

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES  
250 Student Union  
November 12, 2002

Ed Lawry called the meeting to order with the following members present: Achemire, Arquitt, Bays, Bear, Bilbeisi, Binegar, Comer, Ebro, Gasem, Gelfand, Greiner, Henderson, Holcombe, Lamphere-Jordan, Lavery, Masters, Moder, Mokhtari, Morgan, Mott, Murray, Peeper, Redwood, Van Delinder, Veenstra, Weiser, Wetzel. Also present: H. Bergbower, M. Cich, M. Henderson, W. Ivy, L. Jones, V. Mitchell, J. Wallin, N. Watkins, J. Weaver, J. Wheat. Absent: Damicone and Lehenbauer

**HIGHLIGHTS**

---

Annual Report from the Faculty General Education Assessment Task Force.....	1
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	7
Reports of Standing Committees	
Athletics .....	8
Budget .....	8
Campus Facilities, Safety and Security .....	9
Faculty.....	9
Student Affairs and Learning Resources .....	10
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Athletic Council.....	10
Staff Advisory Council .....	11
Student Government Association .....	11
Women’s Faculty Council .....	12
Old Business	
NOC Update.....	12
New Business	
Fall General Faculty Meeting .....	14
New Chancellor for State Regents.....	14
Student Services Organizations .....	15
Minutes on Website .....	15
Reception for President Halligan.....	15

---

Gasem moved acceptance of the October 8, 2002, Minutes. Henderson seconded. Masters amended the Minutes with minor deletions of the word “and.” The Minutes were approved as amended. The November 12, 2002 Agenda was approved and seconded.

**SPECIAL REPORT: Annual Report from the Faculty General Education Assessment Task Force – Julie Wallin and Brenda Masters**

Julie Wallin began the presentation by thanking Faculty Council for the opportunity to provide a special report to Faculty Council on Assessment. Copies of the report for 2002 from the General Education Assessment Task Force were distributed to the audience. Wallin described that for the

past three summers a faculty group has worked on assessment of General Education at OSU. This process is in preparation for the reaccreditation visit of the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) of the North Central Association (NCA). A major portion of the reaccreditation process focuses on assessment. This would include assessment of program outcomes that would be accomplished in the academic units and assessment of general education at the University. Assessment of general education involves assessing or evaluating the goals of the general education program. First, the process requires that the general education program has goals for student learning outcomes and secondly that those goals are assessable. Assessment measures if the goals of the program are being met by the students. The task group on general education assessment was first formed three years ago. The process began with assessable general education goals being identified. The work of the task group entails implementing the assessment of these goals and distributing information that results from such an assessment.

Brenda Masters continued the presentation by describing that the task force was comprised of faculty members from a variety of academic units and colleges. The membership is rotational with two members rotating off each year and two new faculty members joining the group. Two original task force members will rotate off prior to summer 2003, so additional faculty members will be sought to replenish the task force. The membership and the leadership of the group are faculty based. The University has chosen to have the general education assessment process be faculty based, not to evaluate individual faculty, but to assess general learning outcomes. The task force work began with rewriting the general education criteria so that the criteria were not based on what should be taught, but rather what is learned, so that the criteria is more directly assessable. Special attention was paid to the fact that the criteria should be as assessable as possible. The assessment process that was put into place utilizes what is referred to as an Institutional Portfolio. An institutional portfolio consists of examples of student work from across the institution. The student works are randomly chosen in various courses where general education skills would be utilized. The student works are evaluated or assessed by the faculty task force to indicate the level of general education skills that the student presents. The tool used as a guide for assessing the student work is referred to in the assessment field as a "rubric." This is an evaluation matrix where aspects of the work are listed and then descriptions are written to indicate what score would be assigned to the various aspects of the work. Through discussions the task force developed an understanding of the levels of work required for various scores on the aspects of work listed in the rubric. The first rubric the task force developed was to assess the writing artifacts. An assumption was made by the task force that all students and all faculty regardless of major area required good writing skills. Therefore, faculty from many areas were used to develop the writing rubric and to actually perform the assessment of the writing artifacts. Masters indicated that the benefit of having the rubric for the assessment was the understanding that developed during the faculty discussions about what the different scores represented about the quality of the work. During the assessment of the artifacts the rubric is referred to only periodically, such as how an equation sheet might be used during a test by a well-prepared student. The development of the rubric was the activity that caused the faculty assessment group to discuss the characteristics of strong, medium and weak writing. Rarely during assessment of the artifacts did the faculty members actually look up on the rubric what defined a "2" or "3" score. Masters indicated that she had been skeptical at the first of the process about the consistency of scores that would occur from three faculty members from very different fields assessing writing artifacts individually with a prepared rubric. The assessment scores that result

