FY96 budget showed \$100 for postage that could not be included in the FY97 budget.

President Halligan asked, "if you get your contract monitor and your sponsoring agency to agree to a special circumstance is that going to cover you?" Mr. McGuire replied, "No." The individuals that will be coming to campus to look at your disclosure statement and review your policies and procedures will actually go into the departments and ask the questions about how you are transacting your business. They are not just going to listen to the budget people. Any new contract has to have a disclosure statement submitted with it so they will have a road map. Dr. Buchanan asked if under the Special Purpose and

Circumstances for private and state sponsored agreements we will just do it the way we have always done it. Mr. McGuire replied that generically it can't be said that all projects will be the same. If a sponsor pays full indirect costs then there should not be a secretary on the budget as a direct charge since they are paying for that in the indirect costs. If another sponsor is only paying 10-14% indirect cost and in their rules it is stated that secretaries can be charged directly if you can justify the charge. When the government questions this you just show them that it is not out of the indirect cost pool and the government is not being harmed so it would be OK. Dr. Allison asked if anyone had estimated the total loss to the University of this loss in clerical support. Richard Norman replied that the investigator will be talking with their Associate Deans of Research working out some trades where they have excess capacity in their budget so there will be no real dollar loss. Dr. Allison remarked that the overhead money generated by a contract does not always come back to the department that generated the money. I do not see how the department can recover this money, so that the secretarial support that the investigator thought was important for the project may not be available on the contract. Mr. McGuire suggested that the investigator could increase the direct charges for research technicians and free departmental funds to pay for secretarial support. The investigators are going to have to not only worry about getting funded but also about the activities and how to effort report all these activities.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS: President Halligan

1. 92-03-01-FAC **Fixed Terms for Administrators:** Under study, pending appointment of Executive Vice President.
2. 94-12-01-SALR **Composition of Future Information Technology Committee:** Faculty Council committee's response to draft plan is under review by the administration, coordinated by VP Tom Collins.
3. 96-02-01-ASP **Grades Earned by Students Studying Abroad:** Dr. Keener is coordinating effort to address this.
4. 96-02-02-ASP **Issues Relative to Extension Courses:** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review.
5. 96-03-01-RFB **Accumulation of Annual Leave:** Keener, Birdwell, and Matoy are to meet with faculty group to develop an acceptable approach to this issue.
6. 96-04-01-ASP **Computerized Student Enrollment and Degree Audit Program:** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review.
7. 96-04-02-ASP **University Calendars:** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review.
8. 96-04-05 **Adoption of Financial Conflict of Interest Policy:** Acceptance pending final administrative review coordinated by VP Tom Collins and confirmation from Legal Counsel.
9. 96-05-01-LRP **Strategic Management:** Under study. Dr. Keener is coordinating review.
10. 96-05-02-BUDG **Faculty Salary Program:** The commitment of the administration is to have compensation be the dominant portion of all future allocations of E&G state funds. The uncertainties related to the appropriations provided by the legislature and the higher education budget process do not permit OSU to give assurance that parity will be reached within three years.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

A. ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES: Joe Williams — Update

The committee is charged to formulate and recommend policies at all levels of instruction, both graduate and undergraduate including the following: 1) admission, retention and graduation requirements; 2) university catalogs and the academic calendar; 3) incentives and academic awards to encourage scholarships; 4) instructional standards and procedures at all levels, on and off campus; 5) student employment and credit hour load regulations; 6) new curricula and programs; and 7) academic counseling, tutoring, and honors programs. The committee has had a very productive year but is still working on the following: 1) finals policy; 2) convocation and commencement policies including attendance, adornments, and academic recognitions and honors; 3) information on transcripts; 4) plus/minus grading system; 5) academic accommodations for students with disabilities; 6) class attendance/retention issues; and 7) distance education. Dr. Warde presented the results of a survey of the faculty done March 25, 1996, on the merits of a plus/minus grading system. Sixty-one percent of the 433 faculty who returned surveys favored a plus/minus grading system. Many faculty were confused about what a quality point was and so there were no useful results to the question of how many quality points should the plus-minus designation carry. About two-thirds of the faculty favored assigning more than 4 points for an A+. The committee plans to survey the students during the fall semester. If the students are also in favor of the change then a recommendation will be sent to the State Regents. Dr. Ackerson asked if they had considered a 100-point scale. Dr. Warde replied that about 12 respondents had mentioned it. Dr. Allison asked if there is a problem with the present system. Dr. Warde said that there was no real problem but that many people thought that the plus/minus system was better. Dr. Williams presented the following resolution for the committee.

