

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
November 11, 2003

Carol Moder called the meeting to order with the following members present: Arquitt, Austin, Bays, Bilbeisi, Binegar, Chaney, Damicone, Ebro, Gelfand, Greiner, Henderson, Johannes, Lamphere-Jordan, Martin, Morgan, Murray, Phillips, Raff, Redwood, Sirhandi, te Velde, Van Delinder, and Weiser. Also present: T. Agnew, L. Bird, T. Dark, G. Gates, S. Harp, D. Hunt, B. Ivy, E. Lawry, H. Meyer, E. Mitchell, V. Mitchell, S. Murray, M. Strathe, J. Weaver, G. Webb, and G. Wiggins. Absent: Fullerton, Gasem, Lehenbauer, Mokhtari, Mott, and Terry

HIGHLIGHTS

Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	2
Reorganization of the IT Division	2
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	5
Recommendation – Awarding Posthumous Degrees.....	5
Recommendation – Retention of Grade Books and Records.....	6
Athletics	6
Recommendation – Representation of OSU in the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA).....	6
Budget	7
Faculty.....	9
Recommendation – Inclusion of the Words “Sexual Orientation” in Sections 1.02, 1.04, and 1.06 of the University’s Equal Opportunity/ Affirmative Action Policy 1-0101	10
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology	10
Research.....	11
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	12
Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee: Cafeteria Plan Recommendations (Spring 2002).....	12
Rules and Procedures.....	12
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Arts & Sciences Faculty Council.....	13
Staff Advisory Council	13
New Business.....	13

Lamphere-Jordan moved acceptance of the October 14, 2003 Minutes. Henderson seconded. The Minutes were approved. Henderson moved the November 11, 2003 Agenda be approved. Van Delinder seconded. The Agenda was approved.

**REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:
President Schmidly, Provost, and Vice Presidents**

- 01-04-01-BUDG ***Market-Driven Salary Increase to Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:***
Administration will continue to look at faculty salary issues. Special award program for Fall 2003, and funding for salaries will be shared with the Equity consultant.
- 02-12-04-RFB ***Maternity/Family Leave Recommendation:*** Pending. With completion of the Big 12 survey, administration is now finalizing a proposal for further consideration by appropriate faculty and staff committees.
- 03-02-06-EXEC ***Tulsa Bus Policy:*** Pending. An interim procedure on commuting to/from Tulsa on a “walk-up” and “space available” basis has been implemented. Moder has designated K. Gasem to continue discussions with the administration. Consideration is also being given to providing a shuttle bus to OKC with possible Jan. 1 start up date.
- 03-10-02-RFB ***Long Term Disability Policy (3-07500):*** Pending. Currently being reviewed by Legal Counsel.
- 03-10-03-EXEC ***Program Curricular Requirements:*** Rejected as stated; however, the OSU administration affirms the central role of the faculty in the development and evaluation of undergraduate degree programs which meet the OSRHE and OSU academic regulations for degree structures.
- 03-11-01-ASP ***Awarding Posthumous Degrees:*** To President Schmidly
- 03-11-02-ASP ***Retention of Grade Books and Records:*** To President Schmidly
- 03-11-04-FAC ***Inclusion of the Words “Sexual Orientation” in Sections 1.02, 1.04, and 1.06 of the University’s Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy I-0101:*** To President Schmidly
- 03-10-01-RFB ***Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee: Cafeteria Plan Recommendations (Spring 2002):*** To President Schmidly