from this process, however, have been quite consistent. It is essential that the faculty group participate in preliminary discussion about the scores for the formation of the rubric, but once the rubric was developed the resulting scores are surprisingly consistent. During the first summer about 100 writing artifacts were assessed as a beginning point in the general education assessment. Last summer we began to assess mathematics artifacts. The first approach to assessing the general education math skills was the same as the approach for writing, sample from higher division courses that use mathematics and assess whether the student indicated credible general education math skills. Masters indicated that she had thought that assessing general education math skills in upper division statistics courses would be a viable assessment technique. It soon became apparent to the faculty assessing the mathematics skills that students who enrolled in higher level mathematics, engineering or statistics courses did exhibit general education math skills or they would not have been enrolled in such courses. The faculty members working on the assessment of math artifacts very soon found that if the problems were similar with only rote math skills shown, then those artifacts did not indicate clearly if the student knew the math involved or could simply repeat the same steps over and over. The assessors were only able to ascertain if the student had learned the process, not if the student had full grasp of the mathematics involved. The faculty assessing math artifacts began to seek a specific type of problem on exams in basic math classes. Exams in lower division mathematics courses were searched for problems where the student would need to provide a full and complete mathematical idea. For example, the rubric was used to assess a question from an elementary calculus course that asked the students to calculate the first derivative of a simple function, explain in a sentence what the first derivative indicated about the function and to describe what the first derivative indicated in terms of that specific word question. The faculty members on the math assessment subgroup recognized that specific questions were needed where the student performs the mathematics manipulation and also explains the mathematics involved. If the student could provide an explanation the assessors would be more confident that the student was performing the mathematics at more than a “plug and chug” level.

A rubric to assess science artifacts was also developed last summer and during this academic year science artifacts will be collected for assessment with that rubric. Some of you or your colleagues may wish to volunteer student work from science tests or extensive lab work that contains the type of multi-stepped questions used for math assessment where the student performs the technical steps of the problem but then is also asked to explain the process. It is important to note that the artifacts being collected from across campus are not invasive to the student in any manner. The identities of the students involved are kept absolutely confidential. Faculty participation to offer student work has been completely voluntary in the assessment process.

Wallin proceeded by discussing some of the preliminary results from the past two years of assessment data. She referred to the General Education Assessment report which is available on the Assessment website at the Academic Affairs page of the OSU home page ([www.okstate.edu](http://www.okstate.edu)). The institutional portfolio has been selected as the primary way to assess general education outcomes. There is a separate portfolio for each general education skill area. The faculty group has developed rubrics for assessing writing, mathematics and science. Each year as artifacts are assessed, information is added to our institutional portfolio and the dataset becomes a more reasonable size for drawing conclusions from it. In the Annual General Education Assessment

Report the scores for each reviewer are listed. The consistency between assessors for individual artifacts can be noted. Also noteworthy is the symmetry of the set of consensus scores from the faculty assessor group. The writing artifacts for which there are two years of data resulted in 45% of students assessed receiving a 3 on a scale of 1 to 5, with very similar numbers of 1's and 5's and also similar numbers of 2's and 4's. When the data are considered for various classes there is a slight trend for freshman to score lower than seniors. Overall, about 70% of seniors score a 3 or higher on the writing assessment and 55% of freshman receive a score of 3 or higher. The demographic profile of seniors who scored 1 or 2 on writing indicated that those students were international students. Using the SIS admit type the assessment scores were analyzed for the various admit groups. If you consider only "native students," those are students who began at OSU as freshmen just out of high school, then 85% of those seniors score a 3 or higher on writing and 60% of freshman in that category score a 3 or higher. At the end of the summer when NOC was becoming an issue the question about performance of transfer students versus native students became more important. Native students who start at OSU as freshman do have in general higher writing scores than transfer students. The sample size associated with math artifacts is so small that no conclusions have been drawn from the data.

Lawry asked a question about native students versus transfer students concerning whether or not international students were removed from the set of transfer students prior to the two groups being compared. Wallin indicated that international students were excluded from the set of transfer students who were compared to native students. An additional question was asked about what year in college the transfer students were. Wallin stated that a detailed analysis has not been performed for the individual classes in the two groups due to small sample sizes, but that kind of comparison indicates the type of questions that can be addressed with the assessment artifact data. The table of comparisons of various groups of students shows where the analysis can go by using the data from the assessment of institutional artifact data.

