

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES  
250 Student Union  
October 12, 1999

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Arquitt, Bost, Breazile, Dickman, Eastman, Edgley, Fletcher, Gregson, Hallgren, Hoffer, Hsu, Hyle, Johannes, Joshi, Kimbrell, Locy, Martin, Masters, Mayer, Miller, Montgomery, Peck, Rhoten, Sanders, Sisson, Tilley, Warde, and Weeks. Also present: Anderson, Beer, Birdwell, Dahl, Harp, Keener, Knobbe, McCann, Oaks, Pongratz, Suedkamp, Swann, and Watkins. Absent: Fournier and Gedra

**HIGHLIGHTS**

---

|  |   |
|--|---|
| SIS Update .....   | 1 |
| Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....   | 2 |
| Reports of Standing Committees .....   | 3 |
| Academic Standards and Policies .....  | 3 |
| Campus Facilities, Safety and Security .....   | 3 |
| Faculty .....  | 4 |
| Research.....  | 5 |
| Reports of Liaison Representatives .....   | 5 |
| Athletic Council.....  | 5 |
| Student Publications .....   | 5 |
| Staff Advisory Council .....   | 5 |
| Graduate Student Association.....  | 5 |
| Student Government Association .....   | 6 |
| Graduate Faculty Council .....   | 6 |
| Scholarship Task Force Committee .....   | 6 |
| Old Business .....   | 6 |
| Recommendation: Approval of Changes in Policy and Procedure Letter on<br>Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure ..... | 6 |
| New Business.....  | 8 |

---

Brenda Masters moved acceptance of the September 14, 1999, Minutes. James Breazile seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved. James Breazile moved acceptance of the October 12, 1999 Agenda. Brenda Masters seconded. The Agenda was approved.

**SPECIAL REPORT: SIS Update — Randall Dahl**

SIS consolidates and “replaces” 8 separate systems, 7 of which were “legacy” systems. Major domains covered in SIS include: Admissions (graduate and undergraduate, plus recruitment), Financial Aid, Enrollment and Academic Records, Billing and Receivables, and Housing. All primary sub-systems of SIS were functional as of August 15, and “old” systems have been “retired.” Over 5.2 million records were “converted” to SIS to provide complete records. Approximately 20 large and small system modifications were added to assure critical business

## FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

October 12, 1999

Page 2

functions. Two supplemental systems have been acquired to critical business functions not adequately supported by SIS – prospective student management and cashiering. Security profiles have been established for 1,150 users, and primary user training on SIS for 700 faculty and staff (including 21 at OSU-Tulsa). Fall 1999, SIS successfully enrolled new students, disbursed \$45 million in scholarships and financial aid, and billed both students and staff (e.g., ioNet users) via SIS. Currently staff are working through system and functional problems with financial aid disbursement functions. Work continues on GPA and related modifications for compliance with OSRHE policies. Data verification, clean-up, additions, and corrections from data conversion process are also in the works. Initial operational development of enrollment function is scheduled for Spring 2000. Implementation of Web for Students is in process. This includes a wide range of student inquiry and self-service transactions, replacing and expanding IDS. This will be followed by WEB for Faculty/Advisers. People interested in seeing a test version of Web for Students should go to <http://testosu.okstate.edu>. Last, but not least, replacement reports are being developed and a user advisory group is in the works. After 1/1/2000, it is hoped that OSU will have full implementation of Web for Students functions (e.g., grade inquiry, etc.), implementation of Web for Faculty/Advisers function, decentralized production of the class schedule, implementation of voice response inquiry and transaction functions, refinement of basic operations for user convenience and effectiveness, implementation of degree audit function, development of protocols for advising and adviser approval, and incorporation of OSU-Tulsa effective July 1, 2000. The key issues for SIS are that full implementation requires at least one year of operation. Phase 2 will focus on system modification versus policy/procedural changes and the crucial role of user compliance - access versus security. James Breazile asked about future vendor relationships? Dr. Dahl replied that the relationship would be continuous. On-going maintenance would be very important as updates are needed to be made to the system.

### **REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:**

President Halligan, Executive Vice President and Vice Presidents

97-02-02-ADHOC

#### ***Patent Policy 1-0202:***

98-12-03-RES

***Changes to OSU Policy 1-0202:*** Meeting has been set for 10/25/99 with Legal Counsel, FC Chair, Dr. Keener and others to review status of policy draft. 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. New (SCT) computer system is now installed, and Dr. Dahl has initiated discussion on scheduling guidelines. Dr. Vitek has coordinated original review with the Registrar and the Faculty Council committee. Draft revisions were considered, but because of extensive computer reprogramming involved, CIS requested a delay in action until SCT installation.

- 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, and it was forwarded to FC for their review, per 97-09-02-FAC. At May meeting, it was announced that the draft has been posted to the Faculty Council web site for review with input to Chuck Edgley. Legal Counsel is also reviewing.
- 99-05-03-BUDG      ***OSU-Tulsa Commuting Faculty Compensation:*** Under review. Proposal will be reviewed by Academic Affairs and discussed with the Deans Council this fall.
- 99-05-04-BUDG      ***Guidelines for Third Summer Month Salary for 9- or 11-Month Appointments:*** Under review. Proposal to be discussed by Research Directors at 10/15/99 meeting. Recommendation will be sent to Deans Council for consideration.
- 99-09-01-FAC      ***Criminal and Credit Background Checks for Potential Staff Employees:*** Proposal under review by VP Birdwell with campus constituencies.
- 99-06-01-FAC      ***Approval of Policy and Procedure Letter on Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure:*** To President Halligan

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:****ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Diane Montgomery**

This group meets twice monthly and is currently considering the following items: 1) common and final exam scheduling, 2) Academic Appeals Board and the availability of an emergency appeals process appropriate for the unique calendar for the College of Veterinary Medicine, and 3) the concern about consistency of OSU policy across Stillwater and Tulsa campuses. Additionally, the committee has postponed a study for the newly implemented Drop Policy until more data are available; and, they are maintaining an interest in priority registration policy. Finally, looming in the future are policy needs for distance education. They will seek collaborative study groups on the issue as time allows.

**CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY — Steve Hallgren**

Parking and bicycle safety are of primary interest to the committee and the master plan for the university, the committee believes, will provide a better context as they explore these issues. To that end, they will be meeting with John Houck and Harry Birdwell. Marcia Tilley also added that she and Steve had recently met with the parking consultant.

**FACULTY — Chuck Edgley**

A very proud grandfather showed the Council a picture of his new granddaughter – Baby Grace. All are invited to visit the Stillwater Medical Center website for details. Dr. Edgley then

## FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

October 12, 1999

Page 4

presented a summary of "In Their Own Words," The Tulsa Project: A Report on Faculty Experiences at OSU-Tulsa (a full copy of the report is on the Council website). He noted problems and issues as defined by OSU faculty who teach or have taught at OSU-Tulsa (UCAT) and current OSU-Tulsa faculty. Themes that emerged from the 23 respondents were both positive and negative. Positive experiences include good exposure for departments/programs, smaller classes with more one-on-one instruction, one central administrative office for information coordinating enrollment figures and assistance, easy access to audio/visual equipment, and easy access to industry sources. Faculty also mentioned that there is much potential for research with larger subject pools, an urban population, and one faculty member even mentioned the commuting time with another faculty member had resulted in a publication. Negative experiences were documented as well and include limited and unreliable resources and support, "nonexistent" library facilities, travel time and parking issues, inequitable compensation for Tulsa teaching across the campus and a myriad of questions about governance, both representation and input. In addition, coordination and communication between OSU and OSU-Tulsa seems to be one of the biggest problems. The right hand does not seem to know what the left hand is doing and they appear unable to work in concert. In conclusion: "Clearly, Tulsa represents an opportunity for OSU to expand its mission, to serve a more diverse population and to offer more opportunities to both faculty and students. However, the burden of making this happen is not falling on all faculty equally. Some receive extra compensation; others do not. Some faculty are forced to commute; others are able to stay in the familiar and more comfortable confines of Stillwater. The burdens of making the Tulsa campus a reality fall particularly hard on untenured faculty who are more vulnerable to having their careers jeopardized by the internal politics of their departments and the requirement to spend large blocks of their time in Tulsa. Recent experiences suggest that the contributions of young faculty assigned to teach in Tulsa are simply overlooked when it comes time to consider them for tenure and promotion. If the quality of their publications suffer as a result of carrying large loads in Tulsa, no one seems to listen or care. This glaring injustice cannot continue without having a deleterious effect on the morale of newer faculty teaching in Tulsa." "Faculty who commute to Tulsa have one set of problems and resident faculty who live in Tulsa have another. The former focused on travel, compensation, lack of support, and the fact that Stillwater faculty do not recognize the time commitment required when it comes time to make decisions about their fate during tenure and promotion proceedings. The latter focused on isolation, problems of communication, being left off research groups because it is too inconvenient to find times to meet, governance issues, etc." Five suggestions for improvement include: 1) A Tulsa campus representative be created as a regular position on Faculty Council, 2) different compensation structures for teaching at OSU-Tulsa be addressed and some kind of equity be introduced into the system of rewards, 3) Tulsa faculty be consulted by administration on immediate ways of improving resources and support, 4) units show ways in which they are improving lines of communication between the two campuses, and 5) tenure and promotion documents, to the extent that they do not adequately address these problems, should be rewritten to reflect the realities of those commuting faculty who teach in Tulsa. On a new topic, the committee recognizes that six new Assistant Vice-Presidents have been appointed. The group is very worried because faculty counsel was not sought in this decision and they will be looking into the matter.

