

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Ackerson, Arquitt, Bertholf, Bice, Bierman, Buchanan, Cole, Dawson, Edgley, Finn, Gedra, Horn, Hsu, Kimbrell, Krenzer, Lawry, Locy, Martin, Moder, Richards, Robinson, Schwarz, Scott, Sisson, Warde and Wilkinson. Also present: Birdwell, Beer, Blakley, Collins, Jones, Keener, Konigmacher, Lingelbach, Matoy, Mitchell, Najd, Oehrtman, Watkins, and Young. Absent: Miller, Montgomery, and Smith

HIGHLIGHTS

Health Care	1
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	3
Reports of Standing Committees	4
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	4
“Changes in Health Care Insurance” Recommendation.....	4
Academic Standards and Policies	4
Budget.....	4
“Faculty Computer Allocation” Recommendation.....	4
Graduate Student Association Liaison Report	5
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security	6
Faculty	6
“Personal Profit on Required Materials” Recommendation.....	6
Research	7
“Research Scientist Positions be Added to the Faculty Handbook” Recommendation	7
“Research Professor Positions be Added to the Faculty Handbook” Recommendation.....	7
“Research Committee for Faculty Council” (proposed addition to Faculty Handbook).....	8
Rules and Procedures.....	8
Election Results	8
Reports of Liaison Representatives.....	8
Athletic Council	8
Student Government Association	8
Campus Space Committee	8
Student Publications	8
Staff Advisory Council.....	8
New Business	8

Dr. Warde moved acceptance of the March 10, 1998, Minutes. Dr. Lawry seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: Health Care — Harry Birdwell, Anne Matoy and Bob Oehrtman

Dr. Birdwell said in a recent meeting it was asked, “Did you not see this increase in health care costs coming?” Another question that was asked was, “How did you go from a surplus to a deficit in so short a time?” Two years ago the plan had a \$6M surplus reserve. Because of the size of our federal research projects OSU came under the federal cost accounting standards. These say that if a surplus has been generated in anything that has a remote connection to a federal research activity then this surplus must get back into the correct hands. The Health Care Committee decided on a plan to return the \$6M to the participants in the health care program through subsidizing premiums over a three year period. Due to increases in health care costs and increased usage of the system the surplus was exhausted sooner than three years. The administration was able to renegotiate the contract to hold the line on administrative costs. If the present plan were to continue with no change then it would generate approximately \$18M in premiums and pay out \$23M in benefits. More than 2000 people returned the survey. There was no effort by the committee to have the participants validate a conclusion that the committee already held. There were positive things said about the options but there were several people that were unhappy with all the options. One person replied that the survey was like being asked whether your demise should be by being shot, stabbed or having taken a lethal injection. The administration has worked with the HCC to look at a bridge period in order for consultants to study the situation and make a recommendation as to the best option to follow in health insurance. For several years OSU has been a part of a self-insured program but may have reached the point where this is not a good alternative. Fortunately, the Board of Regents asked us to engage a health care consultant to assist the University and the Board in analyzing the health care package. OSU has had an RFP asking for such help for several months. There are 11 or more responses so over the next 30 days a decision will be made as to whom the long-term health care consultant will be. In the meantime the