Binegar pointed out that although the data indicates that the senior students perform better on the writing artifacts there is no accounting for the students who drop out prior to reaching the senior level. He added that since the writing scores only improve slightly for higher classifications perhaps if the dropout factor was considered there may actually be no improvement indicated between freshman and senior scores. Masters added that Binegar was pointing out what should be a concern of all faculty members at Oklahoma State that students only show slight improvement in writing skills while they are here, not dramatic improvement in writing skills. She continued by pointing out that this is one of the first concerns that has been raised from the assessment of writing artifacts. In light of that, the General Education Advisory Council (GEAC) has begun to consider strengthening the writing requirement for "H" or humanities general education courses. The criteria for the writing component for the general education humanities classes has been quite light in the sense that the criteria were written in such a way that one essay question on an exam was adequate for the writing requirement for an "H" or humanities general education course. The membership of GEAC thinks that if students are to be expected to improve their writing then they need the opportunity of editorial exercise where they hand in their writing, it is evaluated, and they rewrite the work. As we all know from our own writing experiences there are usually several rewrites before a final document is generated. GEAC thinks that our students should become more acquainted with that process. The group will attempt to require evaluated, edited writing experiences for the writing requirement on the

“H” area designation. This is not the type of change that can occur quickly in the “H” coursework but over a period of years the writing criteria can be strengthened. This is one of the first assessment observations that has resulted in proposed change to improve the instruction of students at OSU. The point of assessment is to identify what improvements are needed and to incorporate change to address those areas. The assessment work is for naught unless change for improvement occurs as a result.

Henderson added to the discussion by saying that scores for transfer students did not differ that much from scores of native students and she was concerned that such small differences may be discussed out of context. She indicated that generalities should be avoided since currently the data were not analyzed according to how long the transfer student had been at OSU. Henderson continued by saying that performance of transfer students was affected by lack of familiarity of surroundings and that differences in scores may not represent true differences of skills.

Wallin indicated that she was not interested in making broad generalizations but was pointing out how the assessment data might eventually be used to address critical questions at the University. The objective of the faculty general education task group is to assess the writing skills of OSU students. When students graduate from OSU what is the writing skill level in general? This is an effort to look across the institution, not at specific disciplines, and to have faculty from across the University assess the skill levels for the various general education area designations. The use of these data provides the next step in the assessment process. The information is being dispersed so that groups like Faculty Council and GEAC can consider how to generate instructional improvement based on the assessment results. It is important that the assessment results be shared with faculty so that they are aware of this type of information and that the faculty as a whole be informed about this process. The institutional portfolio is not the only method of assessment of general education assessment. In the past OSU has used indirect assessment measures from student surveys. One of the more interesting is the National Survey of Student Engagement which shows data collected in 2002 and in 2001 indicate that OSU seniors write significantly fewer papers than seniors at peer institutions.

Lawry asked if an adequate number of peer institutions had this type of assessment activity going on so that comparisons could be made between institutions. Wallin indicated that this is not a standardized process across institutions. Lawry indicated that he knew that, but he wondered if there was enough activity in institutions with assessment processes in place that results from various institutions could be compared. Wallin stated the NCA accreditation visit will be heavy on assessment. NCA is moving toward more assessment of general education programs. The Higher Learning Commission wants to see an institution that focuses on their own general education program and assesses whether the students are achieving the learning goals of the general education program. An important part of assessment is the resulting faculty discussion about student learner goals. How can student writing be improved? What processes can result in better writing? These are important questions for faculty discussion.

Masters interjected that it is not common for our peer institutions to already have an assessment process in place that utilizes items like an institutional portfolio. The more complex assessment techniques have been more common at high quality community colleges where they are very concerned about assessing student learning at the undergraduate level. Oklahoma State is out

front on the assessment issue relative to peer institutions. We should feel good that we will have the information to address such questions as how does the performance of transfer students improve over their years at OSU. Moder asked if there were any plans to follow specific students over their years at OSU so that individual student progress can be more accurately measured. Masters answered that no process was in place to sample the same student's artifacts year after year. Although that type of data would be ideal to measure progress, the current assessment system does not incorporate tracking of individual students. Masters continued by saying that analysis of the coursework taken by students in the assessment database might indicate that students who took certain courses were more likely to have strong writing scores while students who took other courses might have a higher probability for low writing scores. In this manner characteristics of courses that produce higher writing scores may be able to be recognized. A technique to sample the same students year after year is not in place since at this time faculty participation is voluntary and the process is blind to the student participants. Wallin indicated that from the very first of the general education assessment process that the faculty task group has been very concerned about protecting student anonymity. Currently the samples of student work are collected and rendered anonymous. The artifact is assigned a number and the student name and id are stripped off the work. The faculty assessing the artifacts do not know who the student is or if the student is a senior or freshman, nor do they know any other demographic data about the student. Moder pointed out that the artifacts could be anonymous, while the student information could be tracked through the Assessment Office. Wallin indicated that for other institutions that have attempted such a process that typically the resulting sample size is often too small. The student has to be informed of the tracking and agree to be involved when they are freshman. By the time those students are seniors many are no longer at the institution, so the initial sample size must be very large at the beginning to ensure that an adequate number of observations are still available after several years. The institutional portfolio in use at OSU allows tracking of more information at once. Individual progress cannot be measured, but the general progress of students across the institution can be tracked. Masters added that the demographic variables can be used to track not an individual student's progress but groups of students with specific characteristics. When the dataset is adequately large the institution will be able to address questions such as how the students from a specific transfer institution perform over their years at OSU. For example, composite ACT scores are more correlated to scores on writing artifacts than are other demographic variables. With a larger dataset, variables such as composite ACT scores can be investigated to determine their predictive value for artifact scores. Peeper asked an additional question about how the data were recorded. If a student is recorded as a freshman has he/she completed the freshman year or just beginning? Wallin replied that the artifacts are collected during the spring semester each year so that the freshman would have typically completed one semester. The classification variable is what is listed in the SIS system for the student. Once the dataset is larger the students with fewer than 15 hours, for example, could be analyzed separately to indicate the skills that a student arrives at the University with. Peeper pointed out that collection of artifacts during the spring semester eliminated the chance for fall freshman who do not return for the second semester to be included in the assessment data. An additional question was posed about the randomness of the selection process. Once a faculty member volunteers to offer his/her students' work then the artifacts that will eventually be assessed are randomly chosen from the total set of student work. The selection process that is in place has thus far provided sample percentages that are reasonably similar to the population percentages for the various colleges. Masters stated that stratified