Recommendation No. 96-06-01-ASP — Guidelines for After-hour and Common Final Exams

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: 1. Faculty and students be made more aware of the policies and procedures governing common exams. 2. Saturday classes start prior to the first Monday of classes and that the final for such courses be the Saturday immediately prior to finals week.

Rationale:

1. Common Exam Policies

With the continuing growth of evening and weekend classes, there are increasing conflicts between night classes and after-hour and common exams. Technically, there should never be a conflict between evening classes and after-hour exams. All after-hour exams are to be held Monday-Thursday from 5:30-6:30 p.m., when no undergraduate courses are scheduled. Conflict occurs when faculty schedule after-hour exams without getting prior approval. The current procedures require that all such requests be approved by the faculty person's department head, then college dean, and finally the Registrar's Office.

Conflict between a common final and a night course, however, is possible. Night classes are to hold their exams during finals week at their regular day and time. Many common finals are, however, scheduled Monday-Thursday from 7-8:50 p.m., thus putting them in direct conflict with the final exams for night classes. Current guidelines state that the night class takes precedence and the faculty with the "intruding" common final must permit the student to make up the exam without penalty.

Current policies appear adequate but are not well understood or followed by many faculty. Some faculty are scheduling after-hour exams and/or common finals without going through appropriate channels. This results in conflicts and the possibility that some faculty are scheduling such exams who are not so entitled. We would like the administration to inform faculty, department heads and deans about the policies and guidelines for these exams to help reduce the conflicts. This information could be

disseminated much like the information on syllabi and pre-finals week policies. Faculty would be better able to determine if they are eligible to have such exams and department heads and deans would then serve as better administrative checks. We also recommend that no after-hour or common final be published in the class schedule unless the faculty has documented the appropriate administrative approvals.

Additionally, we believe students should be made more aware of their rights regarding the conflict between evening classes and after-hours and/or common finals. Such information will help protect students from being unfairly penalized when scheduling conflicts arise.

2. First Day and Final for Saturday Classes

Currently Saturday classes begin at the end of the first week of classes and their final occurs at the end of finals week. Having finals at the end of finals week means that these exams will conflict with commencement and convocation ceremonies. To avoid such conflicts faculty are forced to hold their final earlier or to eliminate them entirely. Starting Saturday classes prior to the Monday of the first week of classes would allow faculty to give their final at the beginning of finals week, thereby avoiding conflict with graduation.

Dr. Williams noted that at the Executive Committee meeting a question arose whether starting classes early would be a problem for the dorms. Ron Beer said this would not be a problem. Rather than starting early they could lengthen the periods for Saturday classes and meet for fewer weeks and still have the final examination before finals week. Dr. White questioned the statement that there were no undergraduate classes scheduled during the 5:30 hour since she has taught such classes in the past and the schedule book makes reference to classes beginning at 5, 5:30, etc. Drs. Scott and Schwarz stated that their department was told by the Registrar's Office that they could not schedule undergraduate classes at 5:30. Dr. Allison agreed with Dr. White's position since Engineering labs have been scheduled during this time period during the last two semesters. Dr. Scott said that she understood this is a new policy that went into effect during the past spring semester. Dr. White said that in the College of Business they have regularly had undergraduate classes scheduled at 5:30. Dr. Buchanan said this policy that was recently implemented, but not followed everywhere, flies in the face of the recommendation to have more classes available in the evening. Dr. Scott suggested that we bring in someone from the Registrar's Office to clear up this conflict. Dr. Wilkinson remarked that this policy came from Dr. Keener's office probably some time last fall. Dr. Williams asked if there were any classes scheduled during this time period for the fall semester. Dr. White also has a problem with the statement concerning the priority system for final exams. The class schedule book says the class that meets first during the week has precedence not that the night class has precedence. Dr. Williams said that there is obviously a lot of misunderstanding about this policy and that different people are getting different opinions depending on who they ask. Dr. White also pointed out that during the fall semester some of the convocations are held on the Saturday preceding finals not the Saturday of finals week so that it would conflict with the time in the proposed plan. Dr. Williams also pointed out that some faculty were concerned about convocation being held during dead week. This is a violation of dead week policy. Dr. White suggested that finals for Saturday classes be left to the faculty member teaching the class. Dr. Williams said that this would not be possible since students should know the time of the final when they sign up for the course. Dr. Lawry moved that the motion be tabled until we get further information from the Registrar's Office. The motion was seconded by Dr. Allison. Dr. Gethner pointed out that the conflicts are not the faculty's fault since the schedule is put together by the Registrar's Office. If the night class teachers want to examine during their class time then they should request that the schedule be changed. Motion passed. Dr. Halligan agreed that the Registrar's Office should be invited to the next meeting.