administration is looking for ways to decrease costs. It was discovered that some procedures are higher in Stillwater than for most other locations in OK. Cimarron Health Plan was contacted and urged to meet these charges. Dr. Oehrtman distributed an information sheet on the A&M Institutions Health Care Plan. During Feb. and Mar. 1997, the health insurance for OSU was rebid. Thirty two bids were received. Some of the bids were for fully insured plans, some were HMO's and others were for Administrative Services only. Six vendors were invited to campus to present their proposed bids. Premiums for the fiscal year 1997-98 were established based on the information gained from these six vendors. None of them foresaw the claims increase. By mid-August the HCC received the preliminary claims data through Feb. '97 which showed very erratic monthly costs. Shortly thereafter, American Fidelity asked for \$2M from our surplus funds to meet claims demands and again in October another \$2M was needed to cover the difference between claims and premiums. This is when the HCC started considering alternatives to and within our health care plan for fiscal year 1999. In Jan. 1998 the HCC met with the administrator of the OK State and Education Employees Group Insurance Program. They were chosen because they were the only insurance that could be brought to campus without going to rebid. The survey was prepared to provide information to the committee. Most people liked the coverage of our plan better and liked the fact that we had control over our plan but they liked the premiums of the State Plan. American Fidelity was then asked what kind of benefits plan could be offered as a bridge program if the premium structure of the state plan were used. The state plan was asked to come to answer questions in an open forum on Mar. 16. The HCC was surprised when the representative also talked about an HMO and a Medical Saving Plan since they were led to believe that the HealthChoice indemnity policy was the only option available to us. The HCC and American Fidelity came up with the following bridge program. Premium changes to nearest dollar: Employee from \$160 to \$171, Spouse from \$160 to \$206, Child from \$95 to \$78, Children from \$95 to \$140, Retirees, w/o Medicare from \$168 to \$261, Spouse w/o Medicare from \$168 to \$290, w/Medicare from \$100 to \$155, Spouse w/Medicare from \$100 to \$159, Retiree/Spouse w/State from \$30 to \$45, Retiree/Spouse Tertiary from \$30 to \$30. Benefit Changes: Deductible from \$250 to \$400, Co-pay from 90/10 and 80/20 to 80/20 and 70/30, Prescription plan up to \$20 minimum, Eliminate \$300 supplemental accident benefit and add \$100 emergency room deductible, Eliminate \$55 incentive payments, routine health exams and *Vitality* magazine from Wellness, and add mental parity with a limit for in-patient to 30 days and out-patient to 26 visits. These changes would bring both the projected premiums and projected costs to approximately \$18M. Dr. Halligan gave the following summary of the HCC proposal. Premiums and benefits would be changed as listed for 6 months and a consultant will be engaged to help choose the best option which hopefully would go into effect January 1999. The premiums were adjusted so that each group would approximately pay their own way. Under the old plan some groups were subsidized at the expense of others. Dr. Moder said that some people are currently insuring their spouse or children outside the plan because they can get a similar coverage for less. Why is this? Dr. Blakley said that it costs less to provide coverage for a selected individual in good health than if you have to take everyone in the group. Dr. Moder asked why the HCC decided to change to actuarially determining premiums from the current method. This change puts most of the increase on the employee and makes the amount paid by the university increase by a smaller amount. Dr. Blakley replied that prior to this pricing cycle the state plan also subsidized spouses and children, but felt that they had to do this to help control the price increases. Dr. Moder said it only controls the cost for the institutions not the employees. Are they going to be given raises to cover this? Dr. Robinson said that some other programs in the city are not charged as much for medical procedures as we are. Dr. Birdwell said that we are negotiating with CHP on this. Dr. Moder asked if the PPO is affecting our costs. Dr. Oehrtman replied that preliminary data shows that it is, but it is too early to know. Dr. Birdwell said that a survey of state institutions showed that the increases in health care costs ranged from 16% to over 30%. Dr. Edgley said that the break down of community is a big worry. The idea that I am not going to subsidize your kids is very mean spirited. If these kinds of things are going to be considered then why not introduce behavior. Why should the smokers or heavy drinkers be subsidized? Dr. Halligan said that the proposal is for six months and we have to quit losing money. Dr. Edgley said that he strongly supports getting a consultant in to study the program and applauds the efforts made by the HCC. Dr. Moder said that a concern is for a person who is recently retired and had planned for the health care costs that we had before and now they are being hit with a large premium increase. Dr. Birdwell asked if faculty were willing to forego all or part of a salary program to provide a subsidy to retirees, children or whatever group. Dr. Moder asked what it would take to not nail the retirees. Dr. Arquitt replied that you could increase everyone by 15% and cover the costs of the reduced benefit package. Dr. Birdwell said that this would cost the university approximately \$1M more than this program which would have to come out of a raise program or reallocation of funds if there is no raise program. Dr. Blakley pointed out that the proposed rate for retirees already contains a subsidy since it is based on the rates of the state plan which is capped at \$90 over the employee rate. Ms. Matoy pointed out that the retirees are getting between \$70 and \$75 from OTRS to be applied to health care costs. Dr. Sisson said that one of the ways to keep claims down is to have a healthier faculty. The \$55 Wellness Center incentive payment was eliminated. Why are faculty charged \$120 a year to use Colvin Center? At many universities such facilities are provided without cost to faculty. Dr. Beer said that the entire cost of the Student Center is paid by students. Dr. Arquitt said he is more worried about the spouse and families with two children. How many are in that category? Ms. Matoy said that there are approximately 1200 spouses, 1500 in the children or child category, and 5625 employees; but, the plan also covers the four A&M institutions. Some of the other institutions have a much bigger budget problem than OSU does. Dr. Halligan says the most telling comments he has heard are those from people that say they will not be able to continue coverage for their children. If Halligan was in the subsidy business, he would go