random sampling might be considered in the future so that sampled percentages of students from the various colleges or classifications could match precisely the actual percentages in the student population.

### 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:*** Pending response from Faculty Council Committee on survey results. Geary Robinson presented the survey results from the HES Bureau of Social Research to the Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security Committee on October 30. The committee will submit a written commentary regarding the survey to the OSU Parking and Traffic Rules Committee.
- 01-05-05-RES      ***Copyrightable Intellectual Property Policy:*** Pending action by OSU Board. Final draft was shared with the A&M Board for information and review at their October 25 meeting. It will be presented for final approval at the December 6 Board meeting.  
**NOTE:** Lawry was at the October Board Meeting and saw the interchange between the Regents and Dr. Alexander on that issue and they seemed to give a very positive response to what he had to say. Lawry thinks this recommendation has a very good chance of passing but it still awaits Regent's approval.
- 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 discussion with Faculty Council Committee. Dr. Vitek reviewed the proposed policy, including input from CIS representatives and others. Discussion with FC Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee occurred twice and a follow-up session will be scheduled in mid-November.

### REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

**ATHLETICS — Carol Moder**

The Athletics Committee is working on three issues. One issue is the academic advising services that are available to athletes and non-athletes across the university. Two committee members, Bob Hunger and John Phillips, did an extensive survey of generally available services to all students. They talked to all college officers and all of the advising officers and came up with what the committee thinks is a very useful comprehensive report of the services available to students in general which will be put on the committee website so the information can be viewed and/or used for students if faculty wish to do so. Part of the purpose of looking at this is to compare what is happening with athletes and non-athletes and one thing that became clear was that particularly at-risk students are not targeted across campus, as are student athletes. Student athletes who are considered to be at risk, that is people on probation or having difficulty in a certain semester in coursework, those students are getting tracked more easily and secondly, getting more extensive services if they are athletes than if they are non-athletes. This is partly a resource issue. One of the reasons they might not be getting tracked so well, if they are not athletes, from what was understood from the college advising offices, is that many of the offices said they were suffering a great deal from the fact that there are no longer mid-term grade checks. Prior to use of the SIS system, that was an automatic process that came out of the Registrar's Office. There would be mid-term grade checks for freshman students automatically and they were told this is no longer being done because of the new computer system. The Athletics Committee has referred this to the Student Resources Committee and they will be investigating whether something might be done about this issue. The Athletic Department themselves send out requests through Marilyn Middlebrook's office three times a year requesting faculty give them reports on athletes and so they are able to track their students to the extent that faculty send those forms back and there are some faculty who choose to do so and some do not. They will continue to look at this matter, but in general, they are going to look over the resource issue further and make that information available on their website.

The second issue they are looking at is the tracking of athletes. The NCAA requires that information about graduation rates of athletes be reported and the difficulty with that is that it does not tell very much about what happens to the people that do not graduate and what happens to them beyond six years, which is when the statistic is calculated. The committee felt that it would be important to investigate other ways of tracking and reporting athletes who left and athletes beyond the six-year period and they may be developing a recommendation related to that topic.

A third thing they are planning to do is to interview student athletes and non-student athletes concerning the impact of athletics on their careers as students. They are initiating some contact with the Student Athletic Council to see if some of their members would be interested in coming to the committee and talking to them. They are also initiating more informal contact with students who have issues or concerns with respect to athletics and if any faculty are aware of such students and would like to refer them to the committee they would be happy to hear from you.