B. BUDGET: Nancy Wilkinson — Update

The Budget Committee of the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council serves as a communication link between the faculty and the university administration on budget matters. According to the By-Laws of the Faculty Council (Faculty Handbook, Appendix B, p.8-10), the "committee shall formulate and recommend policies and long-range plans pertaining to the division of funds in the University." Specifically, its functions include: 1) the University budget, its preparation, and status; 2) salary surveys and studies; 3) recommendations and long-range plans relating to the division of funds and resources among various University programs and activities. In addition, it shall be available to consult with and advise the President of the University and other appropriate administrators on matters pertaining to the budget recommendations to be made to the Board of Regents and the division of funds and resources within the University (B-10). During the 1996-97 academic year, the Budget Committee will study, consider and make recommendations about budget matters including, but not limited to, the following: 1) indirect cost allocations and research funding; 2) budgetary effects of student retention; 3) Athletic Council financial activities; 4) salary equity issues; and 5) overview of E&G expenditures. President Halligan suggested that we invite Joe Weaver, Director, University Planning, Budget, and Institutional Research, to the next meeting to start off with the \$71 million that arrived from the state regents and show how it was divided into broad budget categories.

C. CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY: Jeff Anderson — Update

The issues that the committee will be considering for the upcoming year are: 1) parking and the shuttle; 2) use of bikes, skateboards, and rollerblades on campus; 3) reallocation of space in university buildings; and 4) safety training and, in particular, training by use of the WWW. President Halligan mentioned that another concern is weekend transportation to the shopping areas for students. It has been suggested that if we have a shuttle that is running on campus during the week that it could be used to make a couple of loops through the shopping areas on Saturday.

D. FACULTY: Ed Lawry — Update

According to Appendix B, the Charge of the Faculty Committee is as follows: The committee shall formulate and recommend policies governing faculty status, including appointment, tenure, reappointment, dismissal, promotion, leaves, summer work, performance standards, employment, working conditions, work loads, research activities, and similar concerns of the members of the General Faculty. In addition, the committee shall be available to consult with and advise the President of the University on matters which require application or interpretation of policies concerning the Faculty not otherwise provided for within these By-Laws. Matters about which there has been some discussion of future activities: 1) who is empowered to make grade changes and in what circumstances? Are these policies in order?; 2) review and possibly recommend changes in the proposed Policy and Procedures Document on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure; 3) discuss the possibility of indexing Appendix D to make it more user friendly; 4) review the practices on summer responsibilities for faculty who are not employed by the University in the summer; 5) review the A&D process to see if it is accomplishing its aims; 6) discuss the need for a comprehensive plan for Faculty Development; and 7) investigate the workings of the various College Faculty Councils to see if they are working well.

E. LONG-RANGE PLANNING: Dave Buchanan — Update

This committee is devoted to an examination of the future of OSU. Ongoing discussion about the nature of the institution should be in the domain of the committee. The committee should develop, and continually update a faculty "agenda" for the university. The committee shall work with the Chair of Faculty Council in regularly reviewing committee structure and membership. Faculty development shall also be the responsibility of this committee. Faculty Council approved a procedure for strategic planning at the May 1996 meeting. During the coming academic year LRPC will, in conjunction with the administration, determine how to implement that procedure and evaluate topics upon which

to apply strategic planning. They will also determine the nature of a faculty "agenda" and begin development of that. In conjunction with the Faculty Committee, they will also begin to examine faculty development practices at OSU with an eye towards improvement and facilitation.

F. RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS: Steve Marks — Update

The charge of this committee is to review long-range plans concerning retirement and fringe benefits. OTRS is a major issue and the committee will rely on Dr. Birdwell to keep them up to date on this issue. Other issues that will be considered are: 1) the fringe benefits status of employees who are not employed at least 75% and how the University is communicating with them about their status; 2) looking at the rationale behind the 1600 hour rule for accumulated sick leave and how it is updated; and 3) the status of the Emeriti faculty in terms of library privileges, parking, e-mail, office space, insurance, etc.

