

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
October 8, 2002

President Halligan called the meeting to order with the following members present: Achemire, Arquitt, Bays, Bear, Bilbeisi, Binegar, Comer, Damicone, Ebro, Gasem, Gelfand, Greiner, Henderson, Lamphere-Jordan, Lavery, Lawry, Lehenbauer, Moder, Mokhtari, Murray, Peeper, Redwood, Van Delinder, Veenstra, Weiser, Wetzel. Also present: D. Bosserman, G. Gates, D. Good, S. Harp, L. Jones, D. Lehenbauer, C. Meador, E. Mitchell, V. Mitchell, M. Payton, J. Vitek, N. Watkins, J. Weaver, J. Wheat, and E. Woodley. Absent: Holcombe, Masters, Morgan, and Mott

HIGHLIGHTS

| | |
|--|---|
| Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations..... | 1 |
| Reports of Standing Committees | |
| Budget | 2 |
| Campus Facilities, Safety and Security | 2 |
| Faculty..... | 3 |
| Research..... | 3 |
| Retirement and Fringe Benefits | 5 |
| Rules and Procedures..... | 6 |
| Student Affairs and Learning Resources | 6 |
| Reports of Liaison Representatives | |
| Student Publications Committee..... | 6 |
| Athletic Council..... | 7 |
| Emeriti Association..... | 7 |
| Staff Advisory Council | 7 |
| New Business | |
| Resolution on Alpha Gamma Rho | 8 |

Lawry moved acceptance of the September 10, 2002, Minutes. Moder seconded. The Minutes were approved. Moder moved acceptance of the October 8, 2002 Agenda. Lawry seconded the motion. The Agenda was approved.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Halligan and Vice Presidents

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 01-04-01-BUDG | <i>Market-Driven Salary Increase to Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:</i> 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 | <i>Parking Policy:</i> Pending review of survey results. Survey results from Bureau of Social Research (HES) will be presented to the Faculty |

- Council's Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security Committee later this fall. Geary Robinson will initiate.
- 01-05-05-RES ***Copyrightable Intellectual Property Policy:*** Pending review. Additional information provided by Legal Counsel is being reviewed. Joe Alexander to discuss with Faculty Council officers. 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:*** To Dr. Birdwell. President Halligan met with the Athletic Council regarding the Athletic Department's plan for deficit reduction and Athletic Council is studying this issue. Included as part of Dr. Birdwell's annual goals.
- 02-04-01-LRPIT ***Information Technology Policy:*** Pending FC and CIS discussions. Dr. Vitek is reviewing the proposed policy and has asked CIS representatives and others to provide input on the recommendation. Discussion with FC Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee is scheduled on Oct. 9, to be followed by discussions with CIS representatives.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

The Budget Committee met on September 23rd and discussed the implications of fee waivers on the budget. The Committee is currently waiting for data from the Office of Planning, Budget and Institutional Research, which it will use in order to determine whether any recommendations concerning waivers are appropriate. The Committee also discussed the issues surrounding the possible establishment of a campus of Northern Oklahoma College in Stillwater. The budgetary issues were discussed without any clear indication of whether the establishment of an NOC campus would be positive or negative for OSU. Scott will contact Joe Weaver in order to find out his views concerning the budget implications of this proposal.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY & SECURITY — Khaled Gasem

The CFSS Committee had an informative meeting with Mr. John Houck, Asst VP for Physical Plant, and his assistant Mr. Larry Lundholm on facility planning and implementation. Mr. Houck outlined some of the key elements of the decision-making process relating to facility planning at OSU. The indications are that (a) faculty participation in the facility planning process is not well structured; and (b) the process of facility planning, due to funding limitations, is mostly resource driven and not pursuant to a long-term program planning. A second meeting is planned for Wednesday, October 16, 2002 to give Mr. Houck an opportunity to share with the CFSS Committee a presentation on facility planning.