**BUDGET — Scott Gelfand**

The first fiscal quarter ended in September, and state tax receipts were 13% off the estimates. The State is only permitted to allocate 95% of what they estimate, which means there was a

shortfall of 8% for the first quarter. Two months ago the State required a 4.75% budget cut, across the board, which left 3.25% and the State is hoping tax receipts will increase to such an extent that there will not have to be further cuts. However, today the budget numbers were released for the past month, which is the first month of the second quarter, and Gelfand spoke to Joe Weaver and Weaver told him that a 1.75% budget cut was issued across the board. The 1.75% budget cut goes to the State Regents. Last time, of the 4.75% budget cut, the State Regents passed on to OSU 4.34%. It is not known at this time what percent budget cut is going to be forwarded to this institution. This could amount to as much as two million dollars. Weaver said November and December are crucial months because those are the big shopping months. If the numbers do not get significantly better then more budget cuts might be seen in January and February.

### **CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY & SECURITY — Khaled Gasem**

**Facility Planning** — The CFSS Committee had two informative meetings 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. He also highlighted some of the current capital projects and commented on future growth on the Stillwater campus. Based on the information received and the ensuing discussions, the indications are that: 1) Faculty participation in the facility planning process is not well structured. The Space Planning Committee currently drives the process, without a structured input from FC. 2) The process of facility planning, due to funding limitations, is mostly resource driven and not pursuant to a long-term program planning. 3) OSU operates without the benefits of a Planning Office or a similar entity. 4) The current planning procedures do not include CFSS in its deliberations.

**Parking Plans** — The CFSS Committee had a meeting on November 16 with Mr. Geary Robinson, Parking Manager, on the parking plans in light of the survey conducted last year. Mr. Robinson presented to the Committee copies of a report entitled “*Parking: Is There a Solution? An Assessment of Needs and Evaluation of Services.*” He indicated that current plans anticipate the implementation of a multi-modal parking facility, and improving the transit system. He described the \$15 million multi-modal parking facility, which awaits federal funding; and he indicated the need for increasing the transit fees. The Committee is planning to provide written input to Mr. Robinson regarding parking plans. It is hoped this input will expand the scope of the current plans and help realize the full benefits of the Parking Survey.

Bear asked when the survey would be released. Gasem responded that the committee was given a copy and you should contact Mr. Robinson if you are interested in receiving one. Lawry asked Gasem if he would contact Mr. Robinson to see if it could be made available on the Faculty Council website and Gasem replied he would. Peeper commented this seemed to be a report of their recommendations but wondered when the results of the survey would be available. Gasem replied that the report was the actual results of the survey.

### **FACULTY — Susan Redwood**

At its last meeting, the Committee reviewed a proposal developed by the College of Osteopathic Medicine faculty to create a non-tenure faculty track for physician faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching and patient care. The proposal has strong support from COM

faculty. It was submitted to the College Dean, who approved it and submitted it to Dr. Vitek, who asked for a review by the Faculty Council. Dr. Lawry referred the issue to the Faculty Committee. The Faculty Committee has begun study and discussion of the proposal. Dr. Lawry attended the Faculty Committee meeting and expressed his opinions and concerns regarding the proposal. One of the views expressed during the discussion were that definitions of scholarly activity need to be broadened and resources provided so that physician faculty with clinical teaching responsibilities can engage in scholarly activity and be eligible for tenure. Dr. Redwood presented background information relevant to the proposal. Seventy-five percent of U.S. medical schools have a similar track for physician educators whose primary responsibility is clinical teaching. The AAUP published a policy statement on this issue, concluding that tenure is not necessarily appropriate for physician faculty whose primary responsibilities are teaching and patient care. However, the statement recommends that these faculty should be provided with the protections afforded other faculty, including academic freedom and due process. The Faculty Committee will continue its review of the proposal at their next meeting.

### **STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Pat Lamphere-Jordan**

The SALR Committee met on November 11, 2002. They discussed issues related to reports from the Library Advisory Council and the SGA Student Affiliate Fee Allocation Committee. The SGA has conducted training sessions for the treasurers of the student organizations who are eligible to apply for funding from the SGA.

The committee met with Dr. Lee Bird and discussed issues related to fair treatment of all students on campus, the concerns over student awareness of issues related to diversity, and the plans for activities to be held on the campus to heighten awareness of equitable treatment of all individuals. The next meeting will be on December 9 at 9 a.m.

Lawry reiterated that an attempt is being made to get all Faculty Council Standing Committee Agendas and Minutes posted to the FC website and faculty should go to the website to find out what is going on in the committees.