SPECIAL REPORT: Reorganization of the IT Division — Gary Wiggins

Dr. Wiggins, Information Technology Vice President, distributed a handout regarding the status of IT’s reorganization and the next steps involved in the process. Wiggins said the IT program has five departments: institutional research and information management; software services; technology operations; technology support; and, telecommunications. OSU has filled director positions in three of those five departments and placed interim directors in the other two. Some employees have been assigned to new departments and duties and the IT units at the other OSU campuses have been moved into the IT division. Wiggins said next steps include a complete assessment of needs and reassignments of employees in the IT program; fill the two director’s positions now held by Interims; decide the future direction of ETS; review distributed IT activities; distance and technology supported education; and high performance computing. There are still a number of employees who are doing things that have not been fully evaluated as to whether it is the most effective things for them to be doing. There are still a number of employees who perhaps could be more effective in other departments. Wiggins also said OSU must decide what role Education Television Services will play in IT’s future. The ETS department has been around a good while and under a fairly unusual business model. It is supposed to simultaneously function as an auxiliary selling its services and to ESPN and to

whatever other external entities that wish to purchase its services but it is also supposed to function in some ways as a service organization of the university receiving university funds and providing services to support teaching and research and yet it still sometimes bills the university for those services sometimes in competition with other units within the IT Division or within the colleges that provide the same services free and in doing all that it has also gotten itself involved in cost-accounting models and others things that add a certain element of confusion to the discussion. One question is what should ETS be and how should it be structured and that is part of a broader question on how should support for distance and technology education be delivered across the OSU system. There are various models under discussion and one is to let ETS function as an auxiliary enterprise. Let it sell services to Athletics and to external parties and let the service to the university, the support for teaching, for academic enterprises, for research be handled by other units in the IT Division and not be directly billed to the party. That is not the only business model for ETS but is a possibility. In regard to reviewing distributed IT activities, Wiggins said certain services and activities are best handled within units outside the IT division. There really is an advantage for someone running a department, college or other organization, to have his or her people right there responsible to him or her and on immediate call. On the other hand, things like running networks that were done not because anyone thought it was a good idea but because people felt that they were not able to obtain the service any other way. These decisions need to be made before the start of next fiscal year. As far as how distance and technology supported education are going to be supported, Wiggins said a first modest step is that a group is being convened to do a "poor man's" environmental scan to identify the current situation. This group will identify capabilities across the system and when that is done the next step will be to see how those sets of capabilities will merge with current needs and desires. These should become clear as units do strategic planning in areas at all institutions. Steve McKeever and Wiggins have had some conversations regarding high performance computing for research. First rounds of discussions with faculty will begin this month to discuss where OSU needs to go in high performance computing. Three standing committees have been formed and have begun meeting. They are Strategic Advisory, Technical Advisory and Student groups. Binegar said it was his understanding that there were no faculty members on the Strategic Advisory Group and Wiggins replied this group was perhaps ill-named because it was intended to be a group at the administrative level. They are tenured faculty but are also administrators. There is one representative from each of the external campuses (very senior people) and from the Stillwater campus, the Provost, a couple of VP's and a couple of Deans. This was initially designed as a management group. Wiggins added there was significant faculty representation on the technical group. Weiser asked Wiggins to go over what the main purpose of the Strategic Advisory Group is. Wiggins replied two-fold – first to learn what the senior administrators at the other campuses and this campus are thinking about policy issues and second to let them know what the IT Division is thinking about policy issues. Weiser asked if they were looking at strategic issues of IT and Wiggins replied "yes, or perhaps more appropriately the IT implications of strategic issues. Weiser said concerns had been raised that faculty were not in this group. Binegar said, except for Wiggins, he did not see any members of this group that had any expertise in strategic planning for IT. Wiggins said the kind of issues he would discuss with that group does not necessarily require them to be technicians. He feels it is very important for the senior administrators to tell the IT division what they are doing and to discuss the IT implications of it and vice versa and how that impacts their long-term activities. It does not bother him that they are not technical people. Strathe said she is on that committee and they

