

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

May 11, 1999

Page 2

to include ombudsperson in the process. Dr. Keener is coordinating a review of the draft with Nancy Wilkinson.

97-02-02-ADHOC

Patent Policy I-0202:

98-12-03-RES

Under review. Draft approved on 2/11/99 by the Research Council, reviewed on 2/12 by the Deans Council, and sent to Legal Counsel. Deans Council and Faculty Council Chair have requested review of Legal Counsel's final draft before policy is submitted to the OSU Board of Regents.

97-04-03-ASP

Guidelines for Scheduling Common Evening and Final Exams: Administration agrees in principle, but defers decision awaiting new (SCT) 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 (SCT) is operating.

97-09-01-FAC

Policy and Procedure Letter on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure: Under review by Faculty Council. Revised draft recommended by the Ad Hoc committee was reviewed and approved by Deans Council on 2/12/99. President Halligan has sent the proposed draft back to FC for their review, per 97-09-02-FAC. Legal Counsel is also reviewing.

98-05-02-BUDG

Increase in Promotion Raises: Under review. History of current promotional increases has been researched by Academic Affairs and discussed with academic deans in Nov. '98. At February's University Budget Committee meeting, the Office of PBIR was asked to survey Big 12 schools and ascertain practices for promotional increases given outside typical merit programs.

98-10-01-RFB

Equalization of Premiums for OSU Employees, Retirees and Spouses: Under review. The cost for equalization of premiums in the State Plan has been calculated to be \$702,000 per year. This will be considered by the University Budget Committee as priorities are set for FY '00.

99-02-03-SALR

Administrative Review of the Distribution of Revenues from Royalty Monies Generated by Sales of Products Using Licensed Name and Marks: Under review. Administration is reviewing current practices at other institutions. A meeting has been set for May 12 to discuss this with Legal Counsel.

99-04-01-RFB

Increase in University Contribution to Employee Retirement: Under review. This recommendation will be considered by the University Budget Committee.

99-05-01-ASP

Changes in Honorary Degree Policy: To President Halligan.

99-05-02-ASP

Change in Courses Allowed for Retention GPA Computation:
To President Halligan.

99-05-03-BUDG

OSU-Tulsa Commuting Faculty Compensation: To President Halligan.

99-05-04-BUDG

Guidelines for Third Summer Month Salary for 9- or 11-Month Appointments:
To President Halligan.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Bill Warde

Dr. Warde reported the committee was bringing two recommendations. The first concerned the Honorary Degree Policy and was also discussed and approved by the Graduate Council. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:** Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures Statement 2-0220 on Awarding Honorary Degrees be amended as follows: (a) In paragraph 1.01, the last paragraph "Because the honor is conferred upon a person, the Committee on Honorary Degrees looks to sustained and characteristic activity as its warrant - uncommonly meritorious activity, exhibiting values that are esteemed by the University." Should be deleted; (b) In paragraph 3.02, add the phrase "department or school" after the phrase "academic unit"; (c) Replace Paragraph 3.06 which currently reads "Representatives of a nominating unit shall be invited to attend the committee meeting at which its

nominee will be evaluated. Following the general discussion of the nominees, the committee moves into executive session. After deliberation, the members of the committee cast written ballots ranking the candidates. The cumulative rankings are then reviewed by the committee. The committee decides whether its rankings are satisfactory, whether more than one degree should be awarded, and what degree is appropriate to each candidate being endorsed." By "Representatives of a nominating unit shall be invited to attend the committee meeting at which its nominee will be evaluated. Following the general discussion of the nominees, the committee moves into executive session. After deliberation, the members of the committee cast written ballots ranking the candidates. The cumulative rankings are then reviewed by the committee. The committee decides **which nominations are worthy of recognition**, whether more than one degree should be awarded, and what degree is appropriate to each candidate being endorsed.