to a different line than retirees. Dr. Moder said that some of these people will seek out other providers and perhaps get it for less money for kids; however, retirees may have a hard time finding cheaper insurance due to pre-existing conditions. Dr. Birdwell said that if the single category for children was continued then the increase for larger families would not be as great. Dr. Halligan said he would not subsidize the large families on the back of the single child family. Dr. Wilkinson said that she has one child and has had to subsidize larger families. At one time she chose to insure her son through an outside provider in order to save some money. Dr. Buchanan said that he would like to thank Drs. Birdwell, Oehrtman, Blakley, Ms. Matoy, and the HCC since it is evident that they listened to our discussion last time.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Halligan, Executive Vice President and Vice Presidents

- 96-12-04-FAC ***Changes in Appendix D:*** Under review. Dr. Keener will work with Legal Counsel to draft wording changes to more clearly delineate the role of Ombuds and provide additional specifics regarding membership to the Informal Review Committee. Requires Board approval. President Halligan will not add another position.
- 97-02-02-ADHOC ***Patent Policy 1-0202:*** Pending review by Faculty Council committee. Draft including incorporated changes from initial reviews is currently being reviewed by Faculty Council committee. Following their review, document will pass to Research Council, Dean's Council and Legal Counsel. Requires Board approval.
- 97-04-03-ASP ***Guidelines for Scheduling Common Evening and Final Exams:*** Administration agrees in principle, but defers decision awaiting new computer system. Dr. Vitek has coordinated this review with the Registrar and the Faculty Council committee. Draft revisions are being considered. Because of the extensive computer reprogramming involved, CIS must postpone until new computer system is operating.
- 97-09-01-FAC ***Policy and Procedure Letter on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure:*** Under review. Dr. Halligan circulated a memo concerning a meeting involving 4 members of Faculty Council, 2 department heads, 2 deans, some regents and Dr. Halligan to discuss the P&P Letter on Reappointment, Promotion, and Tenure. Some of the areas of agreement were: A change in tone of the document was recommended to emphasize that it is an honor to be granted tenure at OSU and that all candidates should realize that they have the responsibility to provide adequate evidence to justify such an honor. The Deans agreed to revise the statement of responsibilities in light of the agreement that they should have a separate vote in the tenure process. Action should be taken to solicit review and comment from appropriate committees regarding extending the probationary period for one year. The statement which requires the Regents to have faculty approval before any changes can be made, should be deleted. No definite resolution was obtained regarding the opportunity for rebuttal during the process. It is recommended that faculty in each of the colleges make a decision on a response procedure.
- 97-09-02-FAC ***Return of Policy and Procedure Letter on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure to Faculty Council Before Action by the President:*** Pending review of draft P&P Letter.
- 98-02-01-ASP ***OSU Alternative Admission (8%) Program:*** Accepted. Dr. Dahl will ensure appropriate documentation is prepared to implement the policy modifications.
- 98-02-02-FAC ***"Faculty Perceptions of the Appraisal and Development Process" Recommendations:*** Accepted, with implementation as outlined in Dr. Keener's memo dated 3-27-98.
- 98-02-03-FAC ***Timing of the A&D Process:*** Under review. Currently being reviewed through Academic Affairs.
- 98-02-05-SALR ***Course Syllabi Availability:*** Under review. Currently being reviewed through Academic Affairs.
- 98-03-02-LRP ***"Research Makes It Happen":*** Accepted. Dr. Vitek is working with the Faculty Council Long-Range Planning Committee on this initiative, which has the support of the Instruction Council (Associate Deans) and the Deans Council.
- 98-03-01-FAC ***Personal Profit on Required Materials:*** To President Halligan

98-04-02-BUDG *Faculty Computer Allocation:* To President Halligan

98-04-03-RES *Research Scientist Positions be Added to the Faculty Handbook:* To President Halligan

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — **Ed Arquitt** asked Bjorn Martin to present the committee's recommendation entitled "Changes in Health Care Insurance." Dr. Martin said that when this recommendation was drafted the committee did not know what the HCC was going to recommend. The committee was getting a lot of input and questions from faculty who thought the RFB committee would be making the final recommendation. The recommendation supports the HCC committee recommendation but is not identical to it. The rationale for this is that there are many changes being proposed for the health insurance program and the entire university community needs more time to understand the issues and to consider the options. The committee also felt the Survey had too short a turn-around time for people to fully consider the options. Also the data that is used to predict the future costs is not that reliable. There are also policy issues that need to be considered. For example, the cost shift from the university to the employees. The committee was also worried about the steep increase in premiums for dependent children and retirees. Should costs be determined actuarially? If so, then are there other groupings that could be used such as age of the employee? Increases in health care premiums will discourage people from taking early retirement, thus increasing the salary budget for the university. The recommendation reads, **"The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: no changes in the coverage of OSU's health care insurance plan be implemented before January 1, 1999. If necessary, a premium increase should be implemented July 1, 1998 to make the half-year moratorium possible."** Dr. Lawry asked if the committee had any particular recommendations on how to raise the premiums. Dr. Martin said the committee would like to see the premiums raised across the board. Possibly after the study some other plan may be put into place but for the interim period across the board increases seem more appropriate. Dr. Lawry asked what might take place between now and January that is going to be significant in helping to make the decision. Dr. Martin replied that it would give a chance for a consultant to look at several other options and determine what types of coverage other institutions in the region are using. The most positive part of our current plan is the benefits provided and other plans should be seriously studied before we drop our current coverage. Dr. Buchanan said that the date given does not require that a change be made on January 1 but only that no change be made before January 1. However, the statement "no changes be made" is troublesome because some of the changes made by the HCC need to be made. Dr. Horn said that by accepting this proposal we are delaying the inevitable and the HCC's bridge program is a good compromise. Dr. Locy asked where the final decision will be made. Dr. Halligan said it ultimately will be decided by the Board of Regents. Dr. Lawry said that the RFB committee should study how premiums are to be determined. Should each group bear its own costs or should some groups be subsidized? Dr. Krenzer said that if we are going to hire a consultant then why make some significant changes now that could ultimately be reversed. Dr. Gedra said that the HCC plan seems to be more in line with what we may eventually have. Dr. Moder asked if the benefits in the HCC proposal were close to those in the state plan that was chosen by the largest number of respondents to the survey. Ms. Matoy replied that the benefits are comparable to those in the state plan but not identical in all respects. **Motion failed.**

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — **Gerald Horn** said the committee has been working on changes in the academic regulation regarding dropping courses and will present a recommendation at the next meeting. The recommendation will extend the period of time in which students can drop a course with the grade of "W" from the present 3rd week to the 6th week of a semester to the 3rd to 12th week of a semester and proportionate times of the summer, block and short courses. The committee feels that this will allow students to have more information and to make better informed decisions relative to dropping courses and will result in a policy that more accurately reflects what is already occurring. Please forward any comments on this recommendation to Dr. Horn.

BUDGET — **Carol Moder** said the committee is considering two recommendations with regard to salary but is waiting on further information on the budget. Dr. Moder asked Gary Young to present the recommendation. Dr. Young pointed out that for several years OSU has had a Student Technology Fee which keeps student's computers and software updated. There is no current mechanism to do the same for faculty. Many computers in the past have been purchased on grants, but funding agencies are also being faced with smaller budgets and are no longer funding such purchases. Under cost accounting standards it is inappropriate to use funds that way and funding agencies expect the university to provide computers. Also, some faculty do not have the opportunity to write equipment purchases into grants since only their time is funded. The committee brings the resolution: **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: the university allocate to each academic department \$500 per year per tenured or tenure-track faculty member to be used for the purposes of providing computer equipment and software for each faculty member in order to support teaching and other university-related activities. This allocation should allow computers and supporting software to be replaced every three to four years at current prices. Procedures for auditing the use of these funds, similar to those used for the student technology fee, should be established.**