have discussed a lot of things that need to be undertaken, for example, a student information management system on the campus or how to blend with the other campuses. She sees this more as trying to help Wiggins and his people identify how to order their priorities. They can not do everything at once and there is only a limited amount of money to spend. Wiggins added there are also things on the order of development of an internet portal to deliver all kinds of services. Moder said it is still not clear why it would not be useful to have a representative of the faculty discussing issues or there to provide additional perspectives about those policies, strategies, or issues. She continued, there are other committees similar to this that advise the administration and have faculty representatives on them. She feels strategy and policy are things in which the faculty should have input. Wiggins said he would think about that. Raff asked about the Student Technology Fee Committee no longer existing and asked Wiggins if he was aware that when the Tech Fee was started the students agreed to pay it because they would have control of it and Wiggins answered, "yes." He continued, that when he came to OSU he was told about this committee and spoke to the Chair, Ed Johnson, and Dean Johnson told him the students voted on specific expenditures down to a lot of detail and that last year student participation had been limited or nil. Wiggins said he worked with the leaders in Student Government and really felt that the right way to manage the Student Tech Fee, as to manage all OSU's resources, is to figure out, with the students, the student advisory committee and the Student Government Association, what sorts of services they want and need and where they need to be going, but not to put every single software acquisition or every single decision about infrastructure to a vote. Wiggins feels like the kinds of things that need to be discussed with the students are what kinds of services need to be delivered and not whether to put five PC's with two firewalls in a lab or not but that they have a lab that works. Wiggins said he proposed a change in the way it was managed and it was approved. Raff asked, "by the Student Government Association" and Wiggins replied, "by the President of the university and the blessing of SGA." He added it was during the summer and Council was not meeting. Raff said Wiggins's plan might be better but the fact is that Council agreed with the students that they would control it and there is a matter of ethics involved. Raff said, "if you get a positive vote from the Student Government Association giving this up I would agree it's okay." Wiggins said it would be taken under advisement. Wiggins said other IT division committees include the Security Committee and Distance Education Infrastructure Review. Other groups in which they have routine and on-going contact are the Faculty Council IT committee, Student Government Association, Graduate and Professional Student Government Association and Staff Advisory Council. A planned group that does not exist yet is what they are calling a Private Industry Council. Wiggins said he felt it was important to have representatives from the IT industry serving as a technical advisory committee and they are planning on putting such a group together during 2004. The last page of the handout listed seven "Draft Strategic Goals" which included academic excellence; infrastructure; integrated IT environment; research and public service; partnerships, collaborations, and quality service; people and recognition; and management strategy. Sirhandi asked how much interaction there was between the standing committees and were they sharing information. Wiggins replied, "not yet but that was a good idea." Raff asked if Wiggins had any ideas formulated yet about high-tech computing and research. He and his colleagues have found that central mainframes are albatross and that is not the way to conduct research anymore. Wiggins said at a minimum he felt OSU should get some fairly good clusters going and provide some expertise for people to use the clusters. He feels that going forward from that, since there are some small clusters already around campus, OSU needs to look at some great computing relationships to leverage all that.

He thinks computing needs to be looked at more broadly than in just clusters. He feels there is great middleware out there, for example, that will let you utilize things like Intel-based lab machines. It does not work for everything but for some things it works very well on. Whether a shared memory machine is needed for things like visualization is something he really does not know yet but this needs to be discussed with the researchers and with others. Wiggins added he did not feel a mainframe for research was needed. He does feel some very robust clusters are needed. They are very economical and right now we have too many people having to include 24 clusters in their grant where if we had something already available that was perhaps a little more powerful than that and with staff support he feels things could be leveraged better. Those are preliminary thoughts. Ebro asked if ETS was still receiving money from Kellogg and Wiggins replied if they were he was unaware of it. Phillips asked if Wiggins envisioned that services provided by other subdivisions of IT would provide their services free of charge and Wiggins replied, "yes" and added there obviously was a limit but baseline he felt IT services should not be billed out to academic units. Binagar said in Spring 2001 a Faculty Council resolution was passed in regard to an IT policy. Negotiations continued and that was during the time when President Schmidly was hired. It was rejected because a new VP for IT was about to be hired and the President felt that a discussion of a new IT policy should not proceed until the new VP arrived. Wiggins said he had agreed that he and the FC LRP&IT Chair would talk and then Wiggins would provide a written response to that policy. He and the Chair agreed this had not happened and they would contact each other to set up a time to meet.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Andrea Arquitt