FACULTY — Susan Redwood

Dr. Vitek provided the committee with a summary of RPT actions for FY 2002. A total of 82 applications were reviewed on the Stillwater campus. There was disagreement along the review process in 3 cases, and these were forwarded to the Faculty Committee for review and recommendation. At the OKC and CHS campuses, 33 RPT actions occurred. Also, the committee is working with Natalea Watkins, Assistant Vice-President of Communication Services, on developing a video regarding the purpose and significance of Appendix D. The idea for this video came from the meeting last May between the Faculty Committee, Faculty Council officers, Dr. Halligan, and Dr. Keener. The goal of producing this video is to increase consistent use of Appendix D by disseminating it to Regents, administrators, and faculty.

RESEARCH — John Damicone

A special presentation by Carol Olson, Director of the Office of Research Compliance, was presented at the Sept. 30 meeting as follows: The office was created to facilitate research at OSU under the ever-increasing compliance regulations. The office has recently moved to 415 Whitehurst. The mission of the office is to comply with federal regulation and to avoid issues developing into litigation. The structure and staffing of the office was described in relation to the university committees for radiological safety, biosafety, institutional review board, animal care and use, and laser safety. Recent efforts in the area of biosafety have been increasingly time-consuming and office staff has been added. Recent legislation (Patriot Act, Bioterrorism Preparedness, Export Control) is intrusive an interpretation is difficult. The office's approach has been to inform faculty about regulations and to transfer responsibilities of compliance to them. Because fines and/or imprisonment back these new laws, the committee felt efforts were needed to increase the visibility of compliance issues and regulations. Olson indicated that the Office of Research Compliance web page contains pertinent information. Committee members agreed that the web page was effective, but it was difficult to find. The committee decided to facilitate web page access through PIO.

Old Business:

An update on the status of the Copyright Policy recommendation before Administration – The policy was approved by Faculty Council in early 2001 and a recommendation has been before administration since then. The recommendation was approved by the Dean's Council and OSU Administration, but has been under legal review for over six months. The tone of the returned review by OSU Legal Counsel was that of questioning the need for a new policy at OSU. The major modifications of the recommendation requested by Legal Counsel were to: exclude the OKC and Okmulgee campuses; exclude non-faculty staff; modify language surrounding copyright of University works; change the "non-centralized" approval through unit administrators to "centralized" one using deans and tech transfer office; and modify the proposed division of royalties so that the University would recoup all direct costs first. Joe Alexander held a meeting with authors of the proposed policy (Rick Bost, Jim Breazile, and Carol Olson) and Faculty Council Reps (Ed Lawry, John Damicone) to discuss the suggested modifications. The faculty response to the proposed legal review was that Legal Counsel was attempting to set policy rather than addressing specific legal questions contained in the recommendation. Revising the recommendation as suggested by Legal Counsel would in effect make the recommendation moot and return OSU to its current, restrictive policy unlike those of many peer institutions. Faculty pointed out that a more permissive policy would provide creative incentive

that would benefit the University as a whole. Therefore, Faculty Council awaits action by President Halligan on the proposed Copyright Policy recommendation.

New Business:

Research Professorship – The Vice President for Research has asked the Research Committee to revisit the creation of a Research Professorship track that would permit title and advancement to non-tenure-track faculty whose primary mission is research. Salaries of such faculty come from external grant support. Rational for creation of this faculty line would be to increase research productivity during times of dwindling state support. Previous discussions on this request in Faculty Council led to the creation of the Research Scientist position in the faculty handbook. After a brief discussion, the committee decided to further study the request and to ask Joe Alexander to compile data on numbers of such faculty and their impact on research productivity at peer institutions.

Research Infrastructure – Ulrich Melcher reported that he had compiled a list of service facilities that serve multiple academic units and presented a brief survey to gauge sources and levels of support, to identify existing barriers to effectively servicing clients, and provide suggestions for improving services. The committee was asked to review the survey and offer suggestion prior to its implementation.