Furthermore, when new tenured or tenure-track faculty positions are allocated, \$500 per position should be added to the department's computer allocation. Dr. Ackerson asked if the money had to be used for computer related expenses, that is, it could not be used for travel, etc. Dr. Young replied that it had to be used for computer expenses but that it was up to the department head to decide which equipment or software was purchased in a given year. It is estimated that this proposal would cost approximately \$400,000 per year for the Stillwater campus. Dr. Buchanan said the Faculty Council Chair gets phone calls from all over the country asking various questions about OSU policies. The most frequently asked question is how does OSU provide faculty with computers. Dr. Lawry said it might not be appropriate to have a fixed amount for each faculty member. There are some departments that have greater needs than others. Dr. Moder replied it is no longer a matter of choice. The university is requiring every faculty member to have a basic level computer capability in order to satisfy various instructional requirements. The faculty is being asked to produce web-based material, put their syllabus on the web, and to teach the courses in which students make use of technology. So all faculty have to have access to this technology themselves. Four of the Deans made a request for such funds in their budget proposal. Dr. Lawry said that such funds are definitely needed. But how should the money be appropriated? An alternative would be to have a central pot of money and have departments make requests for this money as needed. Dr. Moder said that needs may vary but the committee's assumption is that every faculty member should have a computer that is less than four years old and this should be monitored by the university to assure that the money is being spent for this purpose. Dr. Edgley said that having a central pot of money would lead to further political fights and departments with larger needs are funding those from other sources already. Dr. Schwarz said that it is possible that she will not get a raise this year and she does not need a new computer at this time. There are more pressing needs for this \$500. It seems that technology already has a higher priority than people. Dr. Moder replied that the committee has received many comments from faculty saying that computers are a high priority. The committee thinks a salary program is important also, but that some money needs to be put into this. Ms. Jones said since faculty computers go toward the education of the students why would it not be possible to increase the Student Technology Fee to help fund this. Some of the student labs also need to be improved, so possibly working together would result in better computer facilities for both faculty and students. Dr. Young said he applauds this idea but in the College of Engineering the students are paying computer fees at the rate of \$19 per credit hour and many of them do not use the labs because they have their own computers. It is made very clear by the students on the Student Technology Fee Committee that they do not want to use any of the fee money for faculty needs. Dr. Horn asked why the university did not follow the lead of many industries and lease computers instead of buying them. This option should be considered before this recommendation is approved. Dr. Birdwell said that we do not currently have that option. OSU helped introduce legislation this year, which passed, that would permit mass leasing of equipment. Dr. Moder asked what the cost would be. Dr. Birdwell said he thought it would about the same but would not require the money to all be expended at the same time. Dr. Krenzer said that departments provide many supplies to faculty and each year they have to prioritize which of these things to buy. Why should we restrict the departments choice on this one item? Dr. Moder said that in the library, A&S, and Business approximately 50% of the computers are more than 4 years old and in Engineering 19% of the computers are more than 4 years old. This is a need that the departments are unable to fund using the current maintenance budgets. Mr. Locy asked if departments could carry this money over. Dr. Moder replied that they could. Mr. Locy asked if the money could be spent on service and maintenance of computers. Dr. Moder said that this recommendation was not to increase the number of computers on campus but to update them. Dr. Warde said that his computer is over five years old but within the past six months it was upgraded to a pentium with increased memory. What is the age of this computer? Dr. Young said that if you had a monitor you liked then you could get a good upgrade for the rest of the computer for about \$1000. So this thing should not be overly micro managed. Dr. Moder said that it should be up to the colleges as to the best way to provide faculty with up-to-date equipment. Dr. Lawry said that the plan is not frugal. A department head has the money in his budget so he buys some software when there may be greater needs in other areas. Dr. Robinson said that in her department that some faculty computers were not operating correctly for several months and these faculty members had to work in the lab which was very inefficient. **The motion passed.**

Dr. Warde moved to amend the Agenda to allow the graduate student representative to give his report at this time. Dr. Arquitt seconded. The motion passed.

GRADUATE STUDENT ASSOCIATION — **Nizam Najd** said that Governor Keating issued a proclamation proclaiming April 5-12, 1998, as Graduate and Professional Student Week in the state of Oklahoma. There were 40 attendees at the conference held two weeks ago. OSU is proposing to hold the same conference for the next 2 or 3 years. The Phoenix Doctoral Award Winner was Javier Mont from Industrial Engineering and Management, the Masters Award Winner was Alan Foley from Curriculum and Instruction, and the Outstanding Graduate Teacher was Jeffrey Walker from English. The GSA had a campus walk around to check blue lights and lighting conditions and will do the same next Monday in the University Apartments area. There will be an Open House April 22 from 3 to 5 p.m. to open the new SGA-GSA offices. Elections of officers will be held at this months meeting. Mr. Najd thanked the faculty, staff and administration for their help during his term as president.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — **Linda Robinson** said Jeff Anderson attended the Parking Committee meeting at which the following recommendations were approved and sent to Dr. Birdwell's office: Recommendation to raise parking fees 20% across the board next year. An amendment indicating that no more fee increases should be recommended until a long-term parking plan is developed also passed. Recommendation to adopt a tiered parking fee structure passed. The intent is to reduce congestion in the center of campus and encourage use of peripheral lots. The tiers would be based on convenience (location), not job category. Details should be developed in a comprehensive parking plan prepared by a consultant.

FACULTY COMMITTEE — **Ed Lawry** moved that the Faculty Committee's recommendation from last month's meeting be removed from the table. Dr. Edgley seconded. The motion passed. The recommendation was, "**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: OSU employees should not make a personal profit on any materials that they require OSU students to purchase for academic classes or assigned research. This shall include, but not be limited to, textbooks, manuals, reports, music scores, sets of instructions, syllabi, instruments, other equipment, etc. Any profit that comes to OSU employees from such sales must be donated back to the University through the OSU Foundation.**" Drs. Moder and Edgley commented that they had received several comments supporting the recommendation. Dr. Edgley added that some had said that enforcement should not be a major problem since there are departments that are currently doing this. Dr. Gedra said that the input he received was overwhelmingly negative. One objection was that this reaches into a faculty members pocket to take out money that is already there. It would have been better to suggest that the faculty member should fund a scholarship with such profits. Dr. Lawry said that the intention was not to go back and recoup any money that has already been made on such sales. Dr. Gedra said that the royalty would come to the author who would cash the check and then have to turn it over to the Foundation. Dr. Edgley said that you would be ethically bound to do this but, whether the university would actually take the money would depend on how draconian the enforcement gets. It is not a good idea to take money out of anybody's pocket but there seems to be less problem with taking it out of a faculty members pocket if he/she got it by taking it out of students' pockets by requiring that they buy his/her book. Dr. Scott asked if the people who were negative toward the recommendation were aware that it only applies to profits from students that the author requires to buy the material, not to all OSU students who buy the material. Dr. Gedra said it is not clear. This resolution is insulting to faculty who have taken the trouble to prepare material that improves the course. The amount of money in question is quite small. One person said there was some profit from his textbook the first time it was required but that there was none after that. Dr. Robinson recalled Dr. Richard's concerns from last time and asked if there was any way a faculty member under those circumstances could recoup the expenses for developing material for a course. Dr. Edgley replied that there would be no problem recouping production costs but not salaries. Dr. Lawry said there is nothing in the recommendation that prohibits a faculty member from using his/her own materials in a course. This should be a protection for the faculty member in that it removes the conflict of interest and protects against the thought that the only reason he/she requires this material is to make some money. Dr. Gedra said that this only removes the direct financial conflict of interest. **Motion passed.**

RESEARCH — **Bruce Ackerson** said that the committee has been looking at the IRB but has been able to handle the problems without bringing it to Faculty Council. They are also looking at the Patent Policy and in general are happy with the document, but are not finished with it. The committee has decided not to bring the tabled recommendation off the table but instead to replace it with two other recommendations. The first one adds the position of Research Scientist which is similar to the Research Professional but has more strict qualifications. This title is more clearly understood by granting agencies since it is used by other universities for the type of similar types of work. The position has several levels so a person would have a chance for advancement in rank. It is not a tenured position but is a soft money position. "**The Faculty Council recommends to President Halligan that: the proposed positions be added to the Faculty Handbook. Research Scientist Positions. Persons who hold an earned Ph.D. degree (or equivalent) in an academic discipline and have distinguished themselves by scholarship and research accomplishments may receive temporary appointments as Research Scientist with title of Assistant Research Scientist, Associate Research Scientist, or Research Scientist. These ranks are considered parallel to professional titles. Research constitutes the primary activity. Funds for compensation of Research Scientists will normally originate from federal or private grants or contracts. The terms of appointment shall normally be one year, but reappointment may be made to allow fulfillment of University research obligations. The appointments do not lead to tenure. Appointment is contingent upon approval of the appropriate academic unit or department (e.g. the Graduate College and the University Centers are not academic units). Each college will develop its own procedures for the recruitment, selection, promotion and funding of candidates for these positions.**" Dr. Warde made an amendment to include the Ed.D. degree as well as the Ph.D. degree in the qualifications and to remove the statement, "These ranks are considered parallel to professional titles." Dr. Ackerson accepted this as a friendly amendment. Dr. Warde said that the statement could lead to confusion when people are considered for membership in the graduate faculty. Dr. Lawry said that the Faculty Committee is opposed to the recommendation. One reason is that the recommendation is redundant. The description of Research Professional gives as an example the use of the titles Assistant Research Chemist, Associate Research Chemist and Research Chemist. Presumably if granting agencies understand Research Scientist then they will understand Research

Chemist. The Personnel office has allowed the use of the title Research Scientist already. The paragraph in Appendix D does not have the same qualifications as those listed in the recommendation but a granting agency is not going to go back to Appendix D to see how these people are qualified. Another reason the Faculty Committee is opposed to this recommendation is that the procedure for promotion in these titles is not clear. **Motion carried.**

Dr. Ackerson then presented the second recommendation. **“The Faculty Council recommends to President Halligan that: the proposed positions be added to the Faculty Handbook. Research Professor Positions. Persons who hold an earned Ph.D. degree (or equivalent) in an academic discipline and have distinguished themselves by scholarship and research accomplishments may receive temporary appointments as Research Professor with title of Assistant Research Professor, Associate Research Professor, or Research Professor. These appointments may require the parallel appointment as Adjunct Assistant Professor, Adjunct Associate Professor, or Adjunct Professor to have teaching responsibilities or to serve on thesis and dissertation committees. These ranks are considered parallel to professional titles. Research constitutes the primary activity. Funds for compensation of Research Professors will normally originate from federal or private grants or contracts. The terms of appointment shall normally be one year and may not exceed a total of six years. The appointments do not lead to tenure. Appointment is contingent upon approval of the appropriate academic unit or department (e.g. the Graduate College and the University Centers are not academic units). Each college will develop its own procedures for the recruitment, selection, promotion and funding of candidates for these positions.”** Dr. Ackerson said that this position is also a non-tenure track position and would serve people that were interested in coming in for a short period of time. This position is time limited, it can not exceed six total years regardless of rank. The time limit adheres to AAUP guidelines for non-tenure people. Dr. Warde made the same friendly amendment as above. Dr. Lawry said the Faculty Committee also opposes this recommendation on the grounds that the title of Professor should not be used for temporary positions other than for adjunct positions. The adjunct title could be used for people with the qualifications listed for the Research Professor positions. The committee also is troubled by the lack of procedures for determining advancement and salary increases. Dr. Schwarz said that the AAUP representatives on campus are opposed to this recommendation. Dr. Horn was concerned about the possibility that these people could also be appointed as Adjunct Professors and as such could be given faculty voting rights. Dr. Ackerson replied that the requirement for Research Professors who want to teach to have a dual appointment as a Research Professor and as an Adjunct Professor was added to protect against hiring temporary people to teach. This gives more control. Dr. Moder asked why this title is needed if the Research Scientist title is available. Dr. Ackerson said that one issue was having a title that granting agencies understood and the other was the qualifications. This title may be more appropriate for people in the Humanities. Dr. Warde pointed out that the title of Adjunct Professor or Professor was necessary in most groups in order to be considered for membership or associate membership in the Graduate Faculty. Dr. Edgley said this title is by far the most objectionable of the two. **Motion failed.**

Dr. Ackerson moved that the following mission statement for the Research Committee be added to the Faculty Handbook: “The mission of Oklahoma State University is three-fold: teaching, research, and extension. The focus of this committee is research, which includes creative activities, inquiry in a wide range of disciplines, and the reporting of the results of such inquiry in scholarship. The university where research is properly valued is unique among institutions; in a comprehensive university like OSU, it is research that ultimately drives, enhances, and enriches both the educational experience of all students and the opportunities for extension in society.