Arquitt reported this month the committee is examining Academic Dishonesty policies from the Big 12 schools and comparing them to the current OSU policy. They will begin re-writing this policy in the next month. The committee has asked their undergraduate representative to take the concept of an honor policy to the Student Government Association because they believe it needs to come from them. They continue to be concerned with transfer GPA standards. The committee has received a proposed transfer policy from Academic Affairs, but is seeking further data from Institutional Research before making any recommendations for changing OSU's standards. They have been presented with a proposed new degree – Bachelor of University Studies. This proposed degree originated in the university office of Academic Affairs. The committee will be examining the need for the degree and comparing it to generalist degrees already available on campus prior to making any recommendations.

Arquitt presented the two following recommendations:

Title: Awarding Posthumous Degrees

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: the policy for awarding posthumous degrees be accepted.

Rationale:

Awarding posthumous degrees is allowed by State Regents for Higher Education in recognition of students with degrees in progress (II-2-44).

Awarding such degrees prematurely does not affect the integrity of degrees awarded during commencement because the degree is not in a discipline and is of a different design than the earned degree diploma.

Awarding such degrees is an expression of recognition for the loss of a student that the university can offer to a family.

te Velde asked if somewhere around 50% constituted a majority of what was meant about meeting course requirements and Arquitt replied, "yes, a simple majority." Raff asked if the entire AS&P committee was unanimous in recommending this and Arquitt replied, "yes."

After no other discussion, the recommendation was voted on and passed unanimously.

The next recommendation Arquitt presented is as follows:

Title: Retention of Grade Books and Records

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: policy 2-0214 be amended to reflect State Regents for Higher Education policies on retention of grade records, records of course requirements and materials and records of comprehensive examinations.

Rationale: The current policy for retention of grade records for only 6 months is not consistent with the retention requirements of the State Regents for Higher Education policy. The revised policy provides direction to faculty regarding the materials that must be retained for course documentation, records of course grades and conditions for removal of an "I" grade, and records of completed comprehensive examinations. This revised policy statement incorporates those archival requirements from the State Regents for Higher Education that apply to faculty members

The recommendation was voted on and passed unanimously.

ATHLETICS — Don Murray

Murray distributed a handout regarding "Classification and Major of OSU Student Athletes – Spring 2003" which was compiled from data provided by the Office of the Registrar. The Athletics Committee had an interest in what athletes were majoring in. They contacted Dr. Gail Gates and through the Registrar's Office received a listing of students, both scholarship and non-scholarship, by sports, gender, major and classification. They found from the information that the students seem to be evenly spread throughout the listings of majors. They asked for no names or grades.

Murray then presented the following recommendation:

Title: Representation of OSU in the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA)

The Faculty Council moves that: Oklahoma State University be represented in the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) with the Faculty Council appointing an appropriate liaison.

Rationale:

- The committee feels that the potential representation of OSU in the COIA is significant enough that the recommendation to join this organization be discussed and considered by the entire Faculty Council.
- The purpose of this organization is to cause national reform of intercollegiate athletics
- The COIA is primarily a faculty driven process to bring about reform
- The NCAA and COIA are collaborating
- The COIA seeks comprehensive reform that would affect five broad categories:
 1. Academics
 2. Student Welfare

3. Finances and Scale
 4. Commercialization
 5. Governance
- NCAA Executive Summary – September 3, 2003
 1. Enhance Academic Standards
 2. Increase Accountability for Academic Success
 3. Improve Measurements of Academic Success
 4. Adjust Student-Athlete Time Demands
 5. Strengthen Fiscal Responsibility, Management, and Stability
 6. Improve the Student-Athlete Experience
 - The NCAA is currently the recognized governing body of intercollegiate athletics
 - The Athletic Committee was unanimous in their opinion that the OSU representative to the COIA should strive for equal reform for both the student athlete and the general student body. Each student group should be expected to achieve and be held to equal goals.