**RESEARCH — Richard Bost**

The committee has set a general agenda for the year. The first item is based upon a concern about the recent drop in OSU's standing among research universities. For example, OSU has been in the top 100 in the past, according to one survey; but have more recently been dropped off that list. They are also aware that this drop is not in keeping with President Halligan's stated goal that OSU attain Carnegie I status. Robert Mayer asked about the source of this survey. Dr. Bost indicated that the source was not yet known, but that they were locating it. The Committee plans to research possible corrections. This investigation is to be the focus of their work this year. Specifically they plan to determine which universities have risen in these rankings, and to converse with colleagues at these institutions to learn what changes occurred at their universities that fueled their rise. They will then investigate which of these changes will be of most help to OSU. Dr. Halligan indicated, in an aside, that he believed OSU had not made the progress he hoped for and he would be very interested in their report on this topic. Additionally, they are mindful of the progress being made with the Research Park and will plan recommendations that will complement these initiatives as well as extend research enablement to all faculty. Please feel free to approach any Committee member with your questions or concerns.

**REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:****Athletic Council — A. J. Johannes**

Terry Don Phillips will be meeting with the group in the near future.

**Student Publications — Bill Weeks**

The library tower has moved from the left to the center of the masthead on the paper.

**Staff Advisory Council — Nancy Swann**

The group will be meeting October 13 to discuss the issue of background checks. Staff Appreciation Day is November 4 and all are encouraged to recognize the recipients of service pins in their area. All are welcome to attend activities on this special day as well.

**Graduate Student Association — Kimberly Suedkamp**

Health insurance issues for graduate students were presented noting that recruitment and retention of the best students will be enhanced with an enhanced health care program. The current health plan, offered through the Student Health Center at a yearly cost of \$465, covers approximately 50 percent of the usual and customary charges. Recognizing that the graduate student population includes more students with families and coverage neglects dental, eyes and specific prescription benefits, changes in current insurance offerings are needed. From their student survey it was determined that 43 percent of graduate students attending their forum were uninsured, 70 percent of which cited cost. A Task Force was set up chaired by Joe Weaver. Their report and recommendations will be presented at the next meeting.

**Student Government Association — Jill Anderson**

One of the new projects SGA is working on is using technology to increase voter participation for future campus elections. They would like to create an on-line voting system for students because of poor voter turnout in the past. Money has been set aside for this project and they are

working with an OSU class to develop a program. They are also looking for a permanent staff member to keep the database updated from year to year.

**Graduate Faculty Council — Bill Warde**

Graduate Council voted to approve the COM program in Forensic Sciences subject to administrative approval by Dr. Keener of several concerns. Twelve requests by students for various time extensions and waivers of graduate college rules related to age of courses, extension of time to complete a degree, etc. were heard. Eleven of these were approved and one denied.

**Scholarship Task Force — Dave Buchanan**

The Scholarship Task Force is at work. They have met twice since Dave assumed responsibility as the Chair. Much of the first meeting was devoted to bringing the chair up to date since the Task Force had met several times previously. The second meeting was devoted to a discussion of the results of the faculty survey on scholarship that was conducted last spring. From that discussion came the decision to appoint three temporary subcommittees to address the following topics: 1) Summarize the results of the survey, 2) determine how scholarship is currently defined by OSU administration, and 3) review other definitions of scholarship present in the literature.

**OLD BUSINESS:**

**RPT Document — Chuck Edgley**

Bill Warde moved and James Breazile seconded taking the RPT document (99-06-01-FAC) off the table. The motion carried. At that time Dr. Edgley, for the Faculty Committee and because the Committee had reached a state of utter despair about Council's ability to pass the suggested wording proposed to limit the power of the deans to a process role, recommended that an amendment be made to the RPT document. The change increases the responsibilities of the deans commensurate with the power they have and are as follows:

Pg. 3. Dean. **The deans have several vital responsibilities both prior to and during the evaluation process. He/She works continuously with departments, making sure the standards for reappointment, promotion and tenure are clear and consistent with the level of excellence expected in the College and University and that the department's emphasis on differing aspects of faculty activities matches the role the department plays in the College and University. He/She provides explicit and detailed guidance regarding the type and quality of documentation that will be required of candidates whose applications for reappointment, promotion and tenure are to be forwarded to the EVPAA. Upon receiving recommendations from departments, the dean, with the aid of a college level committee (if applicable), shall carefully review the candidates documentation file, including the recommendations of the Unit's Personnel Committee and Unit Administrator. He/She shall make a professional assessment regarding whether (1) the department's evaluation of each candidate has been rigorous, fair and based on departmentally approved criteria and standards, (2) the documentation provided adequately supports the recommendations of the unit, and (3) the action recommended by the unit is warranted. A written report of this professional assessment will be added to the documentation file and forward to the EVPAA**

**as part of his/her Statement of Recommendation.**

Pg. 13. 4. College-Level Committee Review (if applicable). After receiving recommendations from departments in the college, all documentation files are reviewed in the dean's office, with the dean typically seeking advice from others. Faculty counsel may be, but is not required to be, sought by the dean from an elected college personnel committee or a special or permanent committee of the respective academic college. Following a review of all documents provided on each candidate, the college-level committee shall prepare a Statement of Recommendation regarding **whether (1) the department's evaluation of each candidate has been rigorous, fair, and based on departmentally approved criteria and standards, (2) the documentation provided adequately supports the recommendations of the unit, and (3) the action recommended by the unit is warranted.** This statement is added to the candidate's RPT packet prior to review by the dean. Additionally, the chair of the committee or an appropriately elected representative will record the committee's recommendation on the RPT Summary of Recommendations form, along with his/her signature.

A copy of the college-level committee's Statement of Recommendation (if applicable) shall be given to the faculty member in a confidential manner as soon as reasonably practical, normally within three working days, after the recommendation is finalized.

Pg. 13. 5. Dean's Review. The dean, after reviewing all materials and other recommendations, submits his/her Statement of Recommendation to the EVPAA. **This statement shall assess whether (1) the department's evaluation has been rigorous, fair and based on departmentally approved criteria and standards, (2) the documentation provided adequately supports the recommendations of the unit, and (3) whether the action recommended by the unit is warranted. If the recommendation of the dean is that the action recommended by the appropriate faculty counsel or unit administrator is not warranted, the reasons must be explained in the statement.** This statement shall include any confidential information that conditions his/her recommendation. Even if the recommendation of the dean agrees with that of the unit personnel committee and unit administrator, the dean is nevertheless encouraged to include in the documentation file a written statement setting forth rationale for his/her recommendation. The dean's Statement of Recommendation must be added to the candidate's documentation file, along with his/her notation of recommended action and signature on the RPT Summary of Recommendations form. The dean transmits the documentation file to the EVPAA.

In addition to the RPT form and the documentation specified above, A DRAFT copy of the non-reappointment letter should be sent forward to the EVPAA with all requested documentation, if the dean's recommendation is for non-reappointment.

A copy of the dean's Statement of Recommendation shall be given to the faculty member in a confidential manner as soon as reasonably practical, normally within three working days, after the recommendation is finalized.

The committee also recommends that the following statement be put back in the Candidate

section on page 3. This statement was in the Faculty Committee's original proposal: **In the review process, some of the reviewers may not personally know the candidate and will rely exclusively on materials included or referred to in this file as the basis for their recommendation. The candidate must not assume that the reviewers will know that he/she is an excellent teacher, scholar, and colleague. It is essential that the candidate include in the file all the materials necessary to document and affirmatively establish that he/she has met all applicable criteria and qualifications.**

Following brief discussion, the recommendation was accepted. A motion was then made and seconded to accept the original motion made at the June FC Meeting to accept the RPT document. Discussion then turned to two issues: external peer review and the lengthened tenure review time frame. Robert Mayer noted that in the humanities external peer review was common and virtually required at research institutions such as OSU. James Breazile noted that in certain disciplines external peer reviews occurred already in other ways, such as through the grants process. Ron Rhoten then asked about the implications of the lengthened tenure review time frame. Jim Gregson and Larry Sanders both spoke to the issue. It was noted that new faculty needed to be aware that this requirement, similar to seat time, would or could lengthen their time to review for promotion and tenure. Chuck Edgley noted that approval of this document would require a change in the Faculty Handbook. Dr. Halligan indicated that both could be taken to the Regents at the same time for approval. Dave Buchanan noted that Rules and Procedures Committee should think about drafting language consistent with the RPT document if it were passed. The question was called, vote taken and the motion passed.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

##### **Professor Jim Price's Passing — Chuck Edgley**

Chuck did not want the Council to go without recognizing that one of the faculty in Psychology had passed away – Jim Price.

##### **Meeting Announcements — Marcia Tilley**

The **Fall General Faculty Meeting** is November 16, 1999 at 3:00 in the Student Union Little Theater. All are encouraged to attend. The **November Council Meeting Date and Place** have changed. November 23<sup>rd</sup> is the new date. It will begin at 3:00 in the Oklahoma Room.

The meeting adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

---

Adrienne Hyle, Secretary