Comments from Pres. Halligan: OSU, for those of you who are new to the Council, has a most interesting relationship with its legal service, different from the other six universities I have been associated with. We have a board office and it has legal counsel there. Legal Counsel works for the Board of Regents. The other institution I left, the lawyers worked for the President. As a result, we have a different relationship here. People that are new to the Council should at least understand that. They really provide counsel to all the A&M institutions and so that means Conners, Langston, NEO, etc. The closest would be the University of Missouri where they have a Board of Curators. They have branch campuses but my experience with the counsel there is that it was for the Univ. of MO. Everybody was considered part of the U. of MO. Here it is for all of these other institutions as well as Okla. State. And so that changes the perspective. If you ever attend a Board meeting you'll see that the Counsel sets apart from the various institutions that are making presentations and the Board, on occasion, will turn to Counsel and ask them whether or not they approve or have read and get their approval to the policy. And so it's a different dynamic than at other institutions I've been associated with. Thank you for allowing me to give you that little bit of insight that I have had with extent to that situation.

Murray – Is it difficult for you to get legal advice?

JEH – I've recommended to the Board that they change it. I have always thought it was just not the relationship I had been use to at the other institutions. In other words, when a lawyer came in it was clear he was on my team and worked for the university (us) and not there to get advice. I would have to say the responsiveness has been and is of concern.

Lawry – Yes, I think there have been a number of occasions in which Faculty Council officers and others on Faculty Council have worried about just what John had mentioned before, namely the possibility that the Counsel for the Regents was asserting himself into the process of trying to

fix the policy because it would probably be in the best interests of the university in the way that he understood it from a Regents point of view and that always seemed to be difficult for the faculty because the faculty had to think, well the administration and the faculty make the policies as it were and the Legal Counsel just sort of checks it to make sure it's not illegal or warns people about this, that and the other. It doesn't necessarily say this is what I think you ought to do. I will say, however, in defense of Legal Counsel, they are very responsive to anybody who calls and asks for legal advice.

JEH – It's a structural issue rather than a legal issue.

Binegar – When you say a “structural issue” do you mean this is just the way the by-laws are written for the role of Legal Counsel or this is just the way it's worked out between the Regents and Legal Counsel?

JEH – It's the way it was when I arrived and it's been that way for a long time and I've pointed out to the Regents that it's different from any of the other institutions I have been associated with.

Earl Mitchell – Historically, OSU did have a legal counsel that worked for the president and the university when Moses Fry was here and the Regents changed that to have their own counsel because Moses Fry worked for the president and the university in Whitehurst. We did have a structure like that once.

Lawry – And when he left they didn't replace him?

Mitchell – Right.

Lawry – One more thing – most of you know that on Nov. 19 our General Faculty Meeting primarily has to do with the legal liabilities of faculty and the legal support that the university gives to faculty members to protect them against suits and various sorts of things like that. My suspicion is that at that meeting if additional questions, that might go a little bit further than the bounds we've narrowly defined the topic for, were asked, that they would be responded to. So, if you have questions about the legal situation with regard to faculty and the University that might be a good time to bring them to the table.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Sally Henderson

They are meeting and functioning. Their major emphasis has been on the fringe benefits aspect because the retirement aspect is taking on a life of its own. The fringe benefits aspect that they are pursuing most is adding other health benefit options to the current list of options. The most promising at this time seems to be the plan that OU has, called Schaller Anderson, which is a self-insured plan and they have offered OSU the opportunity to check into the possibility of joining with them in that plan. Obviously, there are other options out there and the committee is investigating those as well. The other flex benefits fringe benefit options Henderson feels, and she believes the committee feels, are as the health benefits important for all employees at OSU and they would like to have a joint meeting with Staff Advisory Council as well as the university-wide committees and try not to reinvent the wheel on those.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Brad Bays

There is an intention to amend the by-laws so that the process of getting student representation on committees can be streamlined. In the past there has been a process where the student government associations have provided two possibilities to the President's Office, the President then approves of one of those and then it comes back for approval from the nominating committee. At the advice of the officers, and in the interest of maintaining control of the membership on Faculty Council, the committee will intend to fix those by-laws so they can receive one name from the student government associations some time in September and then those will be reviewed by the nominating committee and hopefully approved. Since the problem in the process is essentially getting names from the student associations, if they fail to provide names by Sept. 15 then the individual committee chairs will be allowed to appoint students themselves with the approval of the student government associations and through the Council officers. The other point was a request by an officer to rename the committees from "Rules and Procedures" to "Rules", for examples, in order, he assumed, to work better for the website that is being considered now.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Pat Lamphere-Jordan