The recommendation passed with one “opposed.”

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

Gelfand reported several faculty including him, Carol Moder and Lionel Raff had met with the salary consultant and were told that he would do two studies. The first study was a comparison study with OSU salaries to salaries of faculty members in other schools. He had met with OSU deans and asked them to give him a list of 10 to 15 peer institutions for comparison. Rather compare department to department, they were actually going to break it down to codes of instructional programs. The report will be completed in approximately two months. People that look at the report will have the flexibility to include cost of living comparisons if they desire. The second study will be an intra-university study to look at gender and ethnicity comparisons and salaries. They will look at the date of terminal degree year of faculty as they felt this would be the best mode of comparison. On another issue Gelfand said that at the University Budget Committee meeting two months ago, it was announced that Joe Weaver was going to put together a small committee to look at tuition and fee calculations. A number of possible fee and tuition structures were discussed. It was reported last month that a new arrangement for student fees has been proposed: rather than having student fees associated with different programs and then the money going directly to those programs, there would be some sort of centralized fee that would be attached to all credit hours of all students and then the fees would be distributed back to the departments. The second proposal is that tuition which now is different for 1000 and 2000 level classes as opposed to 3000 and 4000 level classes would all be made at the same rate. One of the things Weaver told them is that if someone asks the President, “how much does tuition cost for a student at OSU,” there is not one answer. Many of the faculty at this meeting were concerned about this fee proposal. The concern was if there was just a general fee that would then be distributed to the departments then they would not have any sort of control over the amount of revenues they would get to cover the costs associated with the fees as it is structured now. Arquitt said she understood that course fees are regulated to only be allowed to cover expenses. So if you structure a fee system and apply it to all courses is that appropriate with the State Regents? Weaver replied it would have to be cost based. Arquitt asked if it was appropriate for a student in English to be funding the fees that are required for an Engineering

lab and would the State Regents say that was appropriate. Weaver said the purpose of this committee is to figure out how to simplify OSU's billing and make it easier to articulate to our publics what costs are. Weaver said another issue discussed was to define what is in a course fee and what did tuition pay for. In answer to Arquitt's earlier question Weaver said tuition rates are exactly the same for all students in all programs and yet it costs more to go to Engineering or Chemistry, for example, than it does Sociology. Course fees are a third of the cost for tuition. Binigar added even though the current system might be complicated he thought the students would appreciate knowing what they were paying for. Johannes said he perceived it that large tuition increases are only a minuscule amount of the cost to run a university and what has happened over the years is that fees have been raised. Weaver added that the Legislature could not get tax increases through so fees were raised. Gelfand said the faculty had voiced to him the concern that if all the fees are centralized it will be hard to project in the future how much a given department will get back. The Dean in Vet Med mentioned that he had a ten-year budget and, for example, they know that four years from now they are going to replace a certain piece of equipment and if they are in control of their fees they know they will have the funds to replace that piece of equipment. There might be a concern whereby the administration, for whatever reason, that another department needs more than they are getting now, if the fees were raised Vet Med would get less and they would not be able to plan for the future. Another issue Gelfand brought up was state tax revenue collections in October were \$28 million above the estimate and that means for the year the state is ahead \$47 million. It does not look, at the present time, like budget cuts will be necessary. If things continue as they are, there might be extra funds in the state that will be allocated sometime in the spring. The Budget Committee has been discussing how to get faculty input concerning future spending assuming that there are increased allocations for the university. The committee is in the process of developing a faculty survey which will be mailed out via e-mail probably in January which will essentially solicit faculty opinions concerning a number of different possible areas in which this money might be spent. In another matter, the Budget Committee was asked to find out what affect NOC has on OSU; specifically, what the net increase or decrease in the budgeted operational fund balance would result from the agreement with NOC. Weaver replied that when the current budget was built his information was that remedial courses would not be taught at OSU on general university and so tuition revenue was not estimated. At the same time there were expenses to face and it pretty much equaled out. Raff asked about next semester when NOC started teaching general ed courses and Weaver replied there was nothing in the budget that allows for that. Gelfand asked if the basic idea was that the students that take general ed courses at NOC, as opposed to this campus, then we would have less tuition revenue but presumably there would be some sort of balance in that there would be less overhead and instructor costs associated with educating them. Gelfand asked Weaver if there is anything else over and above that and Weaver said he had not done anything other than remedial. Gelfand said this was something they could talk about and then he would report back to Council. In another issue Gelfand said a member of the Budget Committee explained that a number of years ago, probably five to seven, when it was announced that raises for the faculty would be "x" percent, and he used a hypothetical three percent, essentially what happened was the heads of departments got basically what was a three percent increase in their faculty budget and then that three percent increase would be divided within their faculty. This committee member suggested that what actually happened was that administrators received a minimum of three percent but it could have been a much higher percentage the point being that the administrators raises were on average more than three percent. What was suggested was a)

was this true and b) if this was true it was something that this person wanted made public. Weaver replied that in the past when there have been raise programs there have always been guidelines developed that are general but specific enough to where administrators have guidance about how different classifications of employees are treated, i.e., faculty, staff, students and when departments, deans and vice presidents turn in their plans they do validity checking to make sure all are in compliance with the guidelines without interfering with the merit process. Raff said that was not the question. Johannes said the question was that, in the past, when there was a raise program, if someone went to the Library and looked at the dean's or department head's salaries the year before and the salaries they were given and the published figure for the university, it was not even close to the average. Weaver said he has not been a part of any raise program where administrators were given a higher percentage average amount of money to deal with compared to the faculty and staff. Weaver added that faculty members in a given department might find that the faculty within that group might have a higher raise than their colleagues because the department head makes a discretionary decision. Raff said the question was if all deans, all department heads, all vice presidents raises were averaged is the average percent exactly equal to the average of faculty and Weaver replied faculty are generally higher in his experience. Moder said she felt more data regarding this issue should be gathered.

FACULTY — Linda Austin

Austin reported the Faculty Committee had been working on a video for the last several months of Appendix D. This video has been "shelved" temporarily because Appendix D is undergoing a change in title and is being separated from the Faculty Handbook and that is from a recommendation by former President Halligan who has submitted revisions to the entire document and some of those revisions may apply to Appendix D. Austin said at this time she does not know what revisions he has recommended. Austin said President Schmidly has put together a committee and they will look at the revisions and she assumes the revisions will go through faculty channels and there will be a recommendation to the Board of Regents. Austin added this committee has not met yet. Moder added she, Austin and Redwood are the faculty representatives on that committee plus others and Strathe said her office was in the process of finding a time when the committee can meet. Raff asked Moder if she had seen the changes and she replied she had not. Raff said this was the most important document that exists for faculty and he felt it was very important for them to see the proposed changes. Johannes added that faculty are always a little nervous that changes take place before they get to see them. Arquitt asked if this new document, by whatever name it goes by, doesn't have to be brought to a vote of the entire faculty. Moder replied it had to be approved by the Faculty Council and the Board of Regents. Arquitt asked why this was being separated from the Faculty Handbook and Moder replied that this was a Faculty Council request because in the front of the Faculty Handbook there is a statement to the affect that the Regents can change anything in the book anytime they want. Moder continued that Council was told that applied to the policies in the first part of the Handbook which are not the Appendices but were approved by the State Regents and they therefore asked either that statement be removed or that the two documents be separated. Austin said she would report back after the committee had convened.

Austin said the impetus for the "sexual orientation" recommendation below came from the Staff Advisory Council and is the second time SAC has proposed such. Austin said she understood the first time was under President Halligan's administration and it was thought that "sexual

orientation” would simply be included in the nondiscrimination language that was put into all advertising rather than actually include “sexual orientation” in the Affirmative Policy. Moder added there was also a suggestion that as policies were revised it could be added in one at a time. Austin said that SAC felt that since we lived in a state in which it is still legal to fire someone for his or her sexual orientation, as of the end of 2002, that the university needed to afford those persons protection under a continuing policy. Moder clarified that Faculty Council is endorsing Staff Advisory Council’s recommendation and she also believes the Student Government Association is working on a similar recommendation.

Title: Inclusion of the Words “Sexual Orientation” in Sections 1.02, 1.04, and 1.06 of the University’s Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy 1-0101

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: the University include the words “sexual orientation” in sections 1.02, 1.04, and 1.06 of the university’s Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Policy 1-0101.

1.02 to provide equal employment and/or educational opportunity on the basis of merit and without discrimination because of age, race, ethnicity, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, veterans' status, or qualified handicap.

1.04 to apply equal opportunity in the recruitment, hiring, placement, training, promotion, and termination of all employees; and to all personnel actions such as compensation, education, tuition assistance, and social and recreational programs. The University shall consistently and aggressively monitor these areas to ensure that any differences which may exist are the results of bona fide qualification factors other than age, race, ethnicity, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, veterans' status, or qualified handicap.

1.06 to provide and to promote equal educational opportunity to students in all phases of the academic program and in all phases of the student life program; and shall consistently and aggressively monitor these areas to ensure that any differences which may exist are the results of bona fide factors other than age, race, ethnicity, color, sex, sexual orientation, religion, national origin, veterans' status, or qualified handicap.

Furthermore, the Faculty Council recommends that all university documents and policies addressing discrimination shall be reviewed, and, where the above categories are listed, “sexual orientation” be included.

Rationale: OSU is committed to diversity and equal opportunity.

Weiser called the question. Moder asked for a vote and it passed unanimously.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Mark Weiser

Weiser said most of his update had been covered in Dr. Wiggins report. The main one was the effective elimination of the Student Tech Fee Committee and other issues to bring forward in this update were lack or minimal representation of faculty on committees and he felt this had been somewhat mitigated by a promise to allow the Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee to review minutes from the three standing committees (Strategic Advisory, Technical Advisory, Student) as well as the Security Committee. What say they have afterward and what the timing will bring is yet to be determined. Binegar said he hoped the LRP&IT Committee finds some way to have some kind of representation on the Strategic Advisory Committee because it seems when Faculty Council committees have some preparation for the issues coming along things go a lot smoother and is less reactive. Binegar continued that when plans are only heard after they have been implemented it sometimes it too late to do

anything about them. Weiser said that was one of the biggest concerns with the committee, being more in a review capacity than proactive and that by the time the committee gets an issue, discusses it, and brings it to the group at-large, it's too late. Those committees were formed from the IT Division and someone has already brought that to Dr. Wiggins attention and Weiser said it would be brought up again he was sure. Weiser said he was also ask to look into whether or not a decision on the Student Tech Fee Committee was a criteria of the Regent's for allowing those fees and if so then there is no option to exclude the students from those decisions.

