

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES  
250 Student Union  
March 12, 2002

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Achemire, Bays, Binegar, Breazile, Comer, Damicone, Dickman, Ebro, Edgley, Fournier, Henderson, Holcombe, Lamphere-Jordan, Lawry, Masters, Mayer, Moder, Mokhtari, Redwood, Sanders, Schestokat, Smethers, Veenstra, Weeks, Weiser and Wetzel. Also present: J. Alexander, L. Bird, H. Birdwell, H. Hannah-Bergbower, S. Harp, J. Hawkins, S. Hill, L. Jones, M. Keener, J. Lawler, G. Marshall, T. Meier, E. Mitchell, V. Mitchell, P. Moretti, J. Vitek, and J. Wood. Absent: Fletcher, Gasem, and Peeper

### HIGHLIGHTS

---

Special Report: Smart Cards.....	1
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	3
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	
Report of Task Force on Evaluation of Instruction .....	4
Recommendation – Amendment to Final Exam Overload Policy.....	6
Recommendation – Tuition and Fees Refund Policy .....	6
Athletics .....	7
Budget.....	7
Long Range Planning and Information Technology.....	7
Research.....	8
Rules and Procedures.....	8
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Graduate and Professional Student Association .....	8
Staff Advisory Council .....	8
Athletic Council.....	9
Old Business	
OSU/OU Faculty Senate Joint Meeting.....	9
Retirement Update .....	9
New Business	
Resolution Commending KOSU .....	10

---

Breazile moved acceptance of the February 12, 2002, Minutes. Lawry seconded the motion. The Minutes were approved as written. Breazile moved acceptance of the March 12, 2002, Agenda. Lawry seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved.

President Halligan acknowledged the presence of Executive Vice President Marvin Keener at the meeting. The Faculty Council welcomed him back and expressed wishes for his continued speedy recovery.

#### **SPECIAL REPORT: Smart Cards — James Alexander**

James Alexander from CIS gave an overview of the proposal for the new Smart Cards, which will replace the current OSU ID cards. A design contest is underway to determine which of

several images will serve as the background image for the cards. The Smart Cards will show the picture and the name of each individual and a card number. No Social Security numbers will appear on the face of the card. Faculty, staff, or student status will not be printed on the card. Because the status changes quickly, it will be encoded in the chip, but not printed on the card. A magnetic stripe on the card will encode the name and card number. A computer chip will contain additional information from various SIS or HRS databases. The information encoded in the chip will only be accessible to those with a card reader. The Bursar's office and the Student Union Bookstore will be among the locations with card readers. Status readers will be available to appropriate individuals for an approximate cost of \$15. The chip will accommodate different applications and it will be possible to update information remotely. The cards will have an electronic purse that can contain a maximum of \$99. Each card may also be activated as a Stillwater National Bank ATM card. This will occur only if the cardholder chooses to allow the bank to link the Smart Card to an ATM account. OSU will not share any personal information about the cardholder with the banking partner. For security reasons, the Smart Cards should never be relinquished, except to the police or to the ID office. This will mean that labs or other locations which now take and hold students IDs will have to develop another system. The Smart Cards will be issued to 25,000 individuals in a mass-carding event. The plan is to issue all the cards within a ten-day period. The event is scheduled for April 4-17 [Secretary's Note: The event has since been postponed to some time next fall]. If a person does not get a card during the carding event, he or she can obtain a card from the ID office. However, the expectation is that it will be much faster to get the card at the carding event. No one will have to wait more than 15 minutes for a card at the event. The replacement fee for a lost card will be \$40. It has not been decided whether the money left on the purse of a missing card would be refunded or kept by the university. Weeks asked what the university agreement with the bank included. Alexander said the university would get \$10,000 a year and \$5 for every ATM account opened. Edgley suggested that the university refund the money left in the purse of a lost card, since the university is already charging \$40 for the replacement card. Alexander said many institutions with Smart Cards do keep the money. Edgley said we should adhere to a more generous standard. He asked whether the Art Department had been consulted on the design of the card. Alexander said that students submitted designs and PIO judged the submissions to select finalists. Students are voting on which of the finalists will be selected. Lawry asked whether the university was shifting from the use of the social security number to a separate ID number at this time. Alexander said they were not ready to make the change yet. Binigar asked whether it would be possible to avoid using the Smart Card. Alexander said it was possible if a person never checked out a book from the library or needed to get in a secured door. Weiser asked if a person could still get a card if he or she missed the carding event. Alexander said it was possible, but that it would be much faster and easier to get the card at the event. Wood asked if students would still be able to charge to a Bursar's account. Alexander said they could still do so in all the places that currently accept Bursar charges. Schestokat said that eliminating the printed indication of faculty status on the face of the card would create problems. For example, in Europe a faculty ID is needed to get certain research privileges. Alexander said she could use her old ID card. He said that the status information changed so often that it was often inaccurate, and that it would not be appropriate to print it on the ID for that reason. Schestokat said that the information was still needed in many situations. Moder said that it might be true that student status changed often, but that it was unlikely that the status of faculty members would change very quickly. Alexander said they did not want to print information that might soon be invalid on the face of the card. Wood asked what could be done if the information encoded on the Smart Card was wrong. Alexander said it could be updated at CIS. Jones asked if emeriti faculty would be