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

#### **Athletic Council — Carol Moder**

Athletic Council met on October 17 and at that meeting there were a number of items of business. The Academic Integrity Committee is continuing to look at the issue of missed class days. The committee looked at the actual attendance policy and it is not about “teams” but individual student athletes. The way that schedules have been approved in the past has been by teams – whether the team is missing a certain number of days or not. If the team is not missing more than the requisite number of days then probably no student athlete is. But, if the team is missing more, individual student athletes might or might not be missing more than what is required. For example, if they are on the track team they may or may not be going to different meets. The whole team does not always go to all of the meets. The Academic Integrity Committee is looking at ways of enforcing the policy by athlete as opposed to by team rather than changing the policy which is what they had been considering before. There will be a

proposal that will go to the next meeting of the Athletic Council concerning the enforcement of the policy as it stands now for individual athletes rather than for teams. In other items discussed, the NCAA official Division I graduation rate report came out. The graduation rate for OSU athletes was about 42 percent. This was from the class of 1995-96 – their six-year graduation rate. The overall graduation rate for all students at OSU was 52 percent. The Athletic Department is a little bit concerned about what is a discrepancy at OSU compared to other places. At OSU the women athletes overall are graduating at 45% and the male athletes at 40%. This discrepancy between men and women is much lower than it is at most other Division I schools. At most other Division I schools the women's rate is much higher and it helps pull up the whole average. The Athletic Department is going to investigate why OSU's women's graduation rate is lower than other schools. The Academic Advising Office for Athletes suggests that next year OSU's rates are going to be about the same but they are anticipating a big improvement the following year, which they have said before. The other issue that was raised is there are a number of changes that are pending in Big 12 rules for academic standards. Most of these include increasing the number of hours an athlete might have to complete within a particular semester, etc. So, there is a general cracking down or an increasing of what students have to do toward making progress toward a degree, from the NCAA, and that may or may not have some affect on OSU's overall program. It is not clear whether those standard changes will actually affect the way athletes are making progress toward a degree or not but it certainly will increase compliance. Achemire remarked that a couple of times the six-year tracking graduation rate was mentioned. With the computer power now available why is tracking still being done the 1970s way? Why aren't individual students being tracked? Moder replied because that is what the NCAA requires. Everything we do is based on what the NCAA requires. The Athletics Committee, as stated earlier, is trying to look at better ways of tracking athletes and talking about what is happening with them rather than this NCAA requirement. The NCAA statistics would still have to be done but more information might be obtained if something else were done.

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

Bergbower reported that in regard to the mandatory leave staff is being asked to take during the Christmas break period, the majority of staff do not seem to be too upset; however SAC has received a few complaints and those will be passed on to the proper administration once they have been logged.

#### **Student Government Association — Michael Cich**

Michael reported the following to those present:

**SGA Representative to the OSU Faculty Council:** Michael E. Cich; **PHONE:** (405) 332-0880; **WORK:** (405) 744-5602; **E-MAIL:** cich@okstate.edu

**OSU Student Government Association Online:** *you.okstate.edu/sga*. The website is currently being redesigned. It will include purpose, contact information, meeting agendas and minutes, and an outline of programs and services.

OSU SGA Student Senate Agendas & Minutes. **Agendas and minutes can be provided on request by email until website redesign is complete.**

**SGA Student Senate Committees include:** Internal Affairs, Academic Affairs; Committee on Student Organizations; Budget; University; Stillwater Community Alliance Committee.

**Responsibilities to Student Groups — Constituency Groups: Colleges** – Agriculture; Arts & Sciences; Business; Engineering, Architecture, & Technology; Education; Graduate and Professional Student Association; Human Environmental Sciences; Veterinary Medicine. **Living Groups:** Greek; Off-Campus Student Association; Residence Hall Association; University Apartments. **Related Student Groups — Non-Constituency Groups:** Student Groups without an umbrella organization.

**Current Issues: Northern Oklahoma College** – Erin Lawler, unofficial liaison to exploratory committee. **Online Voting** – November 19 & 20, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., *elections.okstate.edu*. Encourage students to voice opinions on the new process. **Funding for Student Groups** – clarification of current by-laws. **Multicultural Affairs Committee** – committee currently searching for opportunities. **Transfer Enrollment Day** – Campus Organization Fair, Student Union Atrium. Student groups can reserve space by completing form available in SGA office (065 Student Union).

#### **Women's Faculty Council — Jean Van Delinder**

The remaining films of the Fall Semester OSU Women's Film Festival are "The Women," a Hollywood classic on Tuesday, November 12th and "900 Women," a documentary on the increasing population of female convicts on Tuesday, December 3. Both films will be shown at 7:30 p.m. in Classroom Building 313. Trish Long, this year's Women's Film Festival coordinator is soliciting volunteers to serve on the panel discussions that immediately follow the films to be shown in the Spring. The Spring 2003 Film Schedule is now available; the first showing will be January 28th. Please contact Trish Long or Jean Van Delinder if you would volunteer as a discussant. On Thursday November 21 the Women's Studies Program will host its second annual "Worlds of Women Reception" from 11:30 a.m.-2 p.m. in the Student Union Atrium. The next meeting of the Women's Faculty Council will be on Friday, December 6 at 12:30 in Student Union Room 250. The following items are on the agenda: Task Force on Women's Issues, Women's Faculty Council Scholarships and Women's History Month. All faculty members are cordially invited to attend the meetings.