The SALR Committee held its first meeting of the year on September 16, 2002. Dr. Carolyn Warmann, Director of Access Services, met with the committee to discuss procedures for placing materials on reserve in the library. She informed the committee that the process takes about four days from the time of request until the materials are available for student access. The more responsibility placed on the library resources for collecting materials, the longer it will take before materials are avail for students. The committee also discussed future items of concern they might address at upcoming meetings. They would like to invite Dr. Bird and Dr. Mitchell to share with them how they can help in issues of student disturbances and disrespect and insensitivity issues that have occurred since the start of school. Their next meeting will be October 14, 9 a.m., 243 Willard Hall.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:**Student Publications — Suzanne Holcombe**

Suzanne Holcombe has replaced Bill Weeks as the ex officio member for Faculty Council on this Board. **New Business** – members discussed including greater coverage in the Daily O'Collegian (OC) as to elections and voting in Oklahoma. April Marciszewski, OC editor-in-chief, said that there has been some coverage including the primary election that took place this August, but that they would attempt to provide more information for the November election. Members also discussed the issue of what should be reported as front-page news. Comment was made regarding the August 30, 2002 edition that featured OSU women who appeared in Playboy magazine. The OC staff decided that this issue affected enough people that it merited front-page coverage. There are no guidelines as to what appears on the front page; the OC Editorial Board makes this decision. Comment was also made that facts regarding the recent sports brawls were inaccurate. The stories read that certain people were involved who were actually not involved. So this concerns the issue of quality and accuracy. The misrepresentation of facts, however, is unfortunately commonplace in reporting. **Old Business** – The Board will tour the O'Collegian facilities next month. **Reports** – The Board will be selecting a spring editor. Fritz Wirt,

Business Manager reported that lineage (31%) and ads have dropped during September. July and August were fine. This reflects that of the national trend (economy is slow so businesses, etc. less able to place ads). The OC on the Web is in better shape. Fall is usually a strong season with advertisements due to the football season (and there are seven home games this year). Printing costs do not vary that much from year to year. Photos (including color photos) do not require additional costs. All photos are now digital. Responding to a question regarding print vs. Web usage, Wirt reported that according to the National News Association survey, students still prefer the printed version of the paper although Web usage is up. Two machines now support Web usage, one is devoted to the archives which is very popular. The OC Web site can now support up to 160 simultaneous users, 80 on each machine. Marciszewski, OC editor-in-chief, reported that while some writers are slowing down, others are moving strongly forward. The photography department is weak this year. She asked the Board if it thought intramural sports were worthy of news coverage. There was a mixed response. The next meetings will be at 2:30, October 18 and November 15.

Athletic Council — Carol Moder

The Athletic Council met on September 19. The item of business most relevant to faculty members was the attendance policy for athletes. The Council continues to approve team schedules that are in violation of the university policy, which does not allow student-athletes to miss more than 10 days of class in a given semester for team-sponsored events. The Academic Integrity Committee of the Athletic Council will be examining this in order to try to develop a policy that will be effective and will not be regularly violated. Faculty who wish to express opinions about the policy may contact Carol Moder, Chuck Edgley, or Marcia Tilley.

Emeriti Association — Larry Jones

Two members of the Emeriti Association will be inducted into the Oklahoma Higher Education Hall of Fame on Oct. 8 in Oklahoma City. The two are Dr. Esther Winterfeldt, former department head in Nutritional Sciences and Dr. Leroy Fischer, former professor in History. Three vacancies for Emeriti representatives on Standing Committees have been filled for three-year appointments. The three committees and the Emeriti representatives are: University-wide Flexible Compensation Benefits: A. B. Harrison; FC Budget: Robert Radford; and FC Retirement and Fringe Benefits: Jan Carlson. The 2002-2003 Emeriti Directory has been mailed to all emeriti members. The October General Membership meeting is Oct. 9 and will be held in the new City Commissioners room after a tour of the new Police Department and 911 Center. The fifteenth anniversary of the OSU Emeriti Association will be celebrated in November.