G. Rules and Procedures — Margaret White — Update

Margaret White reported in the absence of Rich Paustenbaugh. The committee charge can be found on page B-9 of the Faculty Handbook. During this year the committee will be: 1) supervising and conducting Faculty Council elections; 2) reviewing election practices with the hope of doing away with the paper ballot system; 3) review the activity of the Committee on Committees; and 4) review and recommend procedures for faculty liaison with members of the Board of Regents. Dr. Lawry asked if the Committee on Committees is a committee of the Faculty Council. Dr. Buchanan said that the committee was active a year ago working on the committee structure of the university but did not know its current status. Diane LaFollette suggested that they contact Kay Bull who was the chairman of that committee.

H. STUDENT AFFAIRS & LEARNING RESOURCES: Gretchen Schwarz — Update

The charge of the committee that now includes student affairs and learning resources is to formulate and recommend policies, procedures, and long-range plans pertaining to student concerns and activities common to all divisions of the University, such as those relating to guidance, awards, discipline, campus living areas, health, employment, loans, social and intramural athletic activities, and the distribution of scholarships and other financial awards and assistance, and student regulations. They also formulate and recommend policies and long-range plans concerning the Library, museums, and other learning resources. The committee works with Dr. Beer, the SGA and GSA on student concerns, and they have representatives on the advisory committee on Academic Computing and the Library Advisory Committee. Past topics have included things like the schedule, the use of the student library technology fees, etc. The concerns this year will continue to include the progress of the Classroom Building remodeling, student retention, and the enrollment process. The committee welcomes input and questions from faculty, staff, and students.

LIAISON REPORTS:

Staff Advisory Council — Jackie German

Jackie German, Chair of Staff Advisory Council, said they will host a special Red Cross Blood Drive on June 20 in honor of Dr. Lawrence Boger, OSU President Emeritus. They will be electing officers June 12 and will be setting their agenda for the coming year. The membership areas of the Staff Advisory Council are broken down by vice presidential area. The Council elects new members annually in April. The area of Academic Affairs had two slots for which there were no new member nominations and there were other slots open as well. Jackie urged the faculty to encourage good people to become involved in Staff Advisory Council. Some people cannot get time away from their job or their supervisor will not allow them to be away from their job. This is the first year Staff Advisory Council has been involved in Faculty Council meetings and they appreciate being allowed to report at the Faculty Council meetings. Their representative to Faculty Council gives a report of

Faculty Council activities each month at the SAC meetings. The Staff Advisory Council also appreciated the vote in support regarding staff salaries given by the Faculty Council.

Athletic Council — Margaret White

The Athletic Council met in May and the Fiscal Integrity Committee reported a \$433,623 surplus over budget for this academic year. Of this amount, \$303,763 was transferred to plant maintenance. Also, \$129,860 was used to pay off the deficit account. Season football ticket sales are ahead of last year. Dr. White asked if there was interest in a faculty/staff All Sports Ticket that was similar to the students All Sports Ticket. A show of hands indicated that most people were not interested. The Academic Integrity Committee has received the academic reports from the spring semester and are preparing to look at them. An overview shows that they look good. Steve Uryasz and the coaches are doing an excellent job. The difference in coverage for women's and men's athletics has been discussed and there seems to be some improvement in the coverage of the women's sports.

Old Business: None

New Business:

Dr. Lawry said that supervisors should not discourage staff from participating in Staff Advisory Council and moved that the Faculty Council ask President Halligan to send a memo to all supervisors urging them to allow staff to participate in Staff Advisory Council. Dr. White seconded the motion. Motion carried. President Halligan responded that he would encourage all supervisors to allow their staff members to participate in Staff Advisory Council.

Dr. Warde brought a concern from the A&S Faculty Council concerning the brochure on the *Dangers of Drug and Alcohol Use*. Sections 3.01 Internal Sanctions states: Any student or employee of the University alleged to have violated this prohibition shall be subject to disciplinary action including... The concern is over the word "alleged." Dr. Beer replied that they were aware of the problem and know it should read "found guilty of through due process" and the question is how to convey this change. The university is required by law to produce this pamphlet each year. May Sim mentioned that there is also a problem with the last line of this same paragraph which reads, "Any disciplinary action shall be taken in accordance with applicable policies of the University." There should be a reference as to where to find these policies. Dr. Beer agreed.

Dr. Allison moved that the meeting be adjourned. The meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is September 10, 1996.

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary