

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
March 11, 2003

President Schmidly called the meeting to order with the following members present: Achemire, Arquitt, Bays, Bear, Bilbeisi, Binegar, Comer, Damicone, Ebro, Gasem, Gelfand, Greiner, Henderson, Holcombe, Lamphere-Jordan, Lavery, Lawry, Lehenbauer, Masters, Moder, Mokhtari, Morgan, Mott, Murray, Redwood, Van Delinder, Veenstra, Weiser and Wetzel. Also present: T. Agnew, J. Alexander, L. Bird, D. Bosserman, T. Cagle, M. Chicoine, L. Conners, S. Harp, C. Meador, E. Mitchell, J. Vitek, P. Vitek, N. Watkins, and J. Weaver. Absent: Peeper

HIGHLIGHTS

| | |
|---|----|
| Strategic Plan Update..... | 2 |
| Student Conduct Office Report..... | 3 |
| Report of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations..... | 6 |
| Reports of Standing Committees | |
| Budget..... | 7 |
| Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security | 9 |
| Faculty..... | 9 |
| Long-Range Planning and Information Technology | 9 |
| Research..... | 10 |
| Recommendation – Guidelines for Disbursement of University Start-Up Funds | 10 |
| Retirement and Fringe Benefits | 11 |
| Rules and Procedures..... | 12 |
| Student Affairs and Learning Resources | 12 |
| Reports of Liaison Representatives | |
| Graduate and Professional Student Government Association | 13 |
| Staff Advisory Council | 14 |
| Old Business | |
| Tulsa Bus Policy Recommendation | 14 |
| New Business | |
| Graduate Tuition Waiver Plan | 15 |

Moder moved acceptance of the February 11, 2003, Minutes. Lawry seconded. The Minutes were approved. Moder amended the Agenda to add a Strategic Planning report by Mary Chicoine at the beginning of the meeting and withdraw the Graduate Tuition Waiver Plan recommendation that was to appear under New Business. Lawry moved acceptance of the March 11, 2003 Agenda as amended. Moder seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended.

SPECIAL REPORT: Update from Strategic Planning Consultant – Mary Chicoine

Mary Chicoine reported that in the last couple of weeks prior to the FC meeting she had interviewed about 55 leaders of all campuses throughout the system. Part of the objective of that process is to identify all the different areas that we have in the system. This process helps to clarify the organizational charts of the institutions in the system. It also provides guidance about where units, such as the various centers, are located in the system. As a result of the interviews, about 50 different areas were identified that will be covered by the strategic plan and approximately 220 units. Chicoine continued by describing that once the Vice Presidents of Information Technology and Enrollment Management are in place in the administration then all of this information about areas and units will be available on the website. The planning process will advance slowly until those two positions are filled and the leadership comes up with a definition about how the structure will be, what will be changed, and what personnel will be moved. Although the information on the website is close to accurate it will remain as a draft until May 2004 when all the plans will be completed.

Chicoine related that day, prior to the Faculty Council meeting, she had met with the Executive Team to identify the people who would be invited to participate on the Strategic Planning Committee. Over the last few weeks, nominations to the committee had been requested and individuals had been asked to volunteer. The size of the committee turned out to be larger than expected with a membership of about 25 people. Letters of invitation were going out the day of the FC meeting and potential members are asked to respond directly to Ms. Chicoine to indicate their willingness to serve. Once the membership is set then the committee roster will be published.

A critical step at the beginning of the planning process is getting a system vision and mission statement in place, which currently does not exist. A Board of Regents retreat is planned to address this concern that would include the Executive Team and the co-chairs of the SPC, along with representatives from the Foundation and the Alumni Association Board. This retreat will probably be planned for the first couple of weeks in April. The next step of the process would be plans for the various agencies. The process will attempt to clarify a vision for the Stillwater campus, since we don't have a current continuing plan. FC will be requested to provide input about the priorities that should be addressed in the vision. Chicoine reiterated that these are only the initial steps of the planning process and that all units will be requested to provide plans by May 2004.

After Mary Chicoine had provided the update some questions were posed. Lawry ask how the people invited to join the Steering Committee had been identified. Chicoine said the people invited to participate were the people that were identified after doing the 55 interviews with the various leaders and sending out the open letter to everyone in the entire system asking for recommendations. The top names that were identified by the system community were invited to be involved. Many people received one recommendation, but a set of people emerged who had received four, five or six recommendations from across the system. Chicoine stated that care was given to choose people who showed leadership across several areas and extended caution was exercised to ensure that the Steering Committee had broad representation across the various

campuses and across the colleges on the Stillwater campus. Stillwater is very well represented on the committee.