issued cards. Alexander said yes. Marshall asked whether the cards would be distributed on other campuses. Alexander said they would be available to all the branch campuses and to the other A&M schools, if they choose to participate. Keener said that the other A&M schools could get the cards, but they would not necessarily all participate. He asked whether Tulsa would get the cards at the same time as the Stillwater campus. Alexander said they would get the cards later, but since the number of cards needed was lower, they would distribute them from the carding office, rather than sponsor another carding event.

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

President Halligan and Vice Presidents

- 01-04-01-BUDG      ***Market-Driven Salary Increase to Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:*** Funds not available at this time. Recommendation referred to University Budget Committee for consideration. (As reported at the Sept. 11, 2001, Faculty Council Meeting).
- 01-05-01-CFSS      ***Parking Policy:*** Under review. Input is being sought from faculty, staff and students via telephone and web surveys.
- 01-05-05-RES      ***Copyrightable Intellectual Property Policy:*** Under review. Legal Counsel reviewed the draft document and raised a number of issues. Joe Alexander will meet with members of the Copyright Committee in March to discuss. Approval by the OSU Board is also required.
- Edgley said that legal counsel had raised issues about the copyright policy. The Research Committee asked legal counsel for comments 6 months ago and received nothing. After the policy had gone through all university channels and been approved, legal counsel reviewed the document and raised extensive objections.
- 01-09-01-BUDG      ***Formalization of the University Raise Program:*** Acknowledged. Dr. Keener reviewed the budget implications of this recommendation with Pres. Halligan, Harry Birdwell, and Joe Weaver. Raises for faculty and staff remain a high priority for the administration; however, other mandatory increases must also be considered. (As reported at the Nov. 13, 2001, Faculty Council Meeting.)
- 02-02-01-BUDG      ***Athletic Department Deficit Reduction:*** Under review. President Halligan will meet with the Athletic Council regarding the Athletic Department's plan for deficit reduction.
- 02-02-02-RES      ***Endorsement of Tempe Principles:*** Under review. Ed Johnson is interacting with other Big 12 institutions regarding endorsement of the Tempe Principles.
- 02-02-03-SALR      ***Inform Graduate Students About Health Insurance:*** Accepted in principle (03/12/02). Timothy Pettibone will coordinate a review with units involved, including the Health Center, Graduate College, Human Resources, Payroll, and college departments to determine appropriate implementation.

- 02-02-04-SALR     ***SGA Appointments to University Committees:*** Accepted (02/12/02). Lee Bird will work with SGA to develop a plan for improving the student nomination appointment process.
- 02-03-01-ASP     ***Amendment to Final Exam Overload Policy:*** To President Halligan
- 02-03-02-ASP     ***Tuition and Fees Refund Policy:*** To President Halligan

## REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

### ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Brenda Masters

Masters presented the report of the task force to study evaluation of instruction. This report recommends that the Student Survey of Instruction (SSI) be automated and put online via a secure link on the SIS system. It further recommends that the online form contain four or five global questions to be used university-wide. Additional questions could be added by the instructor, the department, or the college. The full task force report will be available soon on the Faculty Council website. Masters said that the Academic Standards and Policies Committee planned to review this report and make a recommendation to the Faculty Council at a later date. The committee welcomes comments from faculty concerning the report. Mayer asked whether the idea was that students would be told that they should go to the website and see the evaluations of various instructors. Masters said that the web would be used for data collection, but the results would not be displayed there. This would eliminate problems with the duplication, collection and tallying required for the current forms. Mayer said that asking students to use the website would decrease responses. He said when the surveys are distributed in class typically one would get responses from most of the class. For example, 32 students out of a class of 35 might respond. On the website, the responses might be limited to 4 or 16 students, whoever wanted to make the effort. He said for those who need the evaluations to support tenure or promotion actions that would be a problem. Weiser added that the four students who respond might be the ones who are irate about some aspect of the class. Masters said that on the public websites, on which come OSU courses and instructors already appear, the comments are not just from irate students. She said that in large lower division classes not all students fill out the surveys. Furthermore, in Fall 2000 more than 50% of instructors appear not to have taken the forms to class at all. Mayer asked whether the Heads present in the room thought this was accurate for their departments. Moder and Edgley said no. Masters said that she did not think that the Heads who were members of Faculty Council would tolerate faculty non-participation. Sanders raised the issue of whether the evaluations should be used for tenure and promotion actions at all. He said that issue and other points needed to be discussed. Mayer said that he thought the Lawry Committee had codified the use of evaluations by saying that it was not appropriate to put undue emphasis on them. Breazile said that he had investigated the history of the purpose for which the evaluations were to be used. He said the Faculty Council had taken the position on more than one occasion that the forms and the data were the property of the faculty member. The responses of the president at that time left the issue open. Lawry said that the report to which Mayer referred was from a College of Arts and Sciences committee and that its purpose was not to require the use of evaluations, but to warn against their exclusive use in evaluating faculty teaching. Breazile said there were two types of evaluations – formative and summative evaluations – and that they each had distinct purposes and proper uses. Lawry said that some department has their own forms. Breazile said that Faculty Council had indicated that all forms were the property of the faculty member. Masters asked Breazile if she could send the history of the Faculty Council actions on evaluation which Breazile compiled to Council

members who would like it. Breazile said yes. Binengar asked how the security and the anonymity of the evaluations could be assured. Masters said that it would not be an open system. Ebro asked how distance students would be affected. Masters said that they could use the online system. It would have three or four informative, summative evaluation questions. The administration would take responsibility for collecting the responses. If a faculty member wanted to ask questions related to improving the course, he or she could use an additional form or a department could develop a form. Mayer asked whether the five-question form would be available to administrators and whether it would be used for promotion and tenure. Masters said the answers to those questions were not well worked out yet. Mayer said if they are used in these ways, then the issue of how reliable they are becomes more important, especially if it depends upon the student to go onto the web and complete the form. He said there would be no control over who is doing it. Breazile said that one of the issues with student evaluations, even for evaluating how the course is taught, is that you are asking the least informed people on the campus to evaluate your teaching. However, they are your customers. Then to ask them to evaluate faculty is a reach. Faculty have difficulty evaluating each other. He said he did agree that it is a source of data that ought to be used for promotion and tenure, if it's proper information and it's properly collected. That's why these five questions, or whatever they are, need faculty input so they meet faculty needs. Masters said that it's a critical issue that Faculty Council has voted over and over to say the data belong to the faculty, that the faculty should have the forms in their own possession, and that this information should not be used in promotion and tenure, and yet it has always been used that way, without a delineation being made between information that really should be available for evaluation of the faculty member and the informative questions to improve the course. She said she would like to see very narrow questions asked that can be designated as the information that may be used in promotion and tenure actions. She also said that student evaluation were not entirely anonymous now because it is often possible to recognize students' handwriting in classes of reasonable size. Vitek said that he had given Masters information from the University of Michigan task force, which said that some of the information could be part of a student database that students could access. He asked if there was any thought of making some information available to students. Masters said she originally thought that it would be an excellent idea to make some information available to students, but there is vehement information to making it available, especially if it is the same information that is being used in a personnel action. She said she would like to see a distinction made between the information that is private for personnel matters and the information that students might have. Vitek said that Michigan had several sets of questions, some available for faculty, some for administrators, and some for students. Masters said she would love to see that process, but that we needed to take a small step at a time. The first step would be to get an online evaluation form with a few narrow questions. She said that would be adequately difficult. Breazile said that the Smart Card could help with the security issue. He said that now there was nothing to prevent an unscrupulous faculty member from filling out his or her own forms. Mayer said that if they were properly administered that could not happen. He said in the English Department the faculty member leaves the room and the students have control of the evaluations from the moment the faculty member leaves until they are dropped off at the office. Masters said that faculty had access to blank forms for months and that the faculty member had control of the initial process. Dickman suggested that data collected for departmental evaluations should also be considered as belonging to the faculty. Mayer pointed out that it has been said that the Faculty Council has twice said that the faculty should be in control of the evaluations and that they should not be used for promotion and tenure. It has also been said that the Faculty Council position has not been followed. He asked whether it was appropriate for us to facilitate this

procedure if it is being used in ways we have not approved. Breazile said that we need to decide the question of who has access to the information and we need to decide on the appropriate stance about the evaluations. Edgley said that if the evaluations cannot be appropriately used in tenure and promotion, we should perhaps abandon them as a university-sponsored activity. If the students want to run their own evaluation process, they can. Faculty can compile a teaching dossier for tenure and promotion. Vitek said that peer review of teaching was widely used. Masters said that Faculty Council had to consider why we are participating in using the evaluations. She said it was problematic to tell students it's important for them to do the evaluations and then to vote against their use. Mayer said that if faculty have control of the use of the forms and can elect to include them in their dossiers, then the evaluations should not be a problem. He said students are usually very generous in their assessments. However, he reiterated that the electronic collection of the data was too selective and that administering the evaluations in class would sample a better subsection of the students. Masters said that now the evaluations are limited to on-campus classes taught in the fall semester. Breazile said that the main advantage of the online form would be immediate access to the data. The turn-around time for the university-sponsored forms can be up to six months. Lawry said that even though they are not yet making a recommendation, it sounds like the committee is leaning towards the online form. He suggested that they needed to collect more information before taking a position. Breazile said that this was a good point and that after hearing the discussion he was more ambivalent about the proposal. Masters said that the committee would consider various faculty comments.

Masters then presented a recommendation concerning the final exam policy that the Faculty Council approved last semester. She said that immediately after the recommendation was implemented, a student had final exams for three courses with identical course numbers on the same day. The amendment offers a means of determining which exams should be re-scheduled in these cases. ***Amendment to Final Exam Overload Policy: The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:*** an amendment be attached to the Final Exam Overload Policy (01-10-03-ASP/FAC) that states if courses with finals on the same day have identical course numbers then the priority of the courses should be determined by the order of the CID numbers. The highest CID number would indicate the course in which the final exam is rescheduled. ***Rationale:*** The Final Exam Overload Policy needs a technique to prioritize courses that have identical course numbers. Based on this recommendation The Final Exam Overload Policy would be: In the event that a student has three or more final exams scheduled for a single day, that student is entitled to arrange with the faculty member instructing the highest numbered course (4 digit course number) or two highest if the student has four finals on one day to re-schedule that examination(s) at a time of mutual convenience during final exam week. ***If the courses have identical course numbers then the CID number would be used as a tie-breaker with the highest CID representing the course in which the final should be rescheduled.*** Common final exams are not among those to be rescheduled. The affected student should submit this request in writing, with a copy of their class schedule, at least two weeks prior to the beginning of final exam week. The faculty member has one week prior to the beginning of final exam week to arrange a mutually convenient time for administration of the final exam, after which the student may take the request to the Office of Academic Affairs. ***Bold/Italics: Recommended Amendment.*** The recommendation passed unanimously.

Masters presented a second recommendation concerning tuition refunds in the first two weeks of class. ***Tuition and Fees Refund Policy: The Faculty Council Recommends to President***

**Halligan that:** the tuition and fees refunds for drops during the second week of classes be reduced from 100% to 50%. Implementation of this recommendation would result in 100% refunds for drops prior to 12:00am on Monday of the second week of classes, 50% refunds for drops prior to 12:00am on Monday of the third week of classes, and 0% thereafter. **Rationale:** The recommendation facilitates prompt action on the part of the student who intends to drop or a class early in the semester. This recommendation will increase class availability during the second week of the semester when other students can enroll with the permission of the instructor. Masters said that the SGA had been consulted about this recommendation and that they supported reducing the refund to 50% only for the last two days of the second week. Weiser said that prospective students trying to get into a class would still have lost nearly two full weeks under the SGA's proposal. Masters agreed that a two-day change would not solve the problem. Wood asked if the recommendation could be amended to allow full refunds for students who dropped all of their classes within the first two weeks. Moder said that the policy as stated affected drops but not withdrawals. Bird said that the students' were concerned because not every faculty member meets the first class for the full period or provides a syllabus on the first day, so there might not be adequate time to make a decision about the class. She said that faculty need to get the syllabus out on the first day and discuss it. Edgley said that sometimes students didn't come to the first class or two. Ebro said that she understood that the faculty were supposed to post a syllabus on the web. Masters said that was the policy. Bird suggested there needed to be greater accountability on all sides. The recommendation passed unanimously.

#### **ATHLETICS — Ed Lawry**

Lawry announced that the Spring General Faculty Meeting would be on March 25 from 3-5 p.m. in the Wes Watkins Center Auditorium. The theme will be "Big-Time Athletics and the Mission of the University: Are They Compatible?" The speakers will be Murray Sperber, Professor of English and American Studies at Indiana University, and Kevin Weiberg, Commissioner of the Big-12 Athletic Conference. Earlier in the day there will be a number of brown bag lunches on related issues. Students and staff are welcome to attend all of the events. Sanders asked whether the meeting would be teleconferenced to the branch campuses. Lawry said that it would not, because of the expense involved. However, the meeting will be videotaped. The videotapes will be available to interested faculty. Edgley encouraged faculty to attend. Vitek suggested that the press be invited as well.

#### **BUDGET — Jon Comer**

Comer reported on the information announced at the University Budget Committee meeting. The committee had been informed in January that there would be a cut of 1.057%. In February the State Board of Equalization met and indicated that all higher education funds would be cut an additional 1%. For fiscal year 2003, all units are planning for a possible cut of 1.5%. Birdwell said that they have asked the units to plan for two scenarios for FY 2003, one in which the budget is flat and one in which there is a permanent cut of 1.5%. Halligan said that the planning was a matter of being prudent, but that the university did not agree that the legislature should cut the budget. They are looking at scenarios, but they do not necessarily support them.

#### **LONG RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Birne Binegar**

Binegar reported that the committee has been reviewing 4 CIS documents. These documents are very long, detailed descriptions of implementation and operating procedures. Because of the rapidity of the changes in equipment and technology, the specific details need to be constantly revised. The committee began by trying to revise the documents, but after consulting with

various IT professionals across campus and examining OU's Policy, they determined that it would be better to write a new, more general statement of policy and roles. The proposed policy is available on the Long-Range Planning and Information Technology website: <http://www.okstate.edu/fgc/itplan/policies.htm>. The committee would like to have faculty comments on it. Edgley said that he understood that under the current policy it would be technically illegal to plug a PDA into your office computer. Binengar said it would depend on the circumstances, but that the policies allowed for some confusion. For example, the policy indicates that it is a felony to allow access to the network without authorization and there are some routine situations in which it could be construed that this had occurred. This is one reason the committee thinks it would be preferable to have a more general policy statement, which then would allow for implementations policies to be written quickly and to be kept up to date more easily.

#### **RESEARCH — Kouider Mokhtari**

Mokhtari reported that, as Edgley had mentioned, the copyright policy was back. He said that among the issues raised were that the policy was written for the Stillwater campus and did not apply to the circumstances at the branch campuses and that non-faculty were not covered in the section on division of royalties. The committee will meet next week with the attorney. Edgley said that the policy had been on the Faculty Council website for months and that a representative from COM, Richard Bost, was in charge of the Research Committee when the policy was drafted, so it was clear that the branch campuses had adequate representation in the development of the policy.

#### **RULES AND PROCEDURES — David Fournier**

Fournier reported that the deadline for nominations for Faculty Council representatives had passed, but that we still needed one nominee from CEAT and one from OSU-Tulsa. He said that according to the by-laws the Executive Committee serves as the nominating committee if the slate is not filled by the deadline. Halligan said that he had made some phone calls and sent e-mails encouraging the colleges to support the Faculty Council by providing good nominees. Edgley thanked Halligan for endorsing the importance of Faculty Council.

#### **REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:**

##### **Graduate and Professional Student Association — John Wood**

Wood thanked the faculty who volunteered as judges for the thirteenth annual research symposium, which was held March 6 through 8. He said they still needed to collate the results and set a date to announce the awards. After Spring Break the GPSA will distribute a questionnaire on health insurance to determine whether there is support for making a supplemental policy available.

[Secretary's Note: At the February meeting, Wood said that participants were from the humanities, social sciences, and physical sciences. I have been asked to clarify that students from the College of Education also participated.]

##### **Staff Advisory Council — Holly Hannah-Bergbower**

The SAC Carnation sale for Administrative Professionals' Day, Wednesday, April 24 is ongoing. Faculty can place orders for flowers on the web by going first to the university home page and then clicking on the SAC quicklink or by e-mail to [cimino@okstate.edu](mailto:cimino@okstate.edu). Orders are due by April 19. The carnations cost \$3 each. The proceeds go to support staff scholarships. The SAC



is seeking applications for new SAC representatives. They have received many responses to the Day Care survey and hope to move forward with a proposal for that project.

### **Athletic Council — Larry Sanders**

The Athletics Council met February 21, 2002. Actions/discussion included the following:

1. The schedule for men's outdoor track for Spring 02 was approved by a majority vote. It does include a meet during Saturday of pre-finals week that will necessitate travel Friday afternoon.
2. NCAA & Big 12 rep Gerald Lage provided a summary of activities. Since they are between meetings, there were no new actions reported. You may also check [www.ncaa.org](http://www.ncaa.org) for recent press releases.
3. No reports from committees of Academic Integrity or Governance and Rules Compliance.
4. There was a discussion about work in process to bring the mission statement for the Athletics program to accreditation standards. Accreditation issues include graduation rate, the 8% limit policy, more minorities on the student athletics advisory council and the grievance process. The work is in process and will be reported to the council when there is a final draft. There was some discussion about the portion of the mission statement including "ethical conduct".
5. There was no Athletic Director's report.
6. The Student Athletics Advisory Council rep gave a brief report of activities.
7. By acclamation, Eddie Sutton was commended for his 700th win.
8. A correction to the January report: the report erroneously reported that the schedule for men's soccer had been approved. It should have said women's soccer team. There is no men's soccer team.

### **OLD BUSINESS:**

#### **OSU/OU Faculty Senate Joint Meeting –**

Edgley reported that members of the Executive Committee had met with officers from the OU Faculty Senate. They discussed many issues of mutual interest. He said these were very productive meetings.

#### **Retirement Lawsuit Update –**

Edgley said that discussions related to the retirement lawsuit were proceeding. Vice President Birdwell has prepared a series of options for how to return those employed before 1993 to the earlier system. There is a meeting scheduled to discuss these options after Spring Break. The discussions so far have included the possibility of implementing a grandfathering plan as early as July 1, 2002. Edgley said these efforts were testimony to the goodwill of the administration. Halligan said that the budget situation for this year was difficult and that even with good will they could not commit definitively at this point. Edgley said that there were also some legislative initiatives concerning OTRS underway. He announced that if you were a member of the affected class and had not paid your \$100 to law firm, that you should do so. If you are in the class and you have not received a letter from the lawyers, you should e-mail him. Moder said that it was very important to get an accurate list of the class of employees who were affected by the change in the retirement system. She said that even if you prefer not to pay the \$100 fee to the law firm, you should still make sure you are on the list, so you can be included in the class when any settlements are made. Edgley said that the contribution to the lawyer has no effect on whether you can benefit from the lawsuit or not, but you must have your name included in the class to get any benefits. Schestokat asked whether the cutoff date for being in the class was 1995. Edgley said that to be in the class, a faculty or staff member had to be employed at OSU before July 1993. Lawry said that the faculty appreciated how cooperative the administration had been, that Vice President Birdwell and President Halligan had working hard on a solution to

the problems. President Halligan has worked with legislators to suggest the appointment of someone of impeccable reputation to oversee a study of the losses caused by the retirement changes. Halligan said that he sees the retirement issue as having three pieces. The first is to work on a system that will allow us to recruit and retain excellent faculty member. This requires us to get out of OTRS. The second piece is to stop the bleeding. This affects a specific class of employees who were employed before 1993. The third piece is to deal with the alleged damages. Halligan said the Regents acted at their last meeting to approve the selection of a distinguished Oklahoman from outside the university who has stature with the legislature to investigate the situation and hire actuaries in order to write a report on appropriate redress. He said that there was not a lot of money this year, but that they hoped at some point to submit this report to the legislature so that they could take appropriate action. Edgley said that the time frame was not as important as developing a reasonable long-term solution.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

The following is a Resolution commending KOSU presented by Ed Lawry.

#### **Resolution**

It was recently announced that our campus radio station, KOSU, received the prestigious National Journalism Award from the Scripps Howard Foundation. KOSU won the foundation's Jack R. Howard Award for its continuing coverage of the aviation tragedy that killed ten members of the OSU basketball program.

KOSU is one of only four Scripps Howard recipients in either radio or television from hundreds of print and broadcast entries to be so honored. The awards came after a competition judged by some of the most respected names in American journalism.

For this most recent recognition, as well as their continuing legacy of excellence demonstrated by more than 150 awards they have received over the years for news excellence including the DuPont Columbia Award, I move a resolution commending General Manager, Craig Beeby, Program Director, Kelly Burley, News Director, Carrie Hulsey, and the rest of the reports and KOSU's staff for this national recognition. They are a priceless asset to the entire OSU community.

Lawry moved that the resolution be accepted. Masters seconded. The resolution passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is April 9, 2002.

Carol L. Moder, Secretary