#### **NEW BUSINESS:**

##### **NOC Update – Carol Moder**

The NOC Task Force has been formed and John Dobson is the Chair. It has representation from all of the colleges and also graduate and undergraduate representatives. They are investigating a couple of issues at the present time. First, they are looking at the issue of the quality of the current OSU student body. The reason for this is because it has been presented that one of the issues that the NOC proposal is meant to address is the concern about the ACT scores of current OSU students in comparison to students in the Big 12. Those numbers are rather low which causes some to think that admission standards need to be raised. If that happens some kind of mechanism needs to be in place, in the eyes, Moder gathers, of some of the Regents, to accommodate those students who would not be able to enroll at OSU. The Task Force has

decided one of the things it needs to look at is the issue of the quality of the current OSU student body. They are collecting all kinds of data in regard to that and are also trying to look at the performance of students who are admitted in the various ways of admission by ACT by grade point and rank and class and the “so-called” third door where you are admitted on the set of core courses and a 3-point but no rank and class and no ACT. So far, it seems to suggest that there really is not a problem with the quality of the OSU student body and maybe we need to redefine how we are looking at these quality measures. The second issue is looking at NOC and at the kinds of ramifications it would have on OSU if NOC came in and that, of course, depends, to a large extent on what NOC does if it comes in. So, they are looking at it in terms of various things – NOC coming for remedial courses, NOC coming as an OSU “prep” for the students who would not be admissible to OSU immediately, and NOC coming perhaps to meet some kind of adult education market in the community. All these things have been mentioned as possible reasons why NOC would have some mission here in Stillwater. Basically, the Task Force is looking at whether anything needs to be done about the quality of the current students and secondly, what affect an NOC proposal would have on the quality of OSU students, the budget, Gen Ed requirements, quality of education, on faculty, on graduate students; in other words, a long list of issues they are going to be studying. Masters commented that it was the entering freshman ACT being utilized, not ACT of all the students at the university. For example, even though OSU’s is stated to be quite low, she believes it is 1.6 points below the OU entering freshmen ACT. When you begin to look very specifically at the data, 96 percent of OSU’s entering freshmen are in the number that provide that average ACT and only 88 percent at OU are involved in the data that generate their average ACT. Manipulation of the data in terms of who is included and who is excluded certainly would be important. There are some criteria for OU to omit 12 percent of their entering freshmen from the mean ACT calculation. She does not know if that is students who have SAT vs. ACT although there are transformation equations where you can generate one from the other and she ask Dr. Ivy if he had additional information about that. He did not think it would be the SAT because generally that would be the National Merit Scholars that would drive it up. There is one thought, and we do not have the answer from OU, that maybe what they are doing is stating the average ACT for those students who were admitted on the ACT criteria and not giving you the average of the entire class. The students included may be ones who were admitted to OSU on high school grade point or in the 8 percent group. Perhaps the University should consider including in the ACT calculation only students who were admitted through the 24 on the ACT requirement. Moder said if we did that our ACT score would be much higher, of course, and comparable to OU’s. If you look at admission standards, by ACT scores, across the Big 12, we are certainly not the lowest, we are right about in the middle, for our ACT requirement for admission of Big 12 schools. That is why the committee is coming to the conclusion that maybe we do not have a quality problem, maybe we have a problem on what information we are reporting. Henderson asked if it is already way past the point of wondering why NOC for sure and certain was the chosen junior college. Moder said they were told there was no choice, that it was NOC’s region of influence and that it is NOC or none by State Regent’s policy. Henderson asked who tells us that. Moder replied that Dr. Vitek says that is the rule and nothing can be done about it. Henderson asked if there was any discussion about why, apparently, rumor has, that TCC was offered the opportunity and declined if it is the case that NOC is the only choice possible. Moder responded that if that happened then perhaps it was in error. Masters added that it has been related to us that perhaps Dr. Halligan was not clear about the geographic areas. Henderson asked if anyone raised the question that

there are actually already two two-year schools in the “umbrella?” Moder said that was mentioned to Dr. Vitek and he said that you all were not allowed to come in here and teach classes. Henderson – even though we have in the past? Masters – in specific rooms it is allowed that that is not covered in the geographic area. I guess there are two rooms in the Classroom Building. Moder – I think if it comes by teleconference. Masters – I believe there is one on-campus location. Lawry suggested that it be further investigated. He was not sure that the answer was completely sound. Moder suggested that e-mails be sent to Dr. Dobson, Chair of the committee. Bear asked if any information from Dr. Halligan on NOC had been received about what their talks included, what they thought NOC would do? Moder replied “no” but that all three things she had mentioned seemed, perhaps, to have been discussed. That is, the remedial courses, meeting some kind of adult-student market in Stillwater in general and also, there are a certain number of adult admit students who can just come in and take classes and generally they do not do all that well. About 50 percent of them succeed and so the question is would they do better if they were going somewhere else, for example, to a junior college. And then, the OSU prep model which is the only one that makes sense if you are talking about this as another avenue for people who could not be admissible to OSU, that is they would have to take a minimum of 24 hours to qualify to get in as transfer students if they had not been admissible before. So, all of those have been mentioned. We do not know to what extent any negotiations took any path. Bear – it would be interesting to know where they were headed and I’m not sure how to get that information. Moder – I think one of the things the Task Force wants to do is to say, “Okay, if this is what they’re doing these are the potential consequences,” etc., in other words, recommendations with regard to all those three separate options. Peeper said, “wouldn’t it be simpler to figure out what the purpose was and then look at the options?” Moder – on one level it seems that that is obvious but on the other level that is not necessarily true because we can agree whatever we want with NOC but NOC, once they come, can do whatever they want. So even if we say, “we want you to come in and provide OSU prep,” they can do whatever they want. It is their region of influence so there is nothing that can prevent them from extending to the adult market or to remedial work or whatever. Lawry said that most of you have the names of the people on the Task Force and Dr. Dobson is the Chair and if you have concerns about this issue you should contact the people on the Task Force or Dr. Dobson and let them know your concerns. Moder said if anyone wanted to forward specific concerns to her she would be happy to take them to the committee.

**New Business:**

Lawry announced that the Fall General Faculty meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 19, at 3:00 in the Student Union Theater, on “Faculty Legal Liabilities and University Protections.” An attorney from Tulsa, Lou Bullock, an OSU graduate and a long-time civil rights and employment discrimination lawyer is going to give a talk first and then Scott Fern, OSU’s Associate General Counsel for the Board of Regents, will talk about the protections that the university affords. There will be time for questions. He asked all to come and bring other faculty members and make sure everyone knows about the meeting.

A Holiday Reception for Faculty Council Members will be held Tuesday, December 10, after Council meeting.

Lawry announced that a new Chancellor had been named for the State Regents for Higher Education. He is a former President of Oregon State University and Lawry thinks there is a sign of relief being communicated through a lot of faculty at OSU who are happy to see that a life-long academic has been hired for this position and not a life-long politician. Lawry added he thought some debt of gratitude was owed to President Halligan for helping that process along.

Lawry said he had attended a couple of meetings of a group that is sort of an ad hoc committee including members of student services organizations. Lee Bird is chairing this group, as well as some student government people, to talk in a preliminary way about some of the issues involving diversity, multiculturalism, tolerance, and respect on campus. There are a lot of ideas floating around about training people and bringing people in. Resources seem to be being marshaled in one way or another. At the last meeting of the Student Union Activities Board it was mentioned that there were two programs that they were going to present in the spring that might have special interest to people who want their students, or they were interested themselves, in diversity issues. One is a program on January 30 with a group of people from the HBO's Def Poetry Jam. An Israeli, an African-American, and a former skinhead will be presenting the program and will give some idea about differences and problems involved with racial-ethnic differences. Also, on Friday, March 7, Jack Eisner, who is a Holocaust survivor will give a talk that focuses on the Pope, Jewish/Christian relations and religious diversity, including comments about his experiences in concentration camp. He has written a book entitled "War and Love," which he will be signing after his talk.

Masters announced that this month she will attach the Council minutes as a Word document to the listserv message that contains the website link. She also plans to send the entire minutes in the listserv message in case faculty wish to read the minutes as an email message. In future months plans include posting the minutes in various file formats on the website to provide greater access to the minutes for a variety of computer configurations. Faculty input is essential to ensure an effective, useful website. Please continue to send her your comments.

Natalea Watkins announced that if you want to record a personal goodbye message for Jim and Ann Halligan a video camera is available at the OSU Welcome Center in the Student Services Center to allow OSU students, faculty and staff to record memories, messages and good wishes to the Halligans. The recorded messages will be used to assemble a video for their going away reception in early December. You can stop by the Welcome Center between 8 a.m. and 5 p.m., Monday through Friday to record your greeting. Call 744-0444 to make sure there is not a long line or that the Welcome Center staff is not in the middle of giving a campus tour. The camera will be in place until Friday, Nov 22. E-mail messages for the Halligans may be sent to johnstn@okstate.edu Written messages may be mailed to 219 PIO. Also, they are looking for photographs of the Halligans. Bring them to 219 PIO, where they will be scanned and returned to you.

Lawry also said rumor has it that the Presidential search is proceeding apace and they are narrowing down a list and possibly by the end of January there might be candidates to look at.

Lawry said Lionel Raff is preparing another retirement newsletter, which should be out within the week, and he will be reporting regarding the latest legal proceedings. They have been trying

to certify the class and a response has been received from the AG's office saying why this should not be certified.

The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is December 10, 2002.

Brenda Masters, Secretary