Note: FC will invite Mary Chicoine to make periodic updates about the strategic planning throughout the process and her comments will be fully covered in the FC minutes. Refer to the FC minutes to stay informed on the planning process.

SPECIAL REPORT: Student Conduct Office – Peg Vitek

Peg Vitek was invited to give an update for the Student Conduct Office. Vitek began her presentation with a quote from Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the University of Virginia. Nearly 185 years ago, he wrote a letter to the President of the University of South Carolina, lamenting the problem of dealing with student discipline.

“The article of student discipline is most difficult in American education. Premature ideas of independence, too little repressed by parents, beget a ‘spirit of insubordination’ which is the great obstacle to science among us and a principle cause of its decay since the revolution. I look to it with dismay in our institution as a breaker ahead which I am far from being confident we shall be able to weather.”

(From: Reed, Smith, Shaw, & McClay. Higher Education Forum, November 1990)

This quote would lead many to think that Thomas Jefferson may have been the first Student Conduct Officer.

Vitek continued by describing that student conduct is still an issue. Young people come to campus to push the boundaries and the edges of society. That is part of their developmental task. Part of the objective of university life is to be exposed to new ideas, test the system, and figure out what values they are going to retain throughout their university experience. Some students have a more difficult time transitioning from adolescence to adulthood than others. Vitek stated that she views student behavior as a road along which development occurs. She views the processes of her office as attempting to maintain student behavior “between the lines” and keep their behavior from getting out of control.

The Office of Student Conduct attempts to help students understand what the community standards of behavior and values are. Discipline is associated with development that helps our young adults to grow and mature. At the University we have standards and expectations of responsibility that are summarized in the “Students Rights and Responsibilities” statement. The purpose of the code of student conduct is to inform the student body of the standards and behaviors that are appropriate for academic life. Clarity about expected student conduct serves both the community and the individual student.

Peg Vitek continued her presentation by describing the types of complaints that come to the Student Conduct Office. Students file complaints against other students or other individuals. A individual student’s conduct may be brought to the attention of the office by staff, faculty, or other persons, such as local police officers. The complaint is investigated and the process includes working with the student to assist them in recognizing appropriate behavior. An

informal process is often used with Vitek counseling the student individually in her office. More serious cases can involve expulsion from the University. There is a student conduct committee that provides guidance to the office. The number of cases presented to the Student Conduct Office has declined in the recent year due to the fact that students involved in off-campus alcohol arrests are no longer automatically seen by the by the Student Conduct Officer.

Students who are reported for academic dishonesty are brought into the office for a discussion about what activities comprise academic dishonesty. The first time offenders are usually warned about various behaviors that classify as academic dishonesty. The office attempts to reeducate them about appropriate classroom and academic behaviors. The second time offenders are more seriously dealt with. The faculty need to be more aware of the responsibilities when filing a case of academic dishonesty. The process is not as complicated as one might perceive. Even though five letters must be sent to various involved parties, those can be forwarded copies of the letter sent to the student. The Student Conduct Office even has sample letters available for a faculty member who is concerned about the structure of the letter sent. The process needs to be handled in a confidential manner, although it does take some time to address academic dishonesty it is important to do so.

The legal issues in which students are involved are often dealt with through the Student Conduct Office. If a student has a legal entanglement when arriving at the University, such as a drug arrest or DUI charge, the University can provide counseling to that student to assist the student in promoting successful behavior. Students also use the Student Conduct Office to seek guidance or advise about dealing with legally related issues. Vitek's office deals with a wide variety of issues and attempts to provide assistance to both students and faculty. Vitek summarized by saying that the Student Conduct Office has as a basic objective the desire to assist students in having behavior and actions that lead to academic and life successes. Vitek opened up her presentation to the audience for questions.

Brad Bays asked a question concerning the situation where a student has been identified as having participated in academic misconduct and the letters have been sent, but then the student drops the course within the ten day time period that the student has to refute the charge. Once the student drops the course the sanction of a failing grade in the course or a zero on a certain exam can no longer be exercised. Vitek answered that the Academic Standards and Policy Committee of Faculty Council has already been asked to address this issue. We need a clearer statement of the policy of how the sanctions work if the student drops the course once the charges have been filed. Vitek stated that it has occurred that the Registrar's Office has reinstated the enrollment of a student so that sanctions can be exercised.

Khaled Gasem stated that more information could be presented to students about reasonable and appropriate behaviors through the web, for example. He related that students need clear and stable guidelines since the college-aged student is likely to be one who is "checking the limits" and "pushing the boundaries." Roy Achemire stated that the more extensive document about student rights and responsibilities that the Okmulgee campus now distributes to students is not as helpful as the brief, straight-forward, student handbook that they were accustomed to using. The handbook very specifically identified appropriate and not appropriate student behaviors, in a manner that the more extensive document does not. Vitek replied that brochure about student

rights and responsibilities was developed to provide a summary of the more extensive document and perhaps faculty at Okmulgee would find it helpful. Lee Bird interjected that the process is underway to define appropriate conduct across all the campuses. She hopes that once these standards are clarified that they can be made available in a variety of modes, such as orientation or on the web.

Birne Binengar asked about student conduct policy concerning computer use. Vitek replied that the ramifications of inappropriate computer use are addressed through various offices on campus. CIS has a policy about inappropriate computer use, so often that unit deals with the concern first, but then the student is referred to the Student Conduct Office. The Office tries to provide extensive process to the student who is in the situation of being expelled due to illegal computer use.

Jason Lavery indicated that new faculty or untenured faculty are often and incorrectly given the impression that the student has all the rights and the faculty member has all the responsibilities in a student conduct case. He encouraged Vitek to address this impression. He also ask about the terms of the specific outreach of the office to help students understand about plagiarism and especially about the use of the web to promote plagiarism among students. Vitek stated that her office attempts to address education about plagiarism through examples of legal entanglement caused by plagiarism. The concern is cautiously addressed with international students so that they clearly understand what plagiarism entails and what are the negative consequences. Vitek has asked the Writing Center to provide students with examples of plagiarism and information about how to correctly cite work and summarize the thoughts of other writers.

Ed Lawry asked about in cases of academic dishonesty when the faculty member writes the letter, sends it to all required parties, and includes in the letter the prescribed punishment does the Student Conduct Office ever negotiate a different result between the student and the faculty member, or does the office simply process the punishment prescribed in the letter. Vitek responded that the policy provides the faculty member the right to decide the punishment and her office does not negotiate on that issue. Certainly the student is counseled to go to a department head, for example, and attempt to work out a solution from that side of the issue or to resolve the concern in another way. Lawry indicated that some faculty members might be concerned about the student being sent to negotiate with the department head as inappropriate. Vitek indicated that process would be a normal part of the student appeal associated with the charge of misconduct. Mark Weiser added that many confusions could be avoided with clear statements on the syllabus. Lee Bird indicated that the more information students have the better they often perform. She also stated that the faculty member does not have the opportunity to place a specific student on probation or to cause expulsion from the University, but rather the faculty member provides the information to the Student Conduct Office to track a specific student through the courses with various professors to see if there is a need for probation or expulsion. Vitek added that students who come here from different institutions need to be assisted in their understanding of how OSU rules differ from their past institution.

Brad Bays asked about the reduction of cases concerning off-campus alcohol related arrests. Lee Bird responded that the University has not chosen to ignore these cases. In fact the core data about the problem is actually getting a little better. Students in this situation are often in double

jeopardy, clearly the Code of Conduct is not a legal document, but we want students to know that OSU is informed about their situations. We want students to know about the resources available to them, but they've already gone to court, they've already talked to the judge, and they've already been assigned to an educational sanction, so assigning them to meet with the Student Conduct Officer was often not received well. Requiring the student to meet with the Student Conduct Office did not have the effect of reducing the number of off-campus alcohol related arrests. Bays asked how many DUI's would result in the expulsion of a student from OSU. Bird indicated that the question had never had to be addressed for a specific student, but that several DUI's would possibly result in incarceration and certainly then the student could no longer be enrolled. It is viewed as a positive factor for a person who receives a DUI to then be able to successfully proceed in school after that.

Carol Moder posed a question about students who receive a second academic dishonesty charge and whether those students were suspended or expelled from the University. Vitek indicated that last semester a student had been suspended from the University for a second academic dishonesty charge. She indicated that most of the students who come into her office on an initial academic dishonesty charge have made some poor choices and are unlikely to repeat those behaviors after becoming more aware of the issue of plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty. Moder stated that in the English Department with so many composition classes in many cases the faculty or TA involved have already spent a great deal of time talking about standards, giving the students examples and giving warnings to students who do commit plagiarism. She said that by the time a student is officially charged the first time with academic dishonesty he or she is often a repeat offender. Vitek indicated that it was important to document the information and warnings to the student and to correctly file the case as either Academic Misconduct or Academic Dishonesty.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Schmidly 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. Schmidly reported at 02/11 meeting that the proposal needs further evaluation and the administration will continue to look at faculty salary issues.
- 01-05-01-CFSS ***Parking Policy:*** Pending response from Faculty Council Committee on survey results. Survey results from the HES Bureau of Social Research were presented to the Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security Committee in October. The committee will submit a written commentary regarding the survey to the OSU Parking and Traffic Rules Committee. President Schmidly reported that the CFS&SC gave their response to Geary Robinson on February 24 and a response should be received by Robinson that can be reported at the April meeting.
- 01-09-01-BUDG ***Formalization of the University Raise Program:*** Partially accepted (02/11/03). Budget implications were reviewed by the administration. Raises for faculty and staff remain a high priority; however, other mandatory increases must also be considered. July 1 effective date for

- raise programs was accepted. Remainder of recommendation not accepted, but administration is willing to discuss alternatives.
- 02-02-01-BUDG ***Athletic Department Deficit Reduction:*** Accepted (02/11/03). Athletic Director Birdwell is on target this year to reduce deficit by \$.5M, and will continue to enhance efforts to attempt to meet goal of five years. Total success not guaranteed.
- 02-04-01-LRPIT ***Information Technology Policy:*** Not accepted (02/11/03). Given reorganization plans regarding Information Tech and comments from Schmidly in 02/20/03 memorandum, the development of an IT policy should be coordinated with the CIO and designated as a priority for that individual when the position is filled.
- 02-12-01-ASP ***Policy on Final Exam Schedule for Distance Delivered Courses:*** Pending. UEIED Credit Course Committee met on March 3 to review the recommendation. Results of the discussion will be presented to the University Extension Council on March 10 for consideration and recommendation to Academic Affairs.
- 02-12-04-RFB ***Maternity/Family Leave Recommendation:*** Pending. The Leave Task Force of the Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee is considering this and other recommendations on leave.
- 03-02-01-ASP ***Revision of P&P Letter 2-0206 Dropping and Adding Courses and Withdrawing from the University:*** Pending. Proposed revisions will be reviewed by the Council of Student Academic Services Directors and discussed with Student Government representatives. Policy revisions will be delayed until the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Marketing has an opportunity to review and provide input.
- 03-02-02-ATH ***Tracking Athletes:*** Pending. Referred to the Office of University Assessment for possible inclusion in the university-wide assessment plan. Recommendation will also be referred to the Athletic Council for input.
- 03-02-04-RFB ***Change to the Employee Sick Leave Cap:*** Pending. A similar recommendation is being considered by Staff Advisory Council. As such, the administration would like to study input received from both groups prior to formulating a response.
- 03-02-05-RFB ***Implementation of a (457b) Deferred Compensation Plan:*** Accepted. A recommendation to establish a 457b plan was presented to and approved by the OSU Board of Regents at their meeting on March 7.
- 03-03-01-RES ***Guidelines for Disbursement of University Start-Up Funds:*** To President Schmidly.
- 03-02-06-EXEC ***Tulsa Bus Policy:*** To President Schmidly.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

Gelfand reported the committee talked about the possibility of formalizing a procedure to insure that faculty will have input in budget-related decisions made at the university level. He had meet with Joe Weaver regarding this matter and Joe said, at least informally speaking, that he or someone else from the Budget Office would be able to attend the FC Budget Committee

meetings once every month or two. The committee was concerned about what to do in those situations when some sort of emergency cut or something like that occurred and Joe agreed that in those situations he would contact Gelfand and they would either meet or he would try and get other members of the Budget Committee together to meet with him. Gelfand wanted to get feedback from Council on whether the procedure should be formalized or not. Right now Gelfand feels they have a good working relationship with Joe.

The second issue discussed was Block Tuition. The committee decided they would like to meet with either Joe Weaver or David Bosserman to find out details of the program before deciding whether or not they had any input. On March 10, Weaver met with the Budget Committee and they were given a one-page proposal of the fee structure associated with Block Tuition. Gelfand would also like to hear from the faculty community about this matter. He will provide Masters with the one-page handout to post on the Faculty Council website (facultycouncil.okstate.edu), faculty can review and get back to Gelfand with questions or comments. Only details regarding the fee structure are available at this time. There is still no information on the academic side. They still need to get some kind of outline in regard to drop/add policies, whether there will be some kind of disincentive to sign up for a lot of classes and then drop them. One thing they had thought about was the possibility of having an add day that extends one day beyond the drop day so that if a large number of students drop courses then there would be a second day to add those courses. With respect to that issue, the committee encouraged Gelfand to encourage administration to delay making any final decisions concerning Block Tuition until the Faculty Council has had the opportunity to examine any proposal.

The second Tuesday of each month the Office of State Finance issues a news release talking about the state of the Oklahoma budget. Gelfand had gone on-line just before FC meeting and briefly read the report. Again, the February revenue collection receipts were still lower than expected. They did not rebound as some on the Board thought it would. Accordingly, the State issued an order that State Agency allocations be reduced by an annualized rate of 7.85 percent. To put that in perspective, as of December the different agencies were required to cut their annual budgets by 6.5 percent. This is an addition of 1.35 percent more. Since there are four more months in the fiscal year that number will be multiplied by two. OSU was actually cut around 6 or 6.05 percent. Weaver said since the report had just been received they had not been able to study it in detail but what they have been expecting is on the order of 1.4 percent. The cuts implemented last month, across campus, appear more than sufficient to meet the announcements of further cuts.

President Schmidly commented on the Block Tuition remarks made earlier in regard to waiting until the faculty had input and he felt that was perfectly acceptable. He and President Boren had met with the Chancellor to discuss this issue and it was decided not to take tuition to the State Regents until the June 30th meeting. That means that we will not ask our Board to approve it until their June 20th meeting. There will also be at least one more meeting with the students to discuss this issue and it will probably be toward the end of April right before final exams so they will be aware before they leave campus what the situation is likely to be. The reason for waiting so long is to wait and see what the State is going to provide in the way of funding so only the least amount will have to be raised. Moder said the one part of it that had not been discussed was the academic side. Is there going to be a penalty for drops, are there going to be advisor

holds, etc.? The President said they would have to work through all those questions. He would welcome any input from faculty. Finances will have to dictate whether it will be done or not and that is what will have to be approved by the OSU and State Regents. The mechanics can be worked out internally to make sure that other concerns mentioned are taken care of.

President Schmidly mentioned the formalization of the Budget Committee meeting with someone from the Budget Office and Lawry said he thought Gelfand and Weaver had an informal arrangement and that Gelfand could give a report to the FC Executive Committee in May (the last Council meeting before the changeover) about how things have gone.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY & SECURITY — Khaled Gasem

Gasem reported that a set of suggestions and guidelines were sent to Geary Robinson on Feb. 24 as reported earlier on how best to proceed with improved parking on campus. They are now awaiting his decision and feedback.

FACULTY — Sue Redwood

In response to the request to review the draft Racial and Ethnic Harassment policy, the Faculty Committee believes that one policy should be developed to address all types of harassment. It is clear to the Committee that there is a need for such a policy, but the Committee was concerned that the victims of harassment may not be well served by different policies for different types of harassment. For example, if procedures for addressing one type of harassment are not the same as procedures for other types of harassment, it may result in differential treatment and confusion. In addition, in some cases there may be more than one type of harassment involved. The Faculty Committee believes that the draft Racial and Ethnic Harassment policy could be used as the basis for an umbrella policy that covers all forms of harassment. The Committee will seek assistance from Administration in identifying all existing university policies that are relevant to harassment (e.g., the Sexual Harassment Policy, the Workplace Threats and Violence Policy), so that one policy addressing all forms of harassment can be developed without creating inconsistencies. With this information, the Faculty Committee could make a recommendation for one policy that addresses all forms of harassment.

The Faculty Committee received a recommendation from the Student Affairs and Learning Resources Committee to consider a resolution allowing OSU faculty to accept teaching positions at NOC-Stillwater for additional compensation. The Faculty Committee encourages all interested faculty to transmit their opinions regarding this issue for consideration during the committee's review process.

President Schmidly and Earl Mitchell both suggested that Council come forward with a formal recommendation on the harassment issue to present to administration.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING & INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Birne Binengar

On behalf of the LRPITC, Binengar thanked President Schmidly for his prompt consideration of the FC IT policy recommendation. Even though this recommendation was not accepted, the committee greatly appreciated the letter from the President detailing his concerns with the draft policy. Indeed, the LRPITC understood well his reservations about adopting an IT policy just prior to the arrival of the new VP/CIO. The LRPITC hoped to meet with the President even

before the arrival of the new VP/CIO to share with him a faculty perspective on IT at OSU. President Schmidly welcomed this, and even offered the LRPITC a chance to meet with the candidates for VP/CIO.

New issues being considered by the committee are:

– The development of an "Illicit Computer Use Policy"; so that appropriate standards of due process are maintained when illicit computer use is suspected. The President asked if the committee had looked at what some other institutions are doing and Binegar replied that what is known about other institutions is what is read in headlines. He thought that this was usually handled on an individual case basis. Binegar said any input or suggestions could be forwarded to him and the committee would look into it.

Next considered is the lack of consistency and problems with accessibility in OSU's web space. The LRPITC has noted that there are many inconsistencies in OSU's web space. For example, if one uses the search form on www.okstate.edu to find the Faculty Council homepage, one can end up at an obsolete version, without knowing it is the obsolete version. They suspect that outdated and erroneous pages abound in the OSU web space. They are also concerned that OSU web pages are not generally in compliance with accessibility standards mandated by state and federal laws. President Schmidly commented that he had also received feedback from others in regard to the difficulty of maneuvering through the web and the fact that you can end up in different places. He feels whoever is brought in to manage information technology will have an expectation that one of the first things that individual takes on is doing all they can to dramatically improve the web site, the consistency and appearance of it and to work with the LRP&IT committee to make sure the issues of accountability and compliance are dealt with. It is a well-known fact that young people are making decisions on their college choice based on the quality of the web site. That is a major goal President Schmidly has for the reorganization on information technology. Bear asked if OSU-Tulsa would be included. Vitek said that on March 10 in the SWAT Analysis for the system these issues were all brought up as part of the strengths and weaknesses to make sure that there is a system web page that you can go to, in terms of getting into the system, and they will try and link all of the units within the system. That SWAT Analysis will eventually be published on the web.

RESEARCH — John Damicone

The Research Committee has a recommendation on the guidelines proposed by the VPR office for the distribution of University "Start-up" for new faculty positions.

The term "University start-up" refers to funds given to new faculty positions for jump-starting research in addition to those provided by the college. These funds are leveraged through negotiations between the VPR and College Research Directors.

The Research Committee supports the idea of developing guidelines for distribution of start-up monies because:

- 1) a competitive start-up program is essential in the recruitment of a first-rate faculty
- 2) guidelines are necessary to ensure fairness

OSU currently has a limited University start-up program and in addition to recommending that the guidelines be approved, we are recommending increased support for the program as funds permit.

Modifications to the proposed guidelines were developed using the input of faculty who responded to a list-serve request.

Modifications proposed by the Research Committee center on 1) eligibility for start-up funds, 2) the funding period, and 3) eligible expenses.

The committee chose not to limit the program to “those who have the potential to generate significant F&A” but rather to include all whose work will “contribute to the research mission of the University”. This modification was based on the rationale that the investment in start-up for new faculty will better equip them to compete for external fund, which will in turn generate more F&A.

The funding period was increased from 18 months to 24 months to allow for completion of meaningful research by those supported by start-up funds.

The allowed amount of expenses for salaries were increased to reflect the need for many new faculty to hire people to do research.

Moder complimented the committee and said she thought this was a model of getting faculty input, incorporating it, working with the administration and she added they had done an excellent job. Lawry added that Joe Alexander should also be complimented for working so well with the committee.

Gasem offered a friendly amendment to reinsert the word “instrumentation” that had been deleted in the original version of the recommendation. Damicone agreed. President Schmidly asked for any other comments. Wetzel called the question and Gasem seconded. A vote was taken and the recommendation passed unanimously.

Damicone said the Research Committee is also working to finalize a recommendation on the creation of a “research infrastructure fund” to support research service facilities on campus that serve multiple colleges.

RETIREMENT & FRINGE BENEFITS — Sally Henderson

Henderson said that last month she mentioned that the presentation that was made to Faculty Council is available on the web and in the February Minutes a link to her e-mail was made available and she is still waiting on any response anyone would like to make. She also said there would be a flier distributed very soon announcing approximately nine different meeting places to have faculty and staff see this same presentation on all the campuses in various locations.

RULES & PROCEDURES — Brad Bays

Bays reported on the Faculty Council election. Ballots will be mailed no later than Friday, March 14. Faculty will have two weeks to complete and return ballots by March 28. The three candidates for Vice Chair are Birne Binegar, Mathematics; Sally Henderson, Veterinary Technology, OSU/OKC; and Lionel Raff, Chemistry. Faculty nominees for Councilor positions are: College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources: Tim Bowser, Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering; Jerry Fitch, Animal Science; Thomas Phillips, Entomology and Plant Pathology; and Bob Terry (retired), Agricultural Education. College of Arts and Sciences: Linda Austin, English; Carlos Cordova, Geography, Allen Finchum, Geography, Reuel Hanks, Geography, Mahesh Rao, Geography, Marcella Sirhandi, Art, Steve Stadler, Geography, and John te Velde, Foreign Languages and Literatures. College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology: Gary Gipson, Civil and Environmental Engineering and A. J. Johannes, Chemical Engineering. College of Education: Pat Lamphere-Jordan, Curriculum and Educational Leadership and Marie Miville, Applied Health and Educational Psychology. Library: Daniel Chaney, Social Sciences; Tanya Finchum, Government Documents; and Barbara Miller, Government Documents. OSU-Tulsa: Bill Dare, Finance and Jami Fullerton, School of Journalism and Broadcasting. No representatives have been nominated to represent OSU-Okmulgee. Winners will be announced at the April 8 Faculty Council meeting.

President Schmidly announced that he had just been told that the Education Lottery had just passed the House 52 to 49.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Pat Lamphere-Jordan

Lamphere-Jordan reported that Dr. Earl Mitchell had been attending their meetings regularly and they appreciated his input and he has been informing them in regard to activities across campus on Cultural Awareness and Diversity Training. He continues to work with faculty in reviewing and planning courses on multicultural issues and work with various student groups. Currently, he is conducting a study involving minority faculty and their perception of the environment in which they teach and work.

Secondly, as requested by the Committee, Dr. Lee Bird and Dr. Harry Birdwell responded to several concerns regarding students. Two separate incidents had occurred during pre-finals week, last fall and the Committee was seeking additional information about these two incidents. Based on the information, the Committee has decided to seek further information from the Director of Greek Life and the Athletic Committee.

Thirdly, The University Library Advisory Committee met on February 12 and discussed the budget, a survey on the use of laptop computers at the library, and the plans to celebrate the 50th anniversary. Under discussion was an article written by Dr. Johnson which appeared in the February 14, 2003 edition of the Chronicle for Higher Education. The article was in support of the defeat of the Uniform Computer Information Transactions Act (UCITA) that would prohibit fair licensing agreements between libraries and software vendors and publishers. President Schmidly said he had read the article and that it was very good. The 50th anniversary celebration will continue throughout the spring, summer, and fall. The celebration will culminate in a "Friends of the Library Dinner" featuring Ken Burns as the speaker.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:**Graduate and Professional Student Government Association – Chris Meador**

Chris announced the Graduate & Professional Student Government Association (GPSGA) and the Graduate College were proud to present the winners for the 14th Annual Research Symposium presentations. The winners were picked by GPSGA members based on feedback from the judges and scores awarded by the judges for the presentation. Winners were as follows:

Best Overall Paper Presentation: (\$250)

Art McGovern – Health Benefits of Expressive Writing and Talking

Best Overall Poster Presentation: (\$250)

Emily Blackwood – Molecular and Immunological Analysis of the Outer Membrane Protein plpE from *Mannheimia haemolytica* Serotypes 1, 2, and 6

The following winners received \$50 each:

Biology

Paper Presentation: Valerie Horncastle – Associations of Eastern Red Cedar and Community Structure of Small Mammals

Poster Presentation: Bharat Joshi – Distribution and Partial Characterization of PBJs, a Novel Plasmid of the Phytopathogen *Spiroplasma Citri*

Physical Sciences

Paper Presentation: Austin Gilbert – Network Proximity Based Dynamic Clustering for Building Large-Scale Distributed Systems

Poster Presentation: Xun Jin – Developing the Adapted Life Cycle Assessment to Assess the Environmental Performance of Industrial Processes in the Context of Sustainability

Social Sciences

Paper Presentation: Terry Jones – The Hidden Agenda of Darius I in the Behistun Inscription

Poster Presentation: Elaine Fernandez – Comprehending Anaphoric and Cataphoric Pronouns

Education:

Paper Presentation: Alan D'souza – Freshmen in Transition (Fit) at Oklahoma State University: An Evaluation

Poster Presentation: Sandralee Moynihan – The Effects of Self-Efficacy and Competence on ACT Achievement Scores in Math and Science

Environmental Sciences

Paper Presentation: Ekaterina Ermilova – Comparative Analysis of Wind Energy Production in Oklahoma

Poster Presentation: There was only one poster in this area so it was combined with Biological Sciences

There will be an awards ceremony held during the second week of April to present the winners their checks. The time and place is being arranged by the GPSGA. It should be announced on their web site at: <http://orgs.okstate.edu/gpsa/> and winners should receive an email.

Chris added that there was great concern in the way the graduate tuition waiver recommendation was handled and that graduate students were not asked for their input and they are greatly

affected by any changes regarding this issue. He hopes that when this is brought up again the graduates will be allowed to express their opinions.

Staff Advisory Council – La Dawn Conners

The Policy, Benefits and Budget Committee are studying the recommendation from the Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee to upcap sick leave. The committee was also asked to look at the racial and ethnic harassment policy and they have made recommendation regarding that. SAC passed a recommendation requesting Martin Luther King Day be considered a university holiday. The administration supported their recommendation to increase the Distinguished Service Award to \$750. The Bureau for Social Research recently completed the data analysis for the Child Care Survey that was sent out in 2002 and the results available. SAC has begun their Scholarship Fund Drive for 2003 and you will be receiving more information regarding that. The SAC March 12 Agenda includes an update from Dr. David Bosserman. President Schmidly requested that he be sent a copy of the Child Care Survey and Conners replied “absolutely.” The President said he thought he had found a foundation where a proposal could be submitted. Dr. Bosserman asked who on the Faculty Council should be contacted in regard to the Martin Luther King Day issue and Lawry replied, “the Executive Committee.”

President Schmidly introduced Travis Cagle as the new Student Government representative. Travis said he did not have a report but thanked everyone that made him feel welcome and he enjoyed meeting everyone.

OLD BUSINESS:

Lawry moved that the Tulsa Bus Policy recommendation, that was “tabled” last month, be brought off the table. Moder seconded. This passed unanimously. The recommendation is as follows:

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: the University adopt the policy that faculty and staff who ride the busses from Stillwater to Tulsa or from Tulsa to Stillwater in order to conduct University business, including research, advising, teaching, university related meetings and university sponsored events not be charged a fee for such transportation. The policy should grant a space priority for students and faculty who are traveling for classes so that others should be accommodated on a space available basis. The policy should be reevaluated after the first of June, 2003.

Rationale:

1. Faculty or staff who now live in Tulsa, but who are not assigned to the Tulsa campus and commute to work in Stillwater have been charged to take the bus on the grounds that it is voluntary that they live where they do and should not have their travel to work subsidized by the University since it doesn't do this for faculty or staff who live in Oklahoma City or Edmond or any other Oklahoma town outside of the city where their primary work assignment is located. However, the idea of “one university, two campuses” suggests that when a person shows up either on the campus in Stillwater or in Tulsa, they are “at work” and are entitled to the support of the university regarding working conditions.
2. There are already situations, and more will arise, where a person works either in Stillwater or Tulsa and their spouse works on the other campus. One of the spouses would have to sacrifice their transportation time already.

3. Tulsa faculty already face the necessity of making trips to Stillwater for departmental meetings and to interact with colleagues for professional reasons, and in some cases for the sake of securing support through personal interactions with colleagues who will vote on their tenure.
4. Some faculty need to travel to the other campus for research reasons, particularly to use the library resources of Stillwater.
5. Occasionally there may be speakers of note who faculty want to hear on the other campus, but because of the charge have a disincentive to attend such academic events.
6. Free travel on the busses will underscore the idea of solidarity of the two campuses and facilitate the professional work of the faculty.

President Schmidly called for a vote. This recommendation passed unanimously.

In other Old Business Moder asked the President if Judge Morris might have submitted his report to the Regents and asked if he was aware of that. He replied he had not seen it and did not know anything about it yet.

NEW BUSINESS:

Moder clarified that the reason the Graduate Tuition Waiver Plan recommendation that was attached to the Agenda was removed, was because between the time the Agenda was set and this meeting, she had met with a number of university administrators on behalf of the Faculty Council, including Dean Pettibone, and they have determined that at this point they are going to seek some faculty consultation on the issue. Moder asked Dr. Vitek if he would like to comment. Vitek said they were going to have the graduates look at it. There are some major problems with the way the money is being used currently and they really want that to be looked at so they are maximizing the use of those dollars to recruit students, not to just simply give entitlements away in terms of 30 students in a program divided by the amount of money and hand each student \$33 which was the low value of the award last year. Lawry asked who formulated the policy. Vitek replied he was involved with this policy for ten years and they had watched it change to where it became an entitlement program for every graduate in the program rather than having faculty actively recruiting students. Given the pressure on in-state fee waivers this was a way to say “we want them used in a very serious manner for recruitment purposes or we shouldn’t simply be dividing and giving them out in small increments as an entitlement.” Lawry commented that a policy like this certainly has important academic implications for the graduate program and this was deeply puzzling to many of the faculty why this was not discussed with either the Graduate Faculty Council or any other group before the policy was announced on the 28th.

The meeting adjourned at 4:56 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is April 8, 2003.

Brenda Masters, Secretary