Research can be either pure or applied; the former type seeks to establish facts or principles for their own sake while the latter type aims to solve specific problems or find particular ways of accomplishing socially or economically desirable goals. As a comprehensive university seeking to enhance its research activities (by, for example, achieving Carnegie I status as soon as possible), OSU must strive to win external grants and contracts but it must also recognize that a university should foster a wide variety of creative activity and research, the value of which cannot always be judged in terms of marketability or the ability of the researcher to generate external funding. Thus, while applied research that benefits the people and the economy of Oklahoma is an obvious function of a land-grant university, very much related to its extension activities, a genuine research university must also foster and reward pure research and avoid becoming merely a research and development agency for private economic interests. Similarly, the quality of the faculty's research, creative activities, and scholarship must not be measured solely in terms of the ability of faculty members to generate funds for the university.

The mission of this committee is to ensure that the university does everything that it can to stimulate high quality research by all the faculty. The committee will address itself to issues that the faculty identifies concerning the promotion of research activities.”

Dr. Buchanan proposed the statement be amended by deleting the parenthetical statement, “by, for example, achieving Carnegie I status as soon as possible.” Dr. Ackerson accepted this as a friendly amendment. **Motion Passed.**

RULES AND PROCEDURES — **Gene Krenzer** said that elections have been completed and all the positions have been filled. The results are: Vice Chair, Marcia Tilley; Group I-Biological Sciences, Stephen Hallgren; Group II-Humanities, Heidi Hoffer; Group III-Physical Sciences(2yr), Ron Rhoten; Group III-Physical Sciences(3yr), A. J. Johannes; Group IV-Social Sciences(1yr), Larry Sanders; Group IV-Social Sciences(3yr), Ken Eastman; Group V-Teacher Education, Al Carlozzi; Education, Jim Gregson; Business, Janet Kimbrell; OSU/COM, Richard Bost; OSU/OKC, Laura Peck; Multicultural, Paul Hsu; HES(1yr), Renée Daugherty.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES

ATHLETIC COUNCIL — **Dennis Bertholf** said that the AC met March 19. The Academic Integrity Committee reviewed the fall grades and found no major problems. The Fiscal Integrity Committee reported that through February revenues were up 41%. The Rules and Governance Committee reported that the FY98 audits were all positive. The Student Athlete Welfare and Gender Equity Committee reported that the university is on target with the recommendations made in the Title IX compliance report. The report called for 39% of the OSU athletes to be women. The current percentage is 38%. OSU's self study report to the NCAA will be done in 1999-2000 and the NCAA compliance visit will be in 2000-2001.

STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION — **Kristen Jones** said Jeremy Welter and Amy Puckett were elected President and Vice President for next year. The Big Event went very well. There were 80 jobs completed and over 800 volunteers. Ms. Jones will serve as Big Event director again next year. The SGA will be considering a new charter called the Model UN. It is like a world-wide government on a "kiddie" level. They are also trying to start another organization called the Oklahoma Lobbyists Association. The students would appreciate any information that anyone has about lobbyist associations.

CAMPUS SPACE COMMITTEE — **Linda Robinson** reported Lynne Richards attended this committee and reported the following: The committee considered naming portions of and signage for the Advanced Technology Research Center. The formal proposal will be prepared and submitted for future consideration. The OSU Shotgun Club requested establishing a trap shooting range on land owned by OSU. Formal proposal will be prepared and submitted for future consideration. Approved naming university apartment neighborhood area after persons with extended employment at OSU (West, Stevens, Williams, Demaree, Prosser, Morrison). This recommendation will be submitted at the April meeting of the Board of Regents.

STUDENT PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE — **Steve Locy** said that they were unable to appoint an O'Colly summer editor since everyone is waiting for summer internships and no one applied. There have been minor changes in the sky boxes of the paper. The web page has been redesigned.

STAFF ADVISORY COUNCIL — **Nancy Konigmacher** reported that the council is trying to raise money to match the \$1500 contributed by the administration to fund staff scholarships.

NEW BUSINESS:

Natalea Watkins said that faculty will be getting an e:mail survey asking whether they are interested in having a reserved parking space and are willing to pay \$1 per working day for a reserved parking space. May 1 is Celebrate Students Day and also Wentz Scholars Day and you will be amazed at the level of research being done by these students.

Dr. Warde moved that the **Faculty Council adopt the Health Care Committee recommendation as presented by Drs. Birdwell, Oehrtman, and Blakley.** Seconded by Dr. Ackerson. Dr. Moder asked if they should be asked to look at other ways to divide the premiums. Dr. Warde said his motion did not contain that. **Motion passed.**

The meeting adjourned at 5:16 p.m. The next meeting of the Faculty Council is May 12, 1998.

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary