

Due to the fact that President Halligan was out of the country, Ed Lawry called the meeting to order with the following members present: Achemire, Bays, Bilbeisi, Comer, Damicone, Gasem, Gelfand, Greiner, Henderson, Holcombe, Lamphere-Jordan, Lehenbauer, Masters, Moder, Mokhtari, Morgan, Mott, Murray, Peeper, Redwood, Van Delinder, Veenstra, Weiser and Wetzal. Also present: L. Bird, H. Birdwell, L. Cimino, R. Dahl, C. Edgley, S. Harp, W. Jaco, M. Keener, C. Meador, E. Mitchell, V. Mitchell, M. Payton, R. Rhoten, M. Seikel, J. Vitek, N. Watkins, J. Weaver, and J. Wheat. Absent: Binegar, Ebro, Lavery, and Marshall.

HIGHLIGHTS

Social Security Numbers as Student and Employee ID Numbers	1
Ad Hoc Committee Report Regarding Retirement System Changes.....	4
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	7
Reports of Standing Committees	
Budget	7
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	8
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Staff Advisory Council	8
Graduate Faculty Council	8
Women’s Faculty Council	8
New Business	
Presidential Search Committee	9
Appointment of Athletic Director	9

Henderson moved acceptance of the May 14, 2002, Minutes. Wetzal seconded. The Minutes were approved. Henderson moved acceptance of the June 11, 2002 Agenda. Moder seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: Social Security Numbers as Student and Employee ID Numbers – Randall Dahl

Randall Dahl provided a special report on the reduction of the use of SS numbers by the University as identification numbers for both students and faculty. Overuse of SS numbers for identification has been a long-term problem. The University is attempting to make needed changes prior to legislative mandate on the issue. The objective is to minimize the visibility of the SS number and the system operations that involve having the SS number visible. There are many federal systems that involve use of the SS number, such as Federal Financial Aid and the Hope Scholarship. The new system under development will minimize the use of SS numbers to only what is absolutely necessary for the system. The SS number is embedded in many Federal databases and currently OSU has no institutional policy concerning the use of SS numbers. Eight campuses are being served by the main system for which the new ID number is being developed. Consistency is needed across all eight campuses for accurate identification. An attempt is being made to have the employee ID number the same as the student ID number for the same person, rather than having different numbers for the various categories. The eight-digit personal identification number should be recognized as distinctly different from the sixteen-digit Smart Card ID. The card,

which in the future will have some of the characteristics of a credit card, is identified with a sixteen-digit ID number and the person carrying the card is identified with the eight-digit personal ID number. In order to perform this change in the most cost effective manner the University will rely on SCT for help on this issue. The SCT software vendor has redesigned the software for a new ID number and the improvement comes to the University at no cost as a part of the general maintenance fee for the SCT software. There are three phases to the project to implement a personal ID number. The first stage was implemented last semester by using a masking approach to hiding the SS number. A student identification code was generated from a name and number combination. The second phase is occurring this summer with the primary modification of the student system. Later this year the other pieces of the identification number change will be incorporated that will include changes for the employee ID number. The third phase will be full implementation with the necessary adjustments. The full change over is scheduled for summer 2003, so that by Fall 2003 everyone will have their new identification number. The group working on the ID change will develop policy about the use and protection of SS numbers. A subcommittee directed by James Breazile will develop the necessary policy. Lawry requested clarification of the number of digits associated with the personal ID. The eight-digit ID is referred to as the alternate ID. The alternate ID and the SS number will compose a seventeen-digit value for full identification. Dahl indicated that if eight digits were presented to the system the number would be identified as the alternative ID number, but if nine digits were put into the system then the number would be perceived as the SS number. However the number that will come back as a response will always be the alternative ID number, since the main objective is to reduce the visibility of the SS number. Gasem asked why the personal ID was not the same number as the Smart Card ID. Dahl reiterated that the alternate ID is associated with the person and the Smart Card ID identifies the card, which will eventually be used for similar purposes as a credit card. Dahl thanked all faculty for making the web-based submission of grades a success. An invitation to come to FC for a discussion of web-based submission of grades will probably be offered to Dahl in the future. A memorandum initially sent out last April is included in the minutes to provide details for the SS changes.

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 17, 2002
TO: All Faculty and Staff
FROM: SSN Transition Planning Committee
SUBJECT: Social Security Numbers as Student and Employee ID Numbers

The widespread use and relative visibility of individual Social Security Numbers in administrative computing systems is a matter of growing concern nationally with regard to protection of individual privacy and potential identity theft in particular. Several states have enacted specific legislation in recent years to address these concerns. These concerns also exist at Oklahoma State University, and both the Faculty Council and administrative leadership – as well as individual students and employees – have expressed an interest in significantly reducing reliance on the Social Security Number as the primary student and employee identification number in institutional operations and data systems. Executive Vice President Marvin Keener created a “SSN Transition Planning Committee” charged to identify and facilitate an appropriate, prompt, and cost-effective transition to the use of an alternate Student and Employee ID number at Oklahoma State University. Primary conclusions reached by the Transition Planning Committee, including the decision to implement the alternate student/employee ID number system enhancement provided by SCT, OSU’s HRS and SIS vendor, are noted on page 2.

Part of the software enhancement providing a temporary means to "mask" the current Student ID was delivered and installed in July 2001, and complete enhancements will be delivered during summer and early fall 2002. Installation will require some adjustments to the existing system and various reporting programs. Full implementation of the alternate ID system at OSU is planned for Fall 2003.

Consistent with the objective of minimizing visible access to SSN information, it will be necessary to remove such information from any and all institutional, college, and departmental "side systems" and any other databases or data systems using OSU computing equipment and networks, and replace it with the alternate ID number. The Transition Planning Committee will work to facilitate this process.

The new alternate student/employee ID number is *not* the new SmartCard ID Card Number. However, programs to allow necessary internal translations between or using these two numbers will be developed.

Additional details on the alternate ID number and transition process will be provided early in Fall 2002. In the meantime, if you have specific questions, you may contact an appropriate member of the SSN Transition Planning Committee identified below:

James Breazile (Veterinary Med/Faculty Council)	jamedwd@okstate.edu
Randall Dahl, chair (Academic Affairs)	rdahl@okstate.edu
Robert Dixon (Bursar)	rdixon@okstate.edu
Bradley Johnson (Internal Audit)	bjohnson@okstate.edu
Anne Matoy (Human Resources)	upsxxam@okstate.edu
Brian Philpott (Student Government Assn)	philbob@go.com
Joe Weaver (Planning, Budget, Inst Research)	jweaver@okstate.edu
Mark Weiser (College of Business, MIS)	weiser@okstate.edu
Lou Wilson (NEO A&M, MIS)	lwilson@neoam.cc.ok.us
J. L. Albert (CIS, technical consultant)	jla@okstate.edu

Background

The SSN Transition Planning Committee has met periodically during the 2001-02 academic year and has reached several primary conclusions pursuant to its charge, as follows:

- Management of the appropriate use of and access to an individual student or employee's Social Security Number is an institutional responsibility, and appropriate institutional policies should be developed and implemented.
- Responsibility for the management of use and access is not limited to major administrative systems, and such policies must apply across the institution to all information systems.
- Due to federal and state reporting and program eligibility requirements, and to assure necessary integrity and reliability of student and employee records, use of the Social Security Number of students and employees cannot be eliminated. In fact this information must be collected, recorded, and maintained in at least some official University data systems.
- Even while accommodating the legitimate needs for SSN information, it is both desirable and feasible to significantly reduce the use and visibility of an individual student or employee's SSN.
- Many individuals are affiliated with the University as both students and employees (whether sequentially or concurrently), and therefore the alternate ID number must be designed to accommodate both relationships

simultaneously. Since these relationships may involve different institutional components of the OSU and A&M system, the alternate ID number must function across institutions in a system-wide context.

- As a convenience to students and employees, both HRS and SIS should be able to accommodate user transactions based on either the current SSN-based ID number or the new alternate ID number while continuing to limit visible access to SSN information.
- Implementation of the alternate ID system developed by SCT, the University's vendor for its current major administrative systems (FRS, HRS, and SIS), is the most cost-effective and timely method to accomplish the transition away from use of the Social Security Number as the primary student and employee ID. The alternate ID function provided by SCT is appropriately responsive to OSU's identified needs, and is provided to the University at no additional charge as part of the existing annual maintenance agreement.

RWD:bb

SPECIAL REPORT: Ad Hoc Committee Report Regarding Retirement System Changes – Ron Rhoten

Ron Rhoten provided a special report on the retirement system changes. He began by thanking the members of his committee and providing a brief description of the changes that have occurred in the OSU retirement system. Pre 1995 the OSU system contributed to OTRS 6% of \$25,000. Participants were given the opportunity to contribute more if they chose to do so. OSU also contributed to TIAA-CREF 10% of the faculty member salary minus \$7,800 and the faculty member was required to contribute 5% of the salary amount also to retirement. Post 1995 due to legislative edict OSU had to contribute 7% to OTRS of a number that went from \$25,000 and started increasing constantly. OSU decided to keep funds available for retirement contributions essentially constant so the contributions to TIAA-CREF declined steadily as the contributions to OTRS have increased steadily. Also, faculty were no longer required to contribute 5% of their salary amount to TIAA-CREF. That became optional. Some faculty due to IRS regulations could not take advantage of that. The committee has discovered that several tax issues are involved with the retirement contribution questions. The committee charge was based on at least four issues. **Why did the change take place?** The legislature has tried certain changes in an effort to fully fund OTRS. Second, President Campbell and his administration identified that fringe benefits were rising at roughly four times the rate of salary increases. It was difficult to institute a raise program or any type of a salary program with such increases in fringe benefits. The question was turned over to an ad hoc committee, chaired by Darrel Kletke to determine if a better situation could be developed with the then available monies. The committee suggested that the mandatory 5% contributed by the faculty member be made optional, that at least gave the faculty member the option to receive that money as take-home pay. IRS regulations curtailed some member's participation in such a program. **Why wasn't "grandfathering" allowed?** One possibility for grandfathering would have been that OSU would have funded any OTRS increases mandated by the legislature and would also still continue to fund TIAA-CREF contribution. That type of grandfathering would have resulted in two faculty groups, one hired pre 1995 and the other hired post 1995, which would have had different retirement plans. Under that circumstance if the legislature had mandated that OTRS contributions had to be 12% then the University would have had to provide the amount for the pre 1995 hires, while the other group would have to pay it themselves. Another type of grandfathering, which was recommended by the Kletke committee, is that the faculty member could be grandfathered into the system, but the additional contributions to OTRS would have to be made by the faculty member as those contributions increased while the University would contribute essentially constant contributions to TIAA-CREF. That option was not made available by the Campbell administration to the faculty. There were proposed IRS regulations that would have

apparently inhibited that from occurring. Those regulations were continually postponed, until 1999 when the proposed regulations were scrapped entirely. This is the one issue identified by the Rhoten committee in which the current administration missed a chance to remedy the current situation. In 1999 a window of opportunity existed to revisit the retirement circumstance that would have provided a much better chance of a reasonable solution than the current time frame allows. **Were the long-term effects really understood by the people making the decisions at the time?** The answer is both yes and no. The ad hoc faculty retirement committee apparently had a suspicion in 1991 that there may be an increase of the OTRS contribution from 6% to 7%. The committee recommended grandfathering, but stated if the OTRS contribution went from 6% to 7% then the faculty member had to pay it him or herself. Within two years the percent of contribution to OTRS had increased but more significantly the salary limits on which the percents were calculated were beginning to be uncapped. Not only did the percent increase, but the amount on which the percent is paid increased. **Do members of the OSU administration know what the future holds for OTRS?** That is one of the questions for which the answer is not known. There appears to be a lack of a communication liaison between OSU and OTRS. It is a difficult position for the administration to want out of OTRS and to want to be involved in greater discussion about the future of OTRS. **Why didn't the legislative mandate to fund OTRS more fully affect OU in the same way as it did OSU?** The answer was relatively easy to answer. Faculty hired at OU both prior and post to 1995 paid their own OTRS payments. OU contributes 15% of the salary amount to TIAA-CREF and the faculty members are responsible for their own OTRS. As OTRS contributions increased the take-home pay decreased for OU faculty members. Although, the contributions are tax deductible and certainly there are some tax advantages for faculty at OU that do not exist for faculty at OSU. If the retirement contribution is required by law then it is tax deductible; if it is the employees' option then there are some tax deduction constraints. The Rhoten committee did not find any indication of any fact or item that was not public, or any suspicious information associated with the retirement system changes. The committee did not identify any actions on the part of OSU administrators which were beyond the charge of administering. The legislature is responsible for the situation that resulted in the changes to the retirement system. **General conclusions of the committee are** the OSU retirement plan is not a great one. OTRS is a horrible retirement system. It is not portable; it has minimal estate value. There are two types of grandfathering, one where the University pays for OTRS and the other where the faculty member pays for OTRS. The opportunity for the later type of grandfathering was lost in 1999. That was an opportunity missed by the current administration to provide some tax benefits for OSU faculty. **OTRS claims that your retirement amount is 2% times years of credible service times the average of the highest three years of salary; that is knowingly false.** The committee thinks that the retirement changes were a zero sum game, except for OTRS. If a faculty member had made the 5% voluntary contribution to TIAA-CREF, or an equivalent program, and if the faculty member had used a salary increment that was given in lieu of raises in 1995, in succeeding years had increased those amounts annually to match the increase in salary and placed that in TIAA-CREF or an equivalent program and if the legislature had not required increasing payments to OTRS then the faculty member would be roughly where he/she would have been without retirement changes. The IRS limits on tax-deferred contributions caused some faculty members not to be able to make these contributions, since once the 5% was optional it put them over the limit.

In comments and questions that occurred after Rhoten spoke, Lawry pointed out that the administration failed in the late 90's to recognize that significant tax changes were on the horizon that could have significant negative impact on retirement income of OSU employees. Over a period of years when those changes were imminent the administration missed a window of opportunity to remedy the situation. In 1999 when the regulations from the IRS were changed the administration should have taken the responsibility to notify faculty of the changes. The addition of classified personnel to the retirement plan during the late 90's and the complication of the IRS regulations involved created a situation where

grandfathering (when the employee is required to pay for OTRS) was not possible. Increasing costs of medical benefits during the 90's also depleted the pool of funds available for retirement benefits. Additional questions were posed about the published OTRS equation to calculate retirement benefits which is known to be inaccurate. It seems that the OSU administration has either been unwilling or unable to clarify the calculation and refers retiring faculty to contact OTRS directly for specific forecasts of retirement payments. Edgley pointed out that the fact that the Campbell administration saw that fringe benefits were rising rapidly as against salary, was a function of health insurance costs, and that the response of the administration was to steal money from retirement to pay current health premiums. Rhoten agreed with that description. Birdwell remarked, "May I make one brief statement here? There are initiatives that the university and this group have worked on to do interim studies to try to get a structure under which the two comprehensive universities could remove themselves from OTRS and OU and OSU agreed to share the costs of an actuarial study to find out what the impact would be on the universities to remove themselves from OTRS. We received back, maybe yesterday, the proposal from the actuaries so we're fine-checking what all they intend to evaluate in making their report to the OTRS and to the State Legislature. And so during the Legislature interim that will be looked at closely to see if, in fact, there is a way to get OU and OSU out of OTRS. Another interim study is the fact that when the legislation was adopted in '95 it created a circumstance where the employees and faculties of OSU and OU actually receive lesser benefits from OTRS for exactly the same contributions that are made than the career-tech system and the common education system. We brought that to the attention of Tommy Beavers at OTRS and the Legislature and they have verbally agreed that that, in fact, is true and have indicated that the interim study will look at how much money that involves on a salary by salary basis so that remedial legislation can be introduced for next session. So, there are those two things on the way." Gasem asked if there was some motion toward legislative relief to compensate faculty who have suffered damages from the retirement changes. Birdwell indicated that it was his understanding that an impartial party, acceptable to faculty and regents, would be engaged to study the issue. Edgley stated, "A retired judge, someone with impeccable credentials, can look at this whole situation and make a determination as to exactly how much faculty has been affected by those decisions. And, also staff." Birdwell said that such an estimate could be used to indicate to the legislature, "Here is the element of relief that we are seeking." At that point Gasem asked, "if that is what we intend to do, wouldn't it be more beneficial to have only one track instead of having two parallel tracks, one legal going to court where the university claims there are no damages and yet the university, on the other hand, trying to assess the damages for the legislature, which story is the right one?" "You're telling us on one hand there is no damage yet, you're asking us to provide relief and you're telling us you're going to have somebody who's neutral and well-respected and highly qualified assess. So, I think if I were doing it I'd have that procedure completed first before I started complaining to the Attorney General whether it's a trivial suit or a liable suit. At least that is how I would look at it as a layman." Edgley agreed that administration has indicated that, "yes, everybody understands the faculty were terribly and grievously damaged by this" but in court proceedings flat denials are being made or the faculty is being charged with doing this to themselves. Gasem interjected that it seems the administration would want a consistent position which is reconcilable with all their actions because, "anybody who's astute will look at it and say this is basically trying to play both sides and that's not right." Edgley agreed and added, "I think the administration is essentially on our side and what's happened is that this has shifted into other legal arenas maybe through the Attorney General's office." Birdwell indicated that was correct. Edgley commented, "They're saying that if we were to win this case it would have substantial impact on Oklahoma and the way it does business in general and not simply OSU." Gasem added, "I can understand the State is interested in protecting themselves but also as an institution we have our own governance, our own Board of Regents which say, 'hands off, we're still studying this issue.' We're not bringing anything to you, basically deliberations, until we're ready. And, I think it would be amicable if we did it that way." Birdwell

indicated that could be done after the Summary of Judgment motion is dismissed. He doesn't think the case will be dismissed on Summary Judgment.

The entire report from the committee entitled "Report of the Ad Hoc OSU Faculty Council Committee to Investigate the Historical Circumstances that Led to the 1993 Changes in the Faculty's Retirement Plan" will be available on the Faculty Council website in the near future.

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. Awaiting survey results from Bureau of Social Research (HES).
- 01-05-05-RES ***Copyrightable Intellectual Property Policy:*** Under review. Legal Counsel reviewed the draft document and raised a number of issues. Joe Alexander met with members of the Copyright Committee, Legal Counsel, and others to discuss relevant issues. A revised draft is being developed. Approval by the OSU Board is required.
- 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 met with the Athletic Council regarding the Athletic Department's plan for deficit reduction and Athletic Council is studying this issue.
- 02-04-01-LRPIT ***Information Technology Policy:*** Under review. Dr. Keener is reviewing the proposed policy and has asked CIS representatives and others to provide input on the recommendation.
- 02-05-01-ASP ***Enrollment Appeal Document:*** Approved. The Registrar's Office developed the proposed form specifically for this use.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

The reality of the budget for the state and the University is quite bleak with planned budget reductions of 2.5% for this year and perhaps cuts in the units of approximately 1.25%. Actual cuts could exceed these stated proposed amounts. The reductions that are on the table for next year are currently stated at about 2%.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Sally Henderson

The three major areas of concern for the committee include: Taking a more active role in the retirement issue regarding the “stop the bleeding” issue and deliberating drafting a resolution concerning what the institution ought to do in this regard. Another issue relates to the concern of the Staff Advisory Council regarding maternity/paternity/adoption leave. The R&FB committee is considering drafting a resolution in support of SAC’s recommendation and possibly recommending specific details be delineated in such a policy. Also, the committee is investigating the possibility of improving health benefits and will be involved in all phases of pursuit of alternatives to the current package. The committee welcomes input from all interested parties on the issues listed as well as new topics pertinent to the committee’s charge.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:**Staff Advisory Council — Leslie Cimino**

1) SAC is continuing to study the Maternity/Family Leave Recommendation; and 2) their Luncheon and Elections will be held on June 12th.

Graduate Faculty Council — William “Bus” Jaco

1. **Graduate Faculty approves a new Group.** The Graduate Faculty has been organized into five Groups based primarily on similarity of research methods and scholarship criteria (Group I, Biological Sciences; Group II, Humanities; Group III, Physical Sciences and Technology; Group IV, Social Sciences; and Group V, Teacher Education). In April 2002, the Graduate Faculty approved a sixth group, Group VI, Biomedical Sciences. It will be composed of Graduate Faculty in the College of Veterinary Medicine (CVM) and the College of Osteopathic Medicine (COM). This reorganization affects approximately 60-70 current Graduate Faculty members, most of who have been in Group I. 2. **Continuing evaluation for membership in the Graduate Faculty.** Under the current Bylaws (Faculty Handbook, Appendix C: Bylaws of the Graduate Faculty, Part III, Section B), “Each Group **shall** set up a procedure for continuing evaluation of its membership to determine that each full and associate member meets the criteria for membership at that level. To retain all rights for full or associate membership, the member must demonstrate scholarly activity during the previous five years. ...” There is a proposal before the Graduate Council for a change in this section of the Bylaws which will change the word “**shall**” to “**may**.” Such a change also would affect other wording in the bylaws and require other adjustments. The Graduate Council is discussing the merits of this recommendation and a proposal to bring it before the Graduate Faculty for a vote.

Women’s Faculty Council — Jean Van Delinder

This year Women's Faculty Council appointed a Task Force to study the status of women faculty at OSU. Michele Seikel, Assistant Professor, Library, chaired this task force. A copy of the Task Force's findings is available upon request from Jean Van Delinder or Michele Seikel. Women's Faculty Council meets twice a semester and the next meeting is September 11 at 3:30 p.m. Women's Faculty Council is comprised of OSU faculty who are interested in the status of women. The Council helps sponsor events related to women's issues and each spring sponsors awards and grants for scholarship on women's issues to both graduate and undergraduate students at OSU are eligible.

NEW BUSINESS:**Presidential Search Committee –**

Lawry was contacted by the Regents to provide a list of possible faculty members to serve on the search committee for the next president. In review of the last presidential search committee structure it was noted that there were only four faculty member representatives on the search committee comprised of twenty-three people. Considering the importance of the president to the faculty a request has been made for greater faculty representation on the next presidential search committee. The request to the Regents includes participation of four faculty members to be named by FC and an additional four faculty members chosen by the Regents from a list of eight names provided by FC. The FC officers drafted a list of names to be submitted to the Regents, and obtained approval of the Executive Committee to submit the names to Council for their endorsement. The names are: Nominees for Direct Appointment – Kay Bull, Gary Foutch, Carol Moder and Charlotte Ownby. Nominees for Regent's Selection – Bruce Ackerson, Dale Fuqua, Ramesh Sharda and Joseph Stout (all Regent's Professors) and Charles Edgley, Greg Marshall, Mark Rockley and Larry Sanders (four chosen by the Regents from this list of eight names). Damicone moved this list be accepted. There was some discussion as to whether the list represented all the colleges appropriately. Lawry responded that when the list was constructed, diversity of affiliation was considered, but that members were to represent faculty, not their particular college in this activity. Gasem requested that assistant professors be considered for the list. Several councilors voiced that years of campus involvement and governance experience were more important in this case than representation from various faculty ranks. The list was approved by Council.

Appointment of Athletic Director –

As a courtesy, President Halligan had told Lawry about the Athletic Director appointment two days before the announcement, but had not indicated that the appointment was to be permanent. Since the Faculty Council Officers had already informed President Halligan that they believed the appointment should not be of a permanent AD, and since there had been no search (neither the Athletics Committee nor the Athletic Council had been contacted), Lawry was disappointed and surprised by the announcement. Lawry said that since the Athletic Director's position does not supervise faculty, that probably the Policy Statement that is the rule of the University may not have been technically violated. However, it is this lack of consultation on academic administrative appointments that has prompted a recent meeting with administration in which a plan of action to eliminate those problems was developed. University administrators present at the meeting stated that renovation of Lewis Field is an extremely pressing issue and the University was motivated to act fast to fill the AD vacancy in an attempt to not lose any momentum on the renovation project. Gasem stated, "I cannot interpret why they have speeded up this process; however, as an alum and somebody who cares about OSU, I thought they needed to act very quickly. I don't know why, but in our society if a President is retiring it's not a big event. They don't say, 'OSU is collapsing within itself.' But, if you get an Athletic Director to move from one place to another and all of a sudden the grapevine has it that OSU is collapsing and all the negative publicity that goes along with it. So, I felt that if we chose quickly and chose well that it would be to the advantage of the institution and I felt the choice was a very good choice and was timely. Yes, there might be some transgressions in consulting, and this and that, but ultimately you had to look at the outcome and we had to have something to protect the interests of the institution and its programs and I thought, in that sense, it showed a lot of 'guts' to do it this way." Lawry commented, "Some of you may know that *The Oklahoman* at least has an article today in which there's a suggestion that several of the Regents are upset about the process too and think that it was either done precipitously or that the idea about the difference between the interim and the permanent position is something that they're nervous about. I don't know if

that's true or not but that's the story in the paper. Damicone added, "What alarms me is the lack of a search and I think this kind of a search is probably typified to the Halligan regime that when there are searches for administrators there's names added and they become selected. That's how we got our dean. How many internal appointments have we had for administration promotions? I just think inbreeding is a bad thing for an institution and over time it will catch up to you. And, I'm not saying one decision is bad or another, but I just don't think it's really a good way to do business. Maybe that will change." Arquitt agreed and stated, "It seems odd to me not to have a search when you're talking about a position that has that much power and responsibility and that's not to say anything bad about Harry. That's just the idea of no process being followed. We have absolute rules to have searches with all kinds of legal steps for hiring assistant professors at minimal salaries and this one is a much bigger, more powerful position." Edgley indicated that for other past appointments Halligan has supported full searches so the AD appointment stuck him, "out of the pattern." Moder stated, "I would just like to observe that when we were under the impression that this was an Interim position it seemed as though perhaps the ramifications for the rest of the university of pulling Harry out of a rather key position in the university might be able to be handled on a short-term basis by people and place and so forth. But, if this in fact is a permanent appointment I would like to know now what the procedures are going to be for replacing Harry as Vice President for Business and Finance and I seriously hope we're not going to try to patch some patchwork thing together for what is essentially a very important position for the entire university that impacts every aspect of it including the academic one. While it might be very good for Athletics to have Harry, it's not very good for us to have the 'hole' left behind by Harry leaving his current position if it's a permanent appointment." Birdwell responded, "That's the nicest thing you've ever said to me. Thank you." Lawry indicated that obviously he had not asked the President about Birdwell's replacement at VP since only an interim appointment to AD had been discussed. Weiser commented further on Birdwell's appointment to AD. "I get the impression that President Halligan doesn't do this very often, where he makes a decision, and I was struck by the news reports that, in fact, it seemed like they were giving a whole lot more to the Athletic Director than to Dr. Halligan's retirement and the point was made that it could be a year or more until we get an Athletic Director and that was a big deal in the press. And, Dr. Halligan knows that in affect it's a temporary position because it's subject to review by the new President and what he's doing, in my mind, right or wrong, is making a strong statement that he stands behind Harry to try to stabilize this whole thing. And, that's why we have a President as executive authority. If he feels that there's an issue that needs to be taken care of now, hopefully, we've chosen the right President who can make the right decision and I think we ought to stand by him." Moder emphasizing the primary question asked again, "can anyone here address the question about what we're doing about the Vice President for Business and Finance if this is a permanent appointment?" Birdwell indicated he did not want to respond publicly about this issue at this time. Edgley requested an "off the record" session to follow the meeting. Lawry agreed and asked for further new business comments. Hearing none the meeting was adjourned.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is September 10, 2002.

Brenda Masters, Secretary