Individuals recommended for an Honorary Degree by the Committee, and not awarded a degree the first year, shall be eligible to receive the degree for the two subsequent years without further evaluation. After the third year the nomination must be resubmitted by an academic unit to the Committee for evaluation and ranking. The nominating unit will be invited to provide supplemental information to the Committee each year." Items in bold print reflect changes in the wording or additions to the paragraph. **Rationale:** Statement (a) seems to be superfluous and the concerns expressed are subsumed into the remainder of paragraph 1.01. Statement (b) is a housekeeping statement. Statement (c) comes about from the concern that a candidate once nominated remains eligible for consideration for the award of the designated honorary degree remains a candidate forever. The Honorary Degree Committee and the Graduate Council both expressed concern regarding this situation, and suggested that the proposed three year window be instigated after which some review by the Committee be made. Candidates who are not recommended to the president by the Committee can be reconsidered annually with updated information. The statement "rankings are satisfactory" created some interpretational problems for the committee which suggested the change in wording at this location. **The recommendation passed.**

The second recommendation concerned the courses allowed for the retention grade point average computation. **The Faculty Council recommends to President Halligan that: Courses in the Department of Music numbered 1440 and below, and Musi 2610, 2620, and 2630 be removed from the list of courses which may not be included for the purpose of improving the retention GPA of students on academic probation or suspension.** In August of 1991 Norman Durham, implementing Regents policy, wrote a memo for the fall semester of 1991 that singled out these courses. The policy was never reviewed by a faculty committee. Since that time OSU no longer has any athletic courses but the music and leisure courses have remained banned from the computation. The music courses are treated slightly differently than the leisure courses in the computation of the GPA and would require extra programming in the new SIS system. The committee could not find a reason for the music courses to remain on the list. President Halligan said he admired the committee for discovering this problem. Dr. Warde said the problem surfaced when Dr. Dahl was looking at policies that required extra programming in the new SIS system. **The recommendation passed.**

BUDGET — Carol Moder

Dr. Moder brought two recommendations from the committee. The first concerned OSU faculty who commute to Tulsa. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: faculty resident in the Stillwater area be provided additional compensation for commuting to teach in-load on the**

OSU-Tulsa campus and that a uniform university policy for the amount and type of this compensation be established. There are various colleges and units that send faculty to teach in Tulsa. Different policies are in place concerning reimbursement of faculty for the loss of research time because of the time needed to commute. It is assumed that the teaching is in-load and that travel expenses are being paid. This recommendation is only concerned with the time. This amounts to a minimum of three hours per week of commuting time to teach one day per week. In a 1996 proposal for a new contract with Rogers University OSU proposed that there be a reimbursement for commuting time. The proposal was to add 10% to the in-load instructional rate. This shows that the university recognized that there is a significant loss of research time due to commuting. Some departments and colleges across campus now provide either partial summer salary or conference travel/equipment money in order to compensate faculty commuting to OSU-Tulsa for their loss of research time. These compensation rates range from \$500 of travel/equipment money per course to \$2500 in special pay. The provision of these funds is not meant simply to reimburse the faculty member for lost time but also to benefit his or her research by providing partial summer support or increased opportunities to interact with peers at conferences. Another possible form of compensation would be an adjustment in workload. For example, faculty members could be given an appropriate amount of release time from teaching or other responsibilities. No units report using this type of compensation at this time. However, for some faculty the most effective way to ensure an equitable workload might be to allow them to recover the time lost. Dr. Sanders asked why this proposal was being restricted to OSU-Tulsa since there are several other positions, like cooperative extension, that require "windshield time." Dr. Moder replied that the impression given by some people in the College of Agriculture is that travel time is taken into account when a cooperative extension appointment is made. So the travel time is part of the load. Whereas this is not the case for OSU-Tulsa. Most people were hired to teach on campus and only now are being asked to commute to Tulsa. Dr. Sanders replied that he did not agree with that. Dr. Hyle said if resident faculty in Tulsa are asked to teach classes on the Stillwater campus then they should be given the same level of compensation. Dr. Moder agreed. Dr. Rhoten said that "uniform university policy" is somewhat bothersome. The compensation he received for teaching a graduate course in OKC as a young faculty member was that he was allowed to teach the same course on campus thus cutting his preparation time. Other departments might not have this option due to lack of students. This type of innovative compensation should not be sacrificed in order to have a uniform policy. Dr. Moder said that the idea of uniformity being considered would allow for some options in terms of equivalent compensation. Dr. Moder added that she would not consider the plan that was described as being compensation at all since teaching two sections of the same course is always an internal departmental decision. Dr. Rhoten said it seemed to be at the time. **The recommendation passed (not unanimously).** Dr. Moder said that the second recommendation concerned another provisional policy that, without further review, has become university policy. **The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:** the provisional language regarding third summer month salary for 9- or 11-month employees, which was approved by the OSU Faculty Council on April 9, 1991, be incorporated into a Policy and Procedures Letter, with one modification (additions in italics below, deletions struck through). To receive salary for the third summer month, the guidelines would therefore read:

- Faculty must be employed in either a 9- or 11-month appointment.
- If the salary for the tenth or twelfth month is from a grant, the budget, including the additional summer salary, must be approved by the University and grantor/contractor.
- Faculty may request salary for a full month or any fraction thereof.
- Additional criteria may be required by departments or colleges, *with the approval of the departmental or college faculty, respectively.* These will be printed and distributed to all ~~appropriate~~ faculty.

In 1991, when 9 and 11 month appointments became an option, Faculty Council approved a proposal concerning the payment of salary for a 12th month. The following month Vice President Boggs released a document containing provisional guidelines for third summer month salary. These guidelines were similar to those approved by Faculty Council, except that they contained additional restrictions on the source of the funds for the third summer month. It also included the statement "These guidelines are effective for a period of one year effective June 1991. The complexity of the program suggests an evaluation be made prior to summer 1992 to consider any revisions that should be incorporated into the final policy." Such a review never occurred, and no policy ever replaced the one-year provisional guidelines. The current recommendation removes the additional restrictions to restore the original criteria approved by Faculty Council with two revisions. One is the phrase in item 4 which reads, "with the approval of the departmental or college faculty, respectively." The other is to delete the word appropriate from the last line. Tom Gedra headed the subcommittee that formulated this recommendation. Dr. Halligan asked if you could get the 12th month from the state. Dr. Gedra said that if a faculty member could find the money then he/she should be able to get the 12th month from any source including the state. Dr. Moder added that the original document also excluded federal formula research funds or state allocated funds like OSU research moneys for particular research projects like water research and energy research. **The recommendation passed.**

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Mark Sisson

Dr. Sisson reported that the committee proposed to Everett Eaton that a multi-week program be instituted by the OSU police designed to make OSU faculty, staff and students aware of the regulations pertaining to bicycle use on campus. Officers will warn cyclists who flagrantly ignore broadly understood rules and/or posted signs, pedestrians who walk in the bike lanes and vehicles that block or impede traffic within the bike lanes. Chief Eaton has agreed with this program and it will be instituted during the first few weeks of the fall semester.

FACULTY COMMITTEE — Chuck Edgley

Dr. Edgley reported that the committee is considering two major issues at this time. One is an inquiry of faculty who are currently teaching in Tulsa. There are many good responses to the inquiry and the major issues affecting their experience will be outlined at the June meeting. This might also have some bearing on the issue raised by the Budget Committee. The responses do not all have to do with compensation issues but raise many different issues. Dr. Halligan asked if this involved all faculty in Tulsa or just OSU faculty. Dr. Edgley said it was only OSU faculty who are currently teaching in Tulsa or have taught in Tulsa in the past. The second issue is the Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure document. This document goes back to 1997 when Faculty Council approved a document on RPT which was a revision of a previous document. A series of discussions ensued with the administration and primarily with the deans. A task force met at President Halligan's house and agreed on some compromises. The current document is the result of those compromises. There have been several changes suggested by faculty to the document however some of them were part of Faculty Council's original document. Making changes that were in the original document that was approved by the deans seems inappropriate at this time and since such procedures are always works in progress they can be revised again at a later date. Since it is so important that the faculty have a chance to see the compromise document before it is voted on by Faculty Council it has been made available on the Faculty Council web page. Thanks go to Denise Weaver and the support staff in Dr. Keener's office for accomplishing this. So see the document, go to the OSU home page, Faculty Council, then Proposed Policy & Procedure Letter: Reappointments, Promotion and Tenure Process for Ranked Faculty. The changes are given as follows with committee comments in italics:

1. The deans noted that the tone of the document has been refocused to reflect positive statements about the expectations and responsibilities of the candidate and of others involved in the RPT process. A general definition of faculty at each rank has been added (pages 1 and 2).

2. The deans were supportive of extending the probation period to seven years for assistant professors and using a 4/3 (rather than a 4/2) appointment period. It is the dean's contention that such a change will bring OSU's probationary period in line with the majority of other Big 12 institutions (page 6). *This change has not been discussed by the faculty and it should be aired prior to our voting to accept the document. In addition, this is a change that can not be made by changing a policy document since it requires an Appendix D revision.*

3. The deans were also supportive of requiring external peer review letters for all candidates being considered for tenure and/or promotion (section G, Page 8). *The uses to which external peer review letters are being put have never been discussed by faculty and feedback is needed since these documents are routinely being employed to make promotion and tenure decisions. Moreover, some rationale for selecting reviewers should be included in the document. Frequently, people get the peer review letters and have no idea why these reviewers were selected or what expertise they have. It gives the deans an opportunity to pick out negative statements from the peer review letters and use them against the candidate while discounting positive statements.*

4. The deans agreed to the compromise offered on rebuttal, namely that the candidate will be provided an opportunity to respond to the first negative Statement of Recommendation received during the review process. (Section 4, Page 10 specifies the time line and maximum length of the candidate's response). *This compromise is an improvement, but does not satisfy the Faculty Committee's concern about the role of the deans in the RPT process. The committee is still concerned that rather than simply certifying the fairness and accuracy of the procedure, deans are making judgements about the quality of a faculty member's scholarship when, in many cases, they are clearly unqualified to do so. It is the committee's feeling that the peer review procedure is adequate to satisfy this judgement about a faculty member's scholarship. Of course in some cases the deans are well qualified to judge a faculty members scholarship but in others they are not. There are currently cases where department committees, department heads, peer reviewers and college committees all agree that the candidates work is of sufficient quality to qualify for promotion and tenure but the candidate is turned down by the dean for what seems to be arbitrary and capricious reasons. This can only lead to grievances and lawsuits.*

A couple of other issues that the committee will be considering are the ombuds/mediation policy and the policy on the use of electronic mail. Dr. Daugherty asked if the committee comments were also included on the web. Dr. Edgley said that they were not but would be added. Dr. Moder added that the points highlighted by the committee are the ones that came from the task force meeting and those are the ones that the faculty needs to consider. In particular the seven year probation period needs faculty input. Requiring external peer review letters instead of having them be optional is another item that came out of this meeting. Since it has been a two year negotiation process to get to this point faculty should not "nit pick" about items where a compromise has been reached or on things that Faculty Council originally proposed but to focus on the new issues in the policy. There are a lot of very good things in this policy that have already been agreed upon by the administration and the faculty should not lose these changes by bickering. Dr. Tilley asked if it would be possible to vote on each of the changes separately. Dr. Edgley said it could be voted on in any way. However, the administration is looking to Faculty Council for acceptance of a document. If part is accepted and part rejected, then the negotiations would have to be resumed and implementation delayed. There is at least one college that is using the current draft in their procedure. Dr. Halligan said that each side gave some in the compromise so the process could become paralyzed if only parts are accepted. It has already been two years since the original document was passed. Dr. Edgley said that the roles the dean's play is a point of major contention but they are not going to give on this and it does not seem possible to have a policy that says the deans can recommend about this but not that. The best that can be done is to communicate

to the deans faculty concern about the roles the deans are playing in the RPT process. Dr. Tilley said her major concern has to do with the outside peer review letters. The faculty can live with this since they have the right to see the letters, if they do not waive this right. These letters seem to promote a “good 'ol boy system.” Depending on how the reviewers are selected and what instructions they are given the reviewers may totally ignore the criteria stated in the departmental RPT documents and make a decision about whether the candidate would get tenure at their university using their criteria.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Athletic Council — Dennis Bertholf reported that Ron Elliott has been appointed to chair the council for next year replacing Maryanne Mowen who has been chair for the last three years. At the April meeting Sandy Fischer reported on the softball program. This year the council has invited a coach to each meeting to report on their sport. Ms. Fischer said that this is a rebuilding year for the softball program but that she was very proud of the girls effort, their academic record and their participation in community service activities. Courtney Bower reported on the Student Athlete Advisory Board. The board is made up of two players from each sport and meets twice a month to discuss eligibility rules and gambling. They also help to organize community service activities for athletes. Dr. Edgley said he thought it was illegal for athletes to gamble. The Academic Integrity Committee has been discussing ways to publicize the academic success of many of the athletes. The Fiscal Integrity Committee reported that this has been a good year financially for the Athletic Department and they will be able to make another payment on the debt. Next year it may be a challenge to meet the budget since there are no home games against either OU or NU and a new sport has been added, Equestrian.

Emeriti Association — Don Holmes reported that the new president is Audrey Oaks, the new vice president is Roscoe Rouse and the new counselors are David Batchelder, E. L. Stair, Joe Owen, and Baker Bokorney.

Staff Advisory Council — Tina Beverage said that Geary Robinson reported on the new parking policies at the last council meeting. The council wrote a letter approving the proposed change but asked for a long-range parking plan from the parking manager and the parking committee and a funding plan to finance any changes. They also cautioned him about bringing plans to Faculty Council and Staff Council without first going to the parking committee. The staff scholarships have one more year in which the administration will match the funds. The fund raising drive is about \$60 short of the goal but 10 staff scholarships will be awarded for the coming year. Staff Advisory Council voted to support Faculty Council's recommendation to increase the university's contribution to the retirement program since the council feels the increase would benefit staff as well as faculty. President Halligan said that a student called and said the pressure is unbearable during finals week and consequently she had received several parking tickets and asked to have the tickets forgiven. She also asked that during finals week there be free parking for all any place on campus.

Graduate Student Association — Al Woodward reported that the GSA is currently developing a web page, revising the constitution and will send a representative to a conference on assessment in Denver.

Graduate Faculty — Bill Warde reported that Peter Moretti will serve a 4 year term as vice chair of the Graduate Faculty. The council also approved the Fire Protection masters degree out of Political Science. President Halligan said that the tornados in the state once again have brought up the importance of appropriate social infrastructure. The state government is very interested in OSU having these type of

programs.

NEW BUSINESS:

Dr. Tilley said that Martin Luther King Day in 2001 occurs on the first day of class so Monday only classes will meet on the second Saturday of the semester since you need at least one class period to tell the students when you will be meeting. Also, the Dean of Veterinary Medicine called and asked about setting up a temporary Academic Appeals Board to hear a case since they need it settled before summer classes start. In their college the senior year starts at the beginning of summer and a student can not start their senior year unless they have a certain grade in all their courses up to that time. Also they can not start the senior year at any other time than the beginning of the summer session so they are delayed one year. They will ask the council to consider making a more permanent solution to similar problems. Dr. Sanders said that they need to check with the Academic Appeals Board since such cases have been handled in the past.

The meeting adjourned at 4:02 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is June 8, 1999.

Dennis Bertholf, Secretary