Staff Advisory Council — Dawn Good

The deadline for the SAC, Distinguished Service Awards nominations was October 3rd. The selection committee will be reviewing those applications for awards to be presented on November 7th at 10:00 a.m. in the Student Union Little Theater. SAC encourages faculty to be supportive of the Staff Awards Day. INFORMATION: They are changing the fall luncheon to just an awards ceremony with punch and cookies. This is to put more focus on Staff Awards. There are plans underway for the luncheon to be held outside in the Spring. There will be more information on this event as details are finalized. The past couple of years FC members have served staff during the luncheon and faculty participation is appreciated. Depending on the Spring event the Council may contact you for support in the same manner. SAC will have a

Mum Sale during homecoming in order to raise money for the SAC scholarship fund. Deadline date for orders is October 29 and flyers will be sent out for orders. The Council will be voting at their October 9th meeting on whether or not to participate in Homecoming by creating a Tailgate Package. If the Council does decide to participate this will be another opportunity for the Council to raise money for the SAC scholarship. The PB&B committee is reviewing the Long-Term Disability policy with assistance from Human Resources. Feedback continues to be received from staff thanking SAC for posting the updates on the Retirement Lawsuit to their listserv. SAC appreciates Faculty Council keeping staff in the loop of information.

NEW BUSINESS:

Resolution on Alpha Gamma Rho

Ed Lawry reported that at the last Executive Committee Meeting the recent events on campus were discussed and the committee agreed unanimously to put forward the following resolution and he made a motion that the Council adopt it. The resolution reads: *“The Faculty wishes to communicate its strongest condemnation of the behavior of members of the Alpha Gamma Rho fraternity for its insensitive racist expressions. This behavior hurt many individual members of the campus community and embarrassed the entire institution. We urge AGR to amend its ways by initiating positive steps to promote racial harmony and endorse the goals of diversity throughout the campus.”* Lawry made the motion and Moder seconded. Pres. Halligan ask if there was any discussion. Lawry added one point. He was in communication with Dr. Bird about this matter and asked her what should be done with this resolution if it did pass other than merely “passing” it and she suggested that it be sent to the fraternity’s national office and to the Interfraternity Council. Murray and Peeper thought that the entire fraternity should not be condemned for the actions of just a few members. Lawry stated that the behavior of the members should be condemned and in the third sentence suggests that AGR amend its way by initiating positive steps. There is perhaps a slight suggestion that there is a certain kind of climate that made a lot of this to happen. He thinks perhaps AGR has, in a sense, taken responsibility for those members to a certain extent and so he thinks it’s in keeping with what they have already admitted to. Peeper asked if we are aware that this climate actually exists or is this just an isolated incident. Weiser was inclined to condemn the three members and agreed that the entire fraternity was not at fault. He thought the three or four members in the pictures were responsible. Wetzel thought the whole fraternity was guilty. They condoned it and didn’t do anything. It just so happened that three of them did something that was foolish and the rest of them didn’t react. According to the pictures some of them are smiling in the background. What is that? They’re as guilty as the ones that were dressed up. Weiser said, “then condemn those that are smiling in the background. What about the members that weren’t even in the house?” He agreed that it was a bad, stupid thing, but maybe OSU should be condemned because they are all students here. How wide do you cast the net? Wetzel – If you join an organization that’s the price you pay. Peeper – They’ve all joined this organization at OSU. Do we condemn ourselves for the actions of these students? Wetzel – I admit that I’m a faculty member, so if faculty are condemned, I’m a member of faculty and I’m a member of a fraternity also and that fraternity and I take responsibility for that also. Lawry – I think that the feeling is among most of the people, and it was certainly was true among the Executive Committee when we devised this resolution, that there are, of course, degrees of responsibility for various sorts of things and clearly the three members who were involved in this deserve the most reprimand for it, but I

