

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
December 10, 2002

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

HIGHLIGHTS

Getting Beyond Concept – to Commercialization	2
Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	6
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	7
Policy on Final Exam Schedule for Distance Delivered	
Courses Recommendation	7
Revision on P&P Letter 2-0206 Dropping and Adding Courses and	
Withdrawing from the University Recommendation.....	10
Budget.....	10
Campus Facilities, Safety and Security	11
Faculty.....	11
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology	11
Research.....	11
Regents Distinguished Research Award Recommendation.....	12
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	15
Maternity/Family Leave Recommendation	15
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Athletic Council.....	15
University-Wide Technology Fee Committee	16
Student Publications Committee.....	18
Old Business	
NOC Update.....	18
New Business	
Red Cross Blood Drive	21

Wetzel moved acceptance of the November 12, 2002, Minutes. Moder seconded. Peepers amended the Minutes with a correction on page 12, under the Student Government Liaison Committee Report, “Current Issues,” to read “Northern Oklahoma College” instead of “Northeastern Oklahoma College.” The Minutes were approved as amended. Moder moved acceptance of the December 10, 2002 Agenda. Gasem seconded. The Agenda was approved.

**SPECIAL REPORT: Getting Beyond Concept – to Commercialization – Larry Waters,
Director of Technology Management**

The following outline summarizes the information from the Powerpoint presentation provided by Larry Waters.

LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITY MISSION

Teaching
Research and Scholarly Activity
Dissemination of Knowledge

MISSION OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MANAGEMENT

To foster the creation of innovative technologies and to manage those technologies and other intellectual property for the benefit of the University and the public.

WHAT IS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY?

Know-How
Discovery
Tangible Form
 Product
 Process
 Software

WHAT OFFICE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DOES

Interface between faculty and the commercial sector
Work with patent counsel to assess patentability/licensability
Evaluate markets for commercialization of invention
Identify potential licensees
Negotiate terms of license

PHILOSOPHY OF THE OFFICE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Accessibility
Responsiveness
Service

INVENTOR REWARDS AND INCENTIVES

Fulfillment of mission
Transfer of concept to marketplace
Royalties (after recovery of costs):
 50% to inventor
 30% to OSU
 20% to college or division

SUCSESSES OF THE OFFICE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

GreenSeeker
Monoclonal Antibody Diagnostic Tests
Nanotechnology

TESTS OF PATENTABILITY

Is the item new, novel, or innovative?

Demonstrably different from prior art

New use

Improvement

Is the item useful?

Non-obvious to person with ordinary skill in the art

Surprising

Unexpected

STEPS IN THE PROCESS FOR THE INVENTOR

Inventor consults OSU policies (intellectual property and/or copyright) and reviews disclosure form

Inventor sends form to Office of Intellectual Property Management (IPM)

IPM and research directors review disclosure with inventor

STEPS IN THE PROCESS FOR OFFICE OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

IP Screening Committee determines ownership

If OSU owns the intellectual property, IPM protects and markets, if appropriate

RESOURCES

Patent Library at OSU

Only one in Oklahoma

5th floor, Library

Suzanne Holcombe, Patent Librarian, x47086

US Patent and Trademark Office

Association of University Technology Managers (AUTM)

The following paragraphs provide information from the flier provided by IPM.

The Office of Intellectual Property Management (IPM) at Oklahoma State University was established in 1998 following passage of State Questions 680 and 681. This legislation authorized academic institutions and their employees to own and commercialize the technologies they develop and to hold an interest in private business. This dovetails with the provisions of the federal Bayh-Dole Act (1980), which encourages universities to participate in technology transfer activities and to commercialize inventions that result from federally funded research.

The work of IPM responds to these charges and fulfills the third part of OSU's threefold mission: 1) teaching, 2) research and scholarly activity, and 3) dissemination of knowledge. The mission of the Office of Intellectual Property Management at Oklahoma State University is to foster the creation of innovative technologies and to manage those technologies and other intellectual property for the benefit of the University and the public

ROLE OF IPM

To carry out our mission, the staff of the Office of Intellectual Property Management at OSU:

- Assists faculty, staff, and students with the disclosure process
- Reviews disclosures with inventors to learn about potential applications
- Performs technical and market assessments to evaluate the commercial prospects of an invention
- Works with patent counsel to assess patentability and to provide appropriate legal protection
- Recruits prospective licensees
- Negotiates licensing agreements
- Disburses royalty fees to colleges, departments, and inventors
- Advises inventors regarding germane policies and procedures, including conflict of interest
- Facilitates confidentiality agreements
- Reviews and assists with research collaboration agreements as needed
- Facilitates material transfer agreements for biological materials

NOTE: Use of the word “invention” in this document includes software, multimedia, etc. Although a copyright would be required rather than a patent, the process is largely the same.

REWARDS/BENEFITS

Not only does an inventor reap rewards, but society and the inventor’s institution benefit from the transfer of knowledge and technology to the private sector. Below are selected benefits:

- Recognition and enhanced credibility for inventor
- Personal satisfaction
- Generous monetary reward for inventor (see OSU Policies Nos. 1-0201 and 1-0202)
- Revenue to the inventor’s department and college
- The licensee may provide funds for additional research and development, which can provide continued practical experience for students
- Contribution to the public good through improved products, processes, and services
- Expansion of the economy

STEPS IN THE PATENT/LICENSING PROCESS

1. The inventor consults OSU policies (intellectual property and/or copyright) and reviews the disclosure form.
2. The inventor completes the disclosure form and sends or delivers it to IPM.
3. The Intellectual Property Director reviews the disclosure with the inventor and the college research director.
4. The University Intellectual Property Screening Committee determines ownership.
5. If OSU owns the intellectual property, IPM assesses the market potential and works with patent counsel to ensure the invention is properly protected.
6. IPM initiates appropriate marketing.

INVENTOR INVOLVEMENT

The active participation of the inventor is essential to the success of the licensing endeavor. It helps us help you! (Studies show that inventors develop 50-80 percent of leads for licensing.)

Inventors provide background information and insights to IPM personnel and patent attorneys regarding prior art and potential uses and applications of the invention as well as likely licensing prospects. The inventor should provide an abstract that will help IPM market the invention. It should include:

- Title
- Name of inventor(s)
- Succinct (1-2 paragraph) description detailed enough to be informative, but not so detailed that a person skilled in the field could replicate
- Potential applications
- Benefits
- Stage of development

HELP FOR INVENTORS

Patent Searches. Assistance with patent searches is available at the OSU Patent and Trademark Library at OSU, the only one in Oklahoma. Understanding how to conduct a thorough preliminary patent search is extremely useful to an inventor.

The patent librarian teaches inventors how to conduct a preliminary search. Appointments can be made by calling 405-744-7086. Inventors should allow about two hours for the training session.

Lab Notebook Pointers: Keeping proper documentation is crucial to success in obtaining and defending a patent. A laboratory notebook provides evidence of the date of conception of an invention and the steps taken to reduce the invention to practice.

Call 405-744-5361 and ask for a hard copy of our tips about lab notebooks, or visit our web site for more details: (www.vpr.okstate.edu/ipm).

CONTACT INFORMATION

Office of Intellectual Property Management
Oklahoma State University
124 FAPRTC
Stillwater, OK 74078-6056
405-744-5361
405-744-6451 (fax)
mcindy@okstate.edu

After the special presentation questions were posed from the audience. Peeper asked if in addition to the successes listed in the presentation are there other items in the works. Waters responded that there are several ongoing efforts to commercialize some technologies that are currently under study. Dr. Morgan in Agricultural has a project and Dr. Gasem has one in the Chemical Engineering Department. Both of these are projects that have been ongoing over the last year. That is an indication of how lengthy these projects can be. Waters indicated that there were seven or eight more projects that were in various stages of process. One recent project has

been completed with Nomadics. It is not as far reaching as the nanotechnology, but is similar in the scope, in terms of being a long-term cooperation that will require much research prior to its completion. IPM does become involved with research agreements at the very beginning if the agreement deals with concerns of intellectual property. Lawry asked if the above contact information was complete. Waters indicated that the email to contact his office should be sent to the address: mcindy@okstate.edu. Gelfand asked how OSU interacted with a company like Nomadics. Waters indicated that IPM was working to license the technology developed by OSU to Nomadics. An agreement will be worked out to cover the concerns of the commercial process when the item is sold. This is a business arrangement that has as a foundation a research agreement. Binegar posed a question about the involvement with OSU Legal Counsel in the patent process. Waters indicated that IPM works very closely with Legal Counsel and the Boards of Regents and their outside Patent Council to define and maximize the benefits of any patents that might be applied for. The first decision that is made by IPM is whether or not a patent should be applied for. That is a technical, legal and commercial issue. Those are the first concerns addressed so if the process does go forward it is fully protected and its benefit to the University is secured.

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:** Accepted. Final draft approved by members of the OSU Board of Regents at their December 6 meeting.
- 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 for early December.
02-12-01-ASP	<i>Policy on Final Exam Schedule for Distance Delivered Courses:</i> To President Halligan
02-12-03-RES	<i>Regents Distinguished Research Award:</i> To President Halligan
02-12-04-RFB	<i>Maternity/Family Leave Recommendation:</i> To President Halligan

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Andrea Arquitt

The Academic Standards and Policy committee was asked to look into the problems surrounding grade submission on the web. As part of that investigation data was obtained on the number of grades submitted after the deadline during the past academic year. For Fall 2001 the total number of students with late grades were 489. For Spring 2002, 57 students were missing grades. During the 2002 summer session there were 40 late grade submissions. When analyzing the distribution of these missing grades the majority are in “zero-ending” courses or thesis/dissertation hours or appear to be missing the last page of students for a particular course. There were some courses for which the instructor clearly had difficulty as relatively large course sections were listed for some. Therefore, the committee does not believe that the problem with grade submission is huge. However, as a continuing investigation of problems they are planning to survey all faculty early in the Spring 2003 semester in order to allow input from individual faculty. They believe there is a problem with summer grade submission primarily due to the multiple sessions with restrictive grade submission times.

Arquitt presented two recommendations as follows:

Policy on Final Exam Schedule for Distance Delivered Courses Recommendation

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that:

1. The Oklahoma State University policy on final exam scheduling applies to distance delivered courses that are scheduled to meet on a regular basis during the semester. The final exam will be scheduled appropriate to the time of the regularly scheduled meeting time.
2. Final exams for distance delivered courses that are not scheduled to meet on a regular basis during the regular semester [i.e. courses that use a “To Be Announced” (TBA) or “asynchronous” class schedule format] must be scheduled during the final exam period for that semester. The instructor will set the specific day and time for the final exam. Students must be notified of the course’s final exam schedule at the beginning of the semester by publication in the course syllabus and/or on the course Web site.
3. Oklahoma State University policies related to other aspects of the final exam process such as final exam overload and final exam conflict issues will apply to distance education courses.

Rationale:

A request was made to the Academic Standards and Policies Committee to clarify the final exam policy as it applies to distance delivered courses. There has been significant growth in the number of distance delivered courses offered each semester. No reference is made, however, to distance delivered courses in the University's final exam policy or in the publication of the final exam schedule in the University's semester class schedule. Discussions were held with faculty who teach distance education courses in the College of Engineering, College of Education, College of Arts and Sciences, and at OSU-Tulsa. Administrators in University Extension and Educational Television Services who provide support services for distance delivered courses were consulted. Discussions also were held with staff in the Registrar's Office and the Office of the Executive Vice President. Conclusions based on the discussions were:

1. The absence of any specific reference to the applicability of the University's final exam policy to distance delivered courses is a source of confusion.
2. The current final exam policy is sufficiently flexible to apply to distance delivered courses that meet on a scheduled basis during the semester.
3. Clarification of the final exam policy as it applies to distance delivered courses scheduled on a "TBA" or asynchronous format is needed.

**Final Exam Policy for Distance Education Courses
Background Document**

Submitted by Dr. Tony Brown to the Faculty Council Committee on Academic Standards and Policies on November 26, 2002

Introduction

The purpose of the following memorandum is to describe the application of the University's final exam policy to courses offered to students at a distance. An increasing number of courses at OSU are offered through various distance education formats including the Internet and interactive video. Classes are delivered in both asynchronous and synchronous formats. Prior to the development of Internet and compressed video delivery, distance education was limited to courses offered through the Office of Independent and Correspondence Study and off-campus course instruction through University Extension.

An important feature of the growth of Internet and interactive video formats is an increase in the number of distance classes that are offered simultaneously with a class section on the Stillwater campus. The trend is a result in part to the growth of simultaneous course offerings on the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses.

A request was made to the Committee by faculty and by the former Registrar, Dr. Wes Holley, to clarify the final exam policy as it applies to distance education courses. As stated by one faculty member who teaches several distance delivered courses, "At present there are no regulations about when examinations should be given for courses either wholly or partially taught at a distance or through the use of a distance capable platform."

Synchronous and Asynchronous Delivery Formats

There are two major categories of distance delivered courses that are directly related to the University's final exam scheduling policy. Asynchronous courses are not instructed on a regular class meeting schedule. Deadlines for class assignments may be specified including the final exam or the course may be self-paced. Frequently, the course is designed in an independent study format with students accessing lectures on tape or streaming video through the Internet.

Synchronous courses, in contrast, require students to "attend" class and engage in live, real time, interaction with the instructor and other class members. Synchronous courses typically meet on a regularly scheduled basis throughout the semester.

University Final Exam Policy and Its Application to Distance Delivered Courses

In the case of **synchronous courses**, the final exam policy would apply in the same manner that it applies to regularly scheduled classes on the Stillwater campus. Exam blocks are scheduled for 110 minutes, which is longer than the normal classroom session held during the session. For example, classes meeting on a MWF 10:30am start time during the Spring 2003 semester, would have a final exam schedule beginning at 10:00am on Friday, May 9. The final exam period is 10:00-11:50am whereas the regular class session is 10:30-11:20am during the regular semester. The time differential would require an adjustment in the video delivery schedule if proctored from a distance.

According to University policy, exams for Saturday classes would be on Saturday morning of exam week at a time scheduled by the instructor. Any scheduling problem could be managed given the discretion granted the instructor in setting the specific time for the exam.

Exams for early evening or night classes would be held during exam week on the same day of the week of their regular meeting. Classes beginning at 4pm or after, but earlier than 6pm, would have their final exam at 6-7:50pm. Classes meeting at 6pm or after, would have final exams at 8-9:50pm. There would appear to be no major problems for distance courses to follow this schedule given that exams are given on the same day that classes met during the regular semester. The exam time period varies somewhat from the class meeting time during the regular semester. The instructor could manage any problems caused by the difference in class meeting time by requesting from the Registrar an exception to the schedule as provided for under current policy.

Asynchronous distance courses are similar in design to independent study courses. Regular meetings of the class are not scheduled and the course is typically scheduled on a "To Be Announced (TBA)" basis. TBA classes are not specifically mentioned in the University final exam policy. The assumption in this report is that the Instructor determines the time and place of the final exam. The University final exam policy applies to other aspects of the final exam process such as resolving final exam overload and exam conflict issues.

Conclusion and Recommendations

In summary, an initial review of the University final exam policy indicates that the current policy is sufficiently flexible to apply to distance delivered courses that meet on a scheduled or synchronous basis. Application of the final exam policy to asynchronous or "TBA" classes that do not meet on a scheduled basis requires clarification. The absence of any specific reference to the applicability of the policy to distance delivered courses is a source of confusion. It is

recommended that a statement be added to the University final exam policy to the effect that the policy does apply to distance delivered courses.

Revision on P&P Letter 2-0206 Dropping and Adding Courses and Withdrawing from the University Recommendation

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: the P&P Letter 2-0206 be revised to reflect the changes indicated on the attached document. These changes include the following:

1. Timing for dropping courses is specified for the 6th day that classes meet in a regular session (excluding Saturday classes) or the 3rd day of the eight-week summer session with no transcript record.
2. After this time and prior to the end of the 12th week or 6th week of an eight-week session, the student may drop with a “W” recorded.
3. The time for withdrawing from all classes is specified prior to the beginning of pre-finals week.
4. Courses may be added up to the end of the 6th day that classes meet in a regular session or the 3rd day in an eight-week session. With instructor’s approval classes may be added by Friday of the second week that classes meet.
5. Late withdrawals are by petition. The process is specified in sections 4.03. This includes grade assignment by the faculty member and notification of all parties when the process is complete. The maximum date for late drop was changed to be consistent with the deadlines for grade appeals.
6. A committee on Late Drops is officially established whose composition and responsibilities are delineated in section 4.04.

Rationale:

1. The changes clarify the process the time frame for dropping and adding classes.
2. The changes clarify the process that students must follow to drop classes after the 12th week.
3. The revision established a review committee, defines its membership, and the organization and responsibilities of the committee. It clearly defines the role of the faculty member in the process.
4. The changes coordinate deadlines for requesting by petition for late drops to coincide with the deadlines for grade appeals. This removes an unreasonable long deadline for requesting a late drop.
5. The revisions address concerns identified in the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Grade Assignment, August 2002.

After much discussion this recommendation was “tabled.”

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

The Budget Committee met December 9 and discussed two topics. Discussion was continued concerning fee waivers, specifically the OSU Alumni Legacy Award. The committee discussed whether a 2.0 GPA was sufficient to continue receiving the award. The sub-committee working on this issue will meet later in the month and hopes to have a recommendation ready for the council in the near future. The Committee also discussed the possibility of arriving at a means of

providing faculty input on budget issues and decisions. The committee recognizes that these decisions must often be made at the last minute but believes that there might be a way to increase faculty involvement and/or input. On December 10, Joe Weaver forwarded a press release issued by the Office of State Finance. The press release stated that no additional budget reductions beyond the previously announced level would be implemented at this time. In addition, the press release stated that the Board of Equalization would meet on December 20th to evaluate actual collections to date and make projections for future collections. They will then decide what action should be taken down the road.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY & SECURITY — Khaled Gasem

Facility Planning: A draft recommendation addressing facilities long-range planning has been discussed by the CFSS Committee. The recommendation urges the Administration to implement previous CFSS recommendations on the issue and describes a mechanism for follow up. Following an extensive discussion, the Committee instructed the CFSS Chair to seek input from the Administration outlining their efforts implementing the CFSS Recommendations of February 3, 1990.

Parking Plans: The Committee discussed a set of planning guidelines that will be presented to Mr. Geary Robinson. The Committee members agreed that additional time is required to finalize the guidelines.

FACULTY — Susan Redwood

The Faculty Committee reviewed applications for the 2002 Big 12 Faculty Fellowship Program, and will submit Committee ratings of the proposals to Dr. Vitek.

The Faculty Committee is beginning to study issues regarding hiring spouses of new faculty members. We will review policies from other Universities that address this issue. All faculty are encouraged to contact any member of the committee to express opinions or share information regarding the potential development of recommendations for policies in this area at OSU.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Birne Binigar

Since the passage of the IT policy resolution last Spring, the Long Range Planning and Information Technology Committee has been working towards the adoption of an IT policy that would remain both viable and responsive, even as new technologies come in and out of play. Since October, the LRPITC have been meeting regularly with Dr. Vitek, to develop such an IT policy. We now feel that we are very close to the completion of an IT policy document that accomplishes this goal, and also accommodates the concerns of faculty, administrators, and IT personnel. We hope to bring this document before Faculty Council in the form of a recommendation in January or February.

RESEARCH — John Damicone

The Research Committee has been working on two items that were received from the VP Research for comment. The committee received proposed guidelines for formalizing the distributions of University "Start-up" funds for new faculty positions. The purpose of these funds is to supplement Faculty Start-up provided by departments and colleges. Colleges work with the VP for Research to target a start-up amount. Currently there are no established

guidelines for distributing these funds. F&A (Indirect costs) collected on grants is split 50-50 with the University and college. However, the University start-up budget is fixed and independent of F&A collected. The University Start-up budget is currently \$1 million per year, but will be reduced next fiscal year to \$700,000 due to budget problems. In addition, the program is \$4.5 million in debt because of over-extended promises in the past. After reviewing the proposed guidelines, the Research Committee supported the idea of establishing guidelines for the program. A point of contention for some committee members was the statement "Faculty to be targeted for the program are those who have the potential to and are expected to generate external funding that will return F&A to programs operated by the central administration". Such an arrangement would not allow all new faculty to participate in the program and might create, using the words of a college dean, "a tiered system of research importance". Disciplines differ in their access to F&A because some federal programs limit or do not allow F&A. Conversely, other committee members felt it was equitable to target University Start-up to those who would generate F&A and put monies back into the program. The proposed guidelines are attached to the meeting agenda and will be posted on the Faculty Council website for informational purposes and to solicit faculty input before a recommendation is made.

The second item from the VP-Research is presented to Faculty Council as a recommendation to establish the Regents Distinguished Research Award. The award recognizes and rewards faculty for excellence in research. The award criteria were recommended by a "faculty committee" and the Associate Deans for Research, and approved by the Deans Council. The award parallels the Regents Distinguished Teaching Award in salary supplement and the number of awards per college. The Research Committee unanimously supported the idea of the award and most of the selection criteria. The research committee made two modifications to the selection criteria to ensure faculty involvement in the selection process. The first was to specify that colleges use a committee of faculty chaired by the Associate Dean for Research for the internal selection of nominations to go forward to the University-Wide Selection Committee. The second was to change the make-up of the University-Wide Selection Committee. The guidelines specified that the committee would consist of the Associate Deans for Research and the Chair of the Research Committee. The modification specifies that the University-Wide Selection Committee would consist of faculty, preferably immediate awardees, and the chair of the Research Committee. An Associate Dean for Research would chair the committee on a rotating basis. The complete recommendation is as follows:

Regents Distinguished Research Award Recommendation

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: OSU establishes the Regents Distinguished Research Award as recommended by a faculty committee and the Associate Deans for Research, approved by the Deans Council, and modified by the Research Committee.

Rationale:

Research is central to the mission of a comprehensive, land-grant institution. The Regents Distinguished Research Award recognizes and rewards faculty for excellence in research. The award is inclusive of diverse types of creative scholarly activity at OSU by making awards available to each of the colleges. Award criteria are as follows:

REGENTS DISTINGUISHED RESEARCH AWARD

Award Philosophy and Guidelines

Regents Distinguished Research Award recognizes research excellence at Oklahoma State University. The term research includes all creative scholarly activities. Recipients of the award will be selected based on the evidence of outstanding and meritorious achievements in research. The candidates must demonstrate a distinguished record of past and continuing excellence in research, and be clearly recognized nationally and internationally.

Number of Awards

One award per college, except the College of Arts and Sciences will have two. The award will be a \$1,000 permanent increase in annual salary plus associated fringe benefits for the award winner, and an award plaque.

Eligibility and Nomination Criteria

- Full time faculty member at OSU for four or more years in any faculty appointment (includes tenure line as well as research faculty appointments).
- Evidence of national and international recognition of nominee's creative and research accomplishments.
- An individual can receive this award only once during his/her tenure at OSU.
- Each College must submit at least two nominations, except for the College of Arts and Sciences, which must submit at least four.

Required Documentation

- A letter of nomination.
- Curriculum vitae of the nominee, including list of publications and funding history.
- Three letters of recommendations
 - 1) One letter from a faculty member at OSU
 - 2) Two letters from distinguished scholars from outside OSU who can substantiate the nominee's national/international reputation and research excellence. The letters of recommendation should not be solicited from the candidate's thesis supervisor, collaborators, or past students.
- An impact statement (maximum of 2 pages) by the candidate or by a colleague summarizing his/her research/creative contributions, and its impact on his/her field.

Evidence to be considered in the Award Selection Process will include, but not be limited to, some of the following:

- Publications in refereed journals, books, book chapters, and other creative and scholarly work.
- Record of extramural funding.

- Visibility at the national and international level in the candidate's field.
- Participation as an invited speaker, session chair, panel member or performer at the national and international conferences and events.
- Special awards and recognitions from the national and international societies in the candidate's field of research or creative activities.
- Highlights of research accomplishments at OSU.
- Intellectual property accomplishments.
- Any other evidence of research and creative excellence.

Award Process

- Deans, Department Heads and Center Directors will be notified in Fall or early Spring of the availability of this award.
- Colleges will develop a process whereby nominations are accepted. *A committee of prominent college faculty chaired by the Associate Dean will review support materials internally.* At least two nominations for each college award (except for the College of Arts & Sciences which must submit at least four) will then be forwarded by the Dean of the College to the Vice President of Research for consideration by the University-wide Selection Committee.
- Complete nomination packages from the Colleges will be due in the VPR office March 1st.
- The University-wide Selection Committee's recommendation will be due to VPR May 1st.
- The awards will be presented by the University President in the Fall Convocation.
- *Awardees will be invited to present a campus-wide lecture on their research. (friendly amendment)*

Selection Committee

The Selection Committee will be made up of *prominent faculty from each college, preferably immediate past awardees*, and the chairperson of the Research Committee of the Faculty Council. The committee will be chaired on a rotating basis by one of the Associate Deans according to the following schedule:

Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
Arts and Sciences
Business Administration
Education
Engineering, Architecture and Technology
Health Sciences Center
Human Environmental Sciences
Veterinary Medicine

Approved by Deans Council February 14, 2002, and Research Committee on December 12, 2002.

RETIREMENT & FRINGE BENEFITS — Sally Henderson**Maternity/Family Leave Recommendation**

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Halligan that: he fully support the Staff Advisory Council's recommendation of May 8, 2002 entitled "Maternity/Family Leave Recommendation"; to wit:

"The Staff Advisory Council recommends that OSU Human Resources revise the university policies regarding Maternity Leave (1-0701), Sick Leave for Faculty (2-0113), and Sick Leave for Staff (3-0716) to include the use of sick leave for maternity, paternity, and adoption purposes.

The revised policies (or policy) should be clearly written and defined so that they are administered uniformly throughout the university as well as equally between faculty and staff. Furthermore, the policies (or policy) should include reference to the Family Medical Leave Act (OSU policy 3-0708) where appropriate."

Rationale: (From the SAC recommendation)

"OSU is the only Big 12 University that does not allow some use of sick leave by parents who have just adopted a child. Furthermore, several staff members have complained to council members that "maternity leave" is not administered uniformly throughout the university, and that the policies concerning maternity leave are confusing and hard to understand. Unlike many other universities, paternity leave is essentially not addressed at all. Current sick leave policies do not reference FMLA, adding to the potential confusion. Today's workplace is more dynamic than ever before, and we believe this is an opportunity for Administration to improve morale for current employees as well as provide better recruitment tools for quality candidates in the future."

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:**Athletic Council — Carol Moder**

The Athletic Council met on November 21 and there were three items discussed. 1) The Academic Integrity Committee is continuing to work on the absence policy. It has not been finalized yet but it should be by January and presented to Athletic Council at that time. 2) With respect to the deficit of the Athletics Department, Athletic Director Birdwell said they were still on course to reduce the deficit as the Budget Committee recommended. He said they had record ticket sales and that if a Bowl bid was received from Houston (which now has been received) they stood to make a fair amount of money on ticket sales. That would help toward paying off the debt. They are undertaking serious fund-raising for the stadium. They need \$35 million to renovate the south side of the stadium. In order to leverage the bonds for that they need \$8 million up front, in cash. At the November 21st meeting they were not even close to that yet but Dr. Birdwell was hoping to be at that figure for a July groundbreaking and it is understood they have been getting a number of donations since the OU game. 3) The Athletic Council is considering instituting a "Sportsmanship Award." This is supposed to promote sportsmanlike conduct at the games and people eligible include athletics, coaches, Athletic Department personnel, faculty, staff and alumni that participate and attend OSU events. They are working on

the criteria for this and if anyone has any comments let Carol Moder know and she will forward them to Council.

Lawry asked if Moder knew how the university voted on the NCAA academic rule that suggests people who do not get high test scores in high schools may still be admissible under NCAA guidelines even though at the same time standards are being raised for continued participation. Moder understood from Jerry Lage that the vote was up or down on all of the academic reforms and OSU voted in favor of them.

University-Wide Student Technology Fee Committee — Tom Peeper

The Committee Charge is: To identify general computing needs of students to be administered centrally; to develop new facilities, support and manage institutional technologies; to effectively plan and implement technology for both short and long term needs; to review and prioritize budgets and expenditures related to the student technology fee. The committee serves in an advisory capacity to the Executive Vice-President, who must approve each expenditure.

Funds Available and Their Use: \$6/student credit hour, of which \$3 goes to the students' college and \$3 is allocated to the university. In FY 01-02 the committee reviewed and recommended approval of 14 projects that were subsequently approved by the Executive Vice President, which totaled about \$2.2 million. These funds supported major projects proposed by several colleges in addition to major outlays for databases and a wireless laptop system for the Library. The Library wireless system has proven very popular with students and will be expanded. The wireless system will soon extend across most of the core campus, with wireless access in popular areas of the Student Union. Many of you may have noticed the large new up-to-date computer labs in Cordell, Ag Hall and Animal Science Buildings. College of Business has received major funding for technology updates as well including funding for technology for a Masters in Telecommunication Systems Management program.

HES and others have been able to upgrade classrooms with multimedia equipment. In general, the fund has been extremely valuable in "enhancing the students' experience at OSU" which is the fundamental purpose of the fee. Estimated income from the spring'02 semester was \$800,000. Generally, income in the fall semester somewhat exceeds spring semester income.

By October 02 the fund had again accumulated funds to the point of again having a positive balance exceeding \$2 million (\$2,234,300). At the meeting on November 20, 2002 the committee was informed of additional anticipated revenue of \$900,000. This additional amount resulted in an estimated \$3.1 million positive balance. However, it was noted at that time that CIS had not billed the fund for "prior year recovery of network cost increases". Unfortunately, most of those funds may not be available for the purpose of funding technological improvements as they have been in the past. At the Nov. 20 meeting the committee was presented with a brief outline of a budget stating that CIS would be allocated \$1.8 million from the tech fee fund this year for costs dating back two years in the past plus the current year. This was totally unexpected, considering that during the summer of '01 when the fund had a large surplus, a special committee was appointed to devise appropriate ways of utilizing the funds, and no mention was made to the committee that the fund owed CIS \$600,000/year to support networking costs. The need to move this \$1.8 million to CIS now, to pay for costs incurred up to

two years ago, apparently is a result of the current budget crisis. This is unfortunate, and hopefully such a major impact on the students' funds can be avoided in the future.

On the upside, there should still be about \$850,000 left to spend on technology this year. EVP Vitek is developing a multimedia plan with the intent of creating state-of-the-art multimedia classrooms in those rooms with the greatest demand for such technology. Academic Affairs is surveying space across campus. CIS will purchase space inventory software (not with tech fee funds) and EVP Vitek will develop a list of priorities and propose a plan for the Tech Fee Committee to review and make recommendations.

Thus, at this time, for the first time ever, the committee is not in a position to consider requests for funding technological improvements.

Binegar asked about CIS submitting a bill. Peeper deferred to Dr. Vitek. Vitek said all he knew was that when he took his current position Dr. Keener had deferred CIS getting the dollars for developing the networks for all these facilities on the basis that creating the facilities were more important than letting J.L. Albert run this deficit. To make sure all the process dollars went into the student activities rather than paying for that network cost up front. Now, with this budget crunch J.L. needs the money. He has been budgeted for it. With him having to make up the 5-10% cuts like everyone else he needs the resources at this particular time. Masters stated these were networking systems that involved student usage and Vitek replied "yes." Lawry asked if it was permissible, out of this fund, to pay for personnel costs, i.e., a tech person in the Classroom Building, for example, that left the university and they did not fill that position. They have some part-timers to help out but a permanent person is needed. Peeper said this was an issue that they are still trying to work out. There are a few cases where these requests have come in for funding of the people to monitor the labs and, in general, these personnel costs are referred back to the \$3 that the college gets. The committee's purpose has been to set-up the labs in the college, to provide equipment to the college, with the understanding that they would be responsible for maintaining it, supporting it, and replacing it when replacement becomes necessary. The committee has tried their best to stay away from using the money for personnel. Moder stated that the particular person that did the audio-visual support in the Classroom Building served the whole university. Vitek said he did not want to comment about the personnel, they have restricted use of that money. They have not paid for structural changes. For example, when Ag created a room for their building they found wiring problems, asbestos, etc., and the cost was a lot more than they had budgeted for and while they asked the Committee to pay for these changes, they were denied. Natalea Watkins said the person in the Classroom Building, that was no longer there, had worked for her. The person had gone on disability and so their salary had to be paid for six months. Money will be taken out of another account and someone else will be hired so a campus structure or organization you could call when you have a problem. He stated Audio Visual was gone and Watkins interjected that they were not gone. AV functions the same way they always did. The only difference is that they are not doing entrepreneurial activities to try and earn the money. They use to have to do auxiliary work – set up displays for clubs, etc., to earn the money to buy the equipment to put in the classrooms. The money does not have to be earned any longer. Some of that comes from the university. Peeper said he was glad to know that because they had heard from several colleges that said if their equipment broke down there is no longer anyone on campus to fix it. Watkins said there was. Everything is exactly the same.

The only thing they don't do is, for example, set up for the Rotary Club to have a program in CITD. Masters suggested stickers be placed on equipment stating who to call with phone numbers when assistance is needed.

Additionally, Peeper said students have requested they would like to have some recognition that their money is buying this equipment and it has been proposed that a plaque be placed on the door in the Classroom Building that say, "this classroom equipment was furnished with student tech fee funds."

Student Publication Committee — Suzanne Holcombe

Comments were made earlier about the O'Collegian providing good candidate and election coverage. The staff has responded well to this with the election in November.

A few weeks ago the front page featured a photo about the war protest (hand-held sign with offensive language). An e-mail message from a concerned student was sent to the Board and University administration. Editors defended that it expressed a situation. There were other photos available but the "best one" was chosen. The paper is to be edited by students.

In the spring, an adjunct from the Tulsa World has been hired to teach digital photojournalism; all photos are now digital.

Journalism and Broadcasting awards nine scholarships each year, both news and editorial.

Business: As the economy is slower, businesses are less able to place ads and advertising revenue is down. Some expenses have been cut. Early this fall, for the first time, more income was generated from the electronic version than from the print version. The O'Colly is continuing to upgrade the online version. The two versions do not always mirror each other. The Web has additional photos, etc. Budget has bounced back in October. The Web was close to budget.

New: The O'Collegian Mall is on their website: You can shop E-bay, K-mart, etc., and help generate revenue for the paper. OSU gets a percentage of everything sold (varies from company to company). So, visit the O'Colly Mall to do your shopping.

Awards: The O'Collegian has received 4 out of 5 marks of distinction from the Associated Collegiate Press for the 2001-02 academic year. This is an All-American top mark. They have received this distinction for 13 years in a row and 10 years in a row are needed to be in the Hall of Fame. So, OSU has a well-regarded paper in the country.

OLD BUSINESS:

NOC Update – John Dobson

Ed Lawry asked John Dobson, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and Chair of a Task Force Committee to study the issue of Northern Oklahoma College locating a branch campus in Stillwater, to update Council on what the committee had been doing. He said they had met four times and in much of the early meetings had talked about a variety of possible issues regarding what might happen if a branch of NOC arrived in Stillwater. For example, what tuition might be

paid, what types of courses they might teach, what kind of remedial courses would they offer, what kind of opportunities would graduate students have there, what kind of opportunities might disappear here, what would be the relationship for students transferring from one institution to the other, housing, etc. As the committee went through this process they had various committee members develop rather extensive comments about some of these issues. At the last meeting of the Task Force they realized that some of these comments and some of these concerns related to a very broad role of NOC in Stillwater and some of them only related to remedial education. They concluded that they really needed to know what role was anticipated. If the anticipation was that there would be a full two-year, degree-granting institution with two or three thousand students, then that would have a much bigger impact on OSU. If the institution only offered remedial courses that would have a much different and much smaller impact on OSU. Dean Dobson said he had reported to the Board of Regents at their Dec. 6 meeting and he does not think that a “no-expanded presence of NOC” is a possibility as far as the Regents are concerned. He also thinks the Regents are not expecting a two-year, degree-granting institution, at least not in the next couple of years. He does not know what might happen in the next ten to fifteen years. Two other choices for NOC involvement at OSU are remedial/college prep programs and the other is a program that would create an alternative admission for students who would not otherwise be admissible to OSU. The Regents are reluctant to change, i.e., raise admission standards at OSU and not provide an alternative for those students who would not be allowed to enter. So, the two things go hand in hand – raising academic standards at OSU and providing an alternative route for admission to OSU. The alternative role is the concept of NOC offering general education instruction to persons not admissible to OSU. Any student who is not currently admissible to OSU can successfully complete 24 credits at a community college and then apply for admission to the university. This is standard policy. In discussions with the Regents, Dobson feels this is role they have in mind for the NOC/OSU relationship. Dobson thinks that an expanded role for NOC will happen on the OSU campus. At the end of Dobson’s presentation to the Regents, President Halligan told the Regents that he intended to contact NOC and ask them to send OSU a proposal on how they would do remedial teaching and how they would handle this alternative admission route. The Regents passed a resolution commending him for that suggestion. Dobson said the Task Force would meet on Dec. 13 and hoped to have a concrete proposal in hand from NOC at that time.

Achemire asked, “Wouldn’t students go to community colleges in their area rather than come to OSU?” Dobson replied that it is felt by some that if students were able to live in the dorms, go to athletic events, buy “orange stuff” at the stores; they would be more apt to come to Stillwater when they transfer from their community college. Henderson stated that OSU has two perfectly good two-year schools. At what point was it determined that these were not to be considered for this role? Dobson replied that years ago the State Board of Regents allocated districts to community colleges. In other words, for OSU/OKC to come to Stillwater NOC would have to say they did not want to. Northern has the right of refusal to refuse OSU/OKC to come to Stillwater. Henderson then asked who had the say for OSU main campus to come to OSU/OKC campus. Vitek replied, UCO. He added it is a learning sight. UCO can come here and do learning sight work but those are non-duplicative courses that are being taught. Achemire wondered about that because OSU/Okmulgee has a state-wide mission. They are not a junior college. Vitek said they were under the same umbrella. Northern has the first right to teach junior college remedial classes. Gasem said he sensed from comments made that there is a shift on emphasis on the workings of the committee. He thought the committee was instituted to first

assess merit, then logistics and implementations. It seems, from comments made, that the aspect of merit assessment has been foregone and ways are being looked at to implement this decision in a popular fashion. Dobson replied the expectation that the estimate of quality or the sense of this is "moot." They have pages and pages about the quality of students, admission policy, etc., but it's "moot" because they are going to do this. Gasem said a question could be asked, for the sake of transparency and being objective, "Is this meritorious?" Purely on academic merit. Would you say "yes" or "no?" Dobson replied he would have to give you a very mixed answer. Is it meritorious to continue to admit students who are well below the average standard here? He teaches a freshman course and would love to have a higher average level of capability in that class. So, he would say, "Yes that has some merit. Let's change the admission requirements so that when we're teaching our basic level courses we're dealing with a more homogeneous, better-prepared group of students." Is it really a great idea to have an alternative institution with their foot in the door across the street, I'd say, "well I don't know about that, probably not." But he could not say it is an absolutely dumb idea. It is not just the idea of having that institution; it is what having that institution then creates as a set of alternatives. Gasem asked, "so basically you're saying that it is one of the set of alternatives that should be considered but not the sole alternative for us?" Dobson said another alternative that should be considered, but is not going to be considered, is only to say that entrance requirements for OSU should be raised. If that were done he could argue back that if the Regents would agree to raise our entrance standards, to the same ones that OU currently has, first of all 28 percent of the freshmen would be eliminated. And, we would then say, "That's bad." Another positive about this is that we do a better job of taking students through and getting them graduated than OU does regardless of where they are starting from. If there are currently students we are admitting and we want them not admitted into the regular process, but we know if they survive and do well in this alternative we can get them degrees, then we're doing the right thing. So, in terms of the Land-Grant mission to make access to education possible this could be perceived as a good thing. Whatever our theoretical concept is, we have to work with this hand that we have been dealt. So what they are trying to do in the Task Force is to do the best for OSU that can be optimized. Binigar was concerned about students going to a junior college yet still having all the advantages of going to a Big 12 university, i.e., lower tuition, allowed to go to the games and all the activities, etc. He said it looked like to him that a student would delay, for two years, coming to a big university. Dobson replied that he was sure some students are making that decision all across the state. One of the structures that they are going to put into the plan is that those courses have to cost the same as OSU's courses. Would they pay the same for this OSU sub-2 as they would pay for this OSU sub-1? He assumes there is much more financial aid structure in place for regularly admitted students. If you were a legacy student you would get a scholarship for coming here that you would not get for going there. There are some structural things that would make this not a clear-cut route. Morgan asked if one of these out-of-state students could take 24 hours over there and then gain in-state residency and second, once they gain acceptance into OSU would they be able to take eight hours here and four hours across the street and be considered a full-time student. Dobson replied that is what they are trying to structure against. Vitek stated that they could not just go to a junior college to acquire residency because they would have to take a certain number of hours in a given year and prove they were working a full-time job. Lavery said people had voiced concerns to him about the quality and standards involved. In discussions with the Regents how is this question answered? Dobson replied that only one Regent said that what they want to offer to these alternative people is a slower more supportive way to get brought up to

standards. Wetzell wanted to make sure about establishing residency. Vitek said you had to prove you came to Oklahoma to work and not to go to school –full-time for one year at which time you can only take 6, 6, and 3 in the summer.

NEW BUSINESS:

Lawry announced there would be a Red Cross Blood Drive, sponsored by Faculty Council and Staff Advisory Council, on Thursday, December 12, 9 a.m. – 2:00 p.m., on the Starlight Terrace, 4th floor of the Student Union.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is January 14, 2003.

Brenda Masters, Secretary