think even the national office of AGR is very likely to take some action against the fraternity on the grounds that, “look, if your members are doing various kinds of things you have to take a certain amount of responsibility for it.” It may not be the same kind of responsibility, but some responsibility has to be there. Certainly, personally from my point of view, I think that when these kinds of things occur they are embarrassing for the whole institution as they certainly were and it gives everyone a suspicion that there is just something in the structure of the community itself, if you will, that isn’t quite right yet and has to be adjusted. Weiser asked Lawry to read the resolution again which he did. Peeper stated that he represented the Biological Sciences faculty, Group I, and he asked them in their meeting last week when he heard this resolution about AGR would be presented and ask them what their opinions were and what kind of response did they want him to present to the Council. He summed up their comments by saying that they thought enough has been said and enough has been done and AGR has a big enough “black eye” without being condemned by the Faculty Council. To him, he’s reminded about what Pres. Halligan said about the O’Colly one time. He said that every edition of the O’Colly is like a lab experiment in Chemistry – sometimes they work and sometimes they don’t. Peeper thinks fraternities and sororities are social experiences; sometimes the experiments work and sometimes they don’t. When they fail he doesn’t think we should just jump up and condemn them anymore than we’ve already pointed out, quite strongly, the error of their ways. There is a point where, if you continue to condemn, you’re just going to build more resentment than you are cooperation and he thought from what he’d read in the papers they’ve already taken steps to mend their ways and it should end with that. Lavery – two points, one, as far as condemning individuals rather than groups and comparing the fraternity to OSU, a fraternity is built on collective communal action. There’s a very heavy communal atmosphere. We do things together as a fraternity. We help each other and so I see no problem in condemning the actions of the fraternity as opposed to coming to a university where people come in as individuals, and yes, there is a community, but basically people come in as individuals and leave as individuals. The other point in terms of condemning this is that I think faculty should make a statement. We haven’t made a statement. The administration has and various student groups have, but I think that a statement from the Faculty Council would assuage a lot of the concern. I think all of us probably received e-mails from all over the country as to what’s going on here. I mean, it’s on national television and so I think a statement as strong as possible is absolutely necessary. Moder – I think we also have to consider whether we’re willing to offer a gesture of support to the individuals who have been hurt, offended and disenfranchised by the actions of the members of this fraternity. I think by taking this action the Faculty Council is saying, “We support diversity on this campus – we do not consider it acceptable for whatever reason, to take actions that single out certain members of our community.” Weiser – I think it would be great to have a resolution that says that. That is directed to them that indicates that we support the diversity and whatever you are doing to fix it. I don’t have the words because I haven’t spent the time that you have spent on it, but I’m on the fence. I see both sides of this issue. Lawry – my way of hearing what Carol had to say is that she thinks this resolution does what she said it did. Moder – that’s correct. Weiser – well, it does that but it does both things. It condemns the individuals and expresses our...it does the whole thing. Damicone – I have a question, did the fraternity put these pictures up on their website? Lawry – my understanding is, and correct me if I’m wrong, there’s a service that comes around and takes pictures at these parties. Mitchell – Yes, Genesis which is a private group called Party Pics and that’s a business, and they take pictures and put them on the web so students can download them and pick the ones they want to purchase. Bays

– Does this fraternity have open membership or is there a selection going on with the membership? Does the fraternity select their members? Mitchell – Yes. Bays – so why aren't they all essentially grouped as a fraternity, as a communal organization? Why should we single out membership if the membership itself is determined by the fraternity? Murray – If spontaneously one, two, three or four members do something that the entire body of the fraternity is against but it happens rather spontaneously, you're going to hold all those other people accountable? Bays – Accountability is one aspect of fraternity. Murray – This was supposed to be a "come as you are" party. I don't know that the entire fraternity did or did not know what these individuals were doing. These individuals did a very bad thing but I don't believe the entire fraternity did. That's grouping a whole group of people together. Bays – that have volunteered to be responsible for one another. And, because they volunteered to be responsible for one another in this communal environment, they should not condone behavior that they disagree with it in a public setting with photographs. Peeper – Has the entire fraternity said that they condone this action? Bear – my understanding is that how this even got to be public knowledge was accidental. That if no one had noticed these pictures on the website and raised a human cry, this fraternity would not have done anything to make sure this did not occur again and that bothers me. The OSU/Tulsa faculty, in our discussion, is very much in favor of the faculty taking a stance on this. Redwood – I feel if one of us here today made a racist remark or statement or that made an action that was racist in nature, that it would be all of our responsibilities to stop that immediately and not accept it and if we didn't that we all should be held accountable for accepting that kind of behavior. I think about our child abuse statues. It doesn't say, "one person" must make a report of child abuse. Any citizen of Oklahoma who views that or has knowledge or suspicion is obligated to report. I think that both of those scenarios come to mind about this issue. This took place at a fraternity party and other people were present and no one did anything about it. That's wrong in my opinion. Arquitt – not only that but it seems to me that the atmosphere at the fraternity previous to this did not convey the idea that this was unacceptable. If that had been conveyed previously they wouldn't have worn those costumes. Binigar – what still bothers me on this issue is that there was another embarrassing incident at the university that occurred just a couple of weeks ago in which there was punishment regarding athletics where the actions of a large number of athletes, but certainly not all the athletes was handed out. I think, in general, when something is so outrageous, and, in fact, this resolution is not so strong, there's no absolute punishment. It's just the way that the Faculty Council thinks. I don't think a strong resolution is bad in this case even if it's a little bit misguided to some of the wrong people. It is a strong statement and it at least establishes how Faculty Council feels about this issue. Wetzel called the question. Halligan asked all those in favor of the resolution as presented to signify by saying "aye." The resolution passed with three abstentions.

The next issue on the Agenda was the NOC resolution. Lawry said that one was going to be presented but felt it might be in order to withdraw it because of actions by the administration which has made the resolution "moot." The President might like to make a statement about it. Halligan said Interim Executive Vice President, Jack Vitek, has been requested to form a committee composed of deans and faculty members to investigate the academic advantages and drawbacks of a proposed relationship with Northern Oklahoma College. Although the discussions concerning business and administrative details of such a relationship will be held in abeyance until this committee renders a report. The President made a few other comments

regarding this issue. He has enjoyed being President of OSU but he looks forward to the Search Committee doing their work quickly and efficiently. No one can predict the future but we can make informed guesses. Some of his guesses are: 1) in his judgment, OSU needs to increase the test scores of its freshman class to be comparable to the other institutions. They have different admission standards than we have and they have for some time. In his judgment they are having an impact on this institution and he would not be honest with you if he didn't tell you that. He had them there but he didn't go through them but, he thought everyone knew, that in essence we have a 22 ACT, they have a 24; top 30 percent for Oklahoma residents, we're top 33. Non-residents, they're top 25, we're top 50, etc. There are significance differences in admission standards and he feels they should be addressed. If you try to do that we have individuals who deeply love this university. This is their place. Their grandparents, etc., went here and they want to go to Oklahoma State and have access to Oklahoma State. If you raise those admission standards which I have shared with the Board for a number of years, he feels some action should be taken and you don't provide an alternative access route he doesn't feel you would be true to your Land-Grant mission. He's a "land-grant guy" and has been for a long time and he explained that was when Justin Morrill and Abraham Lincoln signed the law that said provide a liberal and practical education of sons and daughters for the industrial class. He feels this is one of the most profound pieces of legislation ever passed in the United States and so for us to remain true to that is important and he was trying to formulate a solution so we could be true to that. There is, in his judgment, a serious probability, not a possibility, that we will be forced to stop teaching remedial education. If you read the Tulsa World on Thursday, Oct. 3, you noticed that one of the candidates for Governor, Steve Largent, said the states two comprehensive universities shouldn't offer remedial courses. He said the state could save 25 million dollars by eliminating those programs for students who need help in these areas. In the other state that he was associated with, the legislature simply passed a law that said the two comprehensive universities could not teach remedial courses and receive any pay. The Board of Regents, at that institution, said this was trampling on their constitutional authority, but they stopped teaching remedial courses. In his judgment we're heading that way. Just to give you some data, 715 out of approximately 3100 of OSU's freshman were strongly advised and recommended to remediate in one or more areas. The State Regents have drawn up maps of the State by regions of influence. OSU is in North Oklahoma College's area of influence. Payne County is part of that. So, if there are going to be remedial courses or access to another vehicle provided, they would be the logical one as determined by the State Regents' policy. Halligan thinks that any committee that looks at this issue needs to think about that a month from now Oklahoma will know who the new Governor is. He also thinks more will be known about the State budget than is known right now as to how much money will be available for next year. He asked Joe Weaver if the September figures had been received and Joe indicated they had not. From Halligan's perspective alternatives need to be looked at as an institution and that's what they're trying to do. A large number of people have been kind enough to share with him their views, some in favorable formats and some in unfavorable formats. If you're being President you're supposed to be saying what you think should be done. That's what he's trying to do. He could have been silent. He concluded by asking, "May I make a gratuitous remark?" He stated, "When I arrived at OSU enrollment had been down 12 years in a row. Twelve years in a row it went down every year. It's gone up every year I've been here. In my judgment, if you don't take action it will have a very significant impact on this institution. You may not like it but it's going to have a significant impact." He thanked all present for listening to his statement. He said these issues

have been well thought out on his part. This is a Class I issue – whether you’re going to have the same admission standards or comparable. What are you going to do with the people you deny? What are you going to do about remedial courses?

Khaled Gasem had two resolutions for Council to consider for passage.

Resolution 1

The Faculty Council commends President James Halligan and the OSU Administration (a) for initiating the healing process in our campus in the aftermath of the Alpha Gamma Rho racial incident, and (b) for their efforts to enrich diversity education at OSU.

Lawry asked if a friendly amendment could be added after “and the OSU Administration” to read, “(in particular Dr. Earl Mitchell and Dr. Lee Bird).” Motion was moved and seconded. Resolution passed unanimously.

President Halligan added that he had talked to Sam Combs who is the President of the Black Alumni Association at OSU – a great guy. What the problem is as Halligan sees it is that every now and then we have “knuckleheads” and what we need to do is to get this transmitted from generation to generation to generation. We have a group of students now who are undoubtedly unsensitized to this issue and will carry it with them for the rest of their lives. But the problem we have is that four years from now we’re going to have a whole new crop of students, or six, or eight years from now and unfortunately about every ten years we’ve had an unfortunate incident. So, I said who is continuous in this process – the Alumni. So, I have asked the AGR Alumni if they would invite a black Alumni of OSU and see if we could get the alumni associations committed to transmitting this information from generation to generation because there are guys like John Copeland and so on that are going to be in the AGR house for the next fifteen years or so and he can say that anything like this is dumb. This is a new way we are trying to attack this.

Resolution 1 (as amended)

The Faculty Council commends President James Halligan and the OSU Administration (in particular Dr. Earl Mitchell and Dr. Lee Bird), (a) for initiating the healing process in our campus in the aftermath of the Alpha Gamma Rho racial incident, and (b) for their efforts to enrich diversity education at OSU.

Gasem moved acceptance of the motion. Damicone seconded. **Motion passed as Amended.**

Resolution 2

The Faculty Council recommends that a workshop should be conducted at the beginning of each academic year to train student leaders (from student government, athletics, fraternity houses, and residential halls) on issues of diversity and community relations.

Gasem – This is just to have a corporate memory because the turnover in our student government is, like you said, very short and we need to expose them to case studies of success and case

studies of failure and that could happen during orientation week. As a new faculty member I remember we had an orientation on sexual harassment, and on this and that, and the reason being is that we wanted to sensitize the individual to campus expectations to conflict or otherwise and I think we need to keep that corporate memory somehow and I figured the faculty could obtain a very good role in that as well and the alumni as well.

Gasem moved acceptance of the motion and Damicone seconded. Halligan asked for discussion. Lawry thought the Council should vote against this motion for the following reason. He liked the idea and thought it's a good idea; however, he had talked to Dr. Earl Mitchell and suggested the Faculty Council should appoint an Ad Hoc Committee to investigate the questions of what the university might do to promote an atmosphere of tolerance and respect on a permanent basis. If a committee got together and tried to investigate what could be done and what shouldn't be done this would be a very good idea, perhaps as a recommendation, and it should be discussed in that committee first before it comes to Council for a vote. He suggested the motion should be defeated and wait for that kind of response from an Ad Hoc Committee. **Original motion did not pass.**

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is November 12, 2002.

Brenda Masters, Secretary