RESEARCH — John Damicone

Damicone said the committee has been working on the research infrastructure fund. This is a recommendation they have been working on for about a year to develop a fund for obtaining money to support purchases and repairs for research service facilities and he believes the administrative term for those are "cost centers" where they charge for services where they can not charge enough to maintain a bank account and replace and repair equipment. VP McKeever met with the committee and he sounded like he was in favor of this idea. In a second item, Damicone said they had been asked to look into the Intellectual Property Patent Policy. He does not know if there was a revision made or if this revision is being proposed but there is a Patent Policy he thought came through Faculty Council before his tenure. He thought McKeever was involved in drafting it at that time. The proposed revision or the "done deal" is that the cost share on royalties from any license agreement would be changed for the New Product Development Center for Small Rural Agriculture. The committee will look into this and try and find out who is part of this Center but he is not sure it is a "center" yet but possibly a grant that came through from the State Legislature. Damicone said McKeever alerted the committee to the fact that they will probably be revisiting the Research Professorship track in the near future and he asked that the Research Committee support this. This was briefly discussed at their meeting and most of the committee favors this idea. This would be a non-tenure track research faculty position funded on "soft money." Sirhandi asked for clarification on this. Moder explained that the research deans have asked periodically for an amendment to Appendix D which would allow for new titles. That is, Research Assistant Professor, Research Associate Professor, Research Professor. The idea is that these are not regular faculty tenure-track appointments but are funded on soft money and as long as they keep bringing the money in they can stay here and they can be promoted from Assistant, to Associate, to Full. Moder feels there would have to be criteria for promotion and some kind of evaluation, etc. This proposal has come forward before to Faculty Council and in the past it has been voted down. Last year it was mentioned to the Research Committee and they asked for further information and data in support of what this would accomplish and they did not get it and therefore a recommendation was not brought forward. Moder said it may be brought back again. Gelfand asked if AAUP has come out with any kind of position statements on this or studies on whether there is a correlation between, for example, positions of this type and increased research funds or not. Damicone said he did not know. When Joe Alexander was asked that kind of information they got a list of about 50 similar universities and about half of them had these positions. Damicone said McKeever had said he was shocked that a justification was not provided because according to him he has the information as to what kind of impact these positions had at other universities. Moder said perhaps Damicone could ask Dr. McKeever to present a special report to Council regarding this issue. Damicone said his committee was not bringing this forward at this time and that McKeever was just alerting the committee this would be coming forward from administration.

Damicone's recommendation would be to wait until it comes. Binegar said, "when the administration's proposal did come, it will be important to ask questions like; if these people are hired as research professors who does the hiring, and will promotions of research professors be done with peer review, by the home department, etc." Damicone said he had seen some proposals made over the past ten years with certain verbiage but nothing definite.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Sally Henderson

Henderson moved, and Binegar seconded, to "un-table" a recommendation made at the October Faculty Council Meeting regarding the proposed Cafeteria Plan Recommendations. Martin, representative from OSU/Okmulgee, ask for clarification that these also apply to the OSU branch campuses. Henderson replied "yes." Henderson then proposed a friendly amendment to the original recommendation which is listed below (friendly amendment highlighted in red):

Title: Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee: Cafeteria Plan Recommendations (Spring 2002)

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: he fully support the "Cafeteria Plan" recommendations submitted by the University Retirement and Flex Benefits Committee's Flex Benefits Task Force **with the exclusion of items 9, 10, and 17 (9. Enhanced Employee Assistance Program; 10. Enhanced Wellness Program; 17. Education Incentive Program [tuition/fee waiver]) which are "of cost" to the university.** These task force recommendations were submitted to Faculty Council for consideration in June of 2002.

Rationale:

- The majority of the recommendations are cost neutral for the university.
- Many of the recommendations have already been implemented or are in the process of being implemented.
- The remaining programs recommended have long been desired by many OSU employees and may be considered retention and recruitment incentives.
- Staff Advisory Council has already accepted these recommendations.

This recommendation passed unanimously.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — A. J. Johannes

Johannes reported that the R&P committee is looking at electronic balloting and a sheet explaining this was attached to the November Faculty Council Agenda. It is also below for informational purposes.

Electronic Balloting Information Sheet November 4, 2003

The Rules and Procedures Standing Committee is exploring ways of conducting voting electronically for Faculty Council elections.

Rationale—Electronic balloting is desirable and should be pursued. In addition to making voting easier for eligible voters, it has the potential of simplifying the tallying of the ballots, providing a secure, reliable and easy to use service, and increasing broader voter participation.

E-Balloting — conducting electronic balloting requires three things:

1. Institutional technology—the technologic ability to create and distribute the ballots, a means of collecting the votes cast, and a means of counting the ballots readily exists. We are investigating whether the Information Technology Division at OSU has the server capabilities to distribute the ballots, collect and tally the results.
2. Member technology—Member technology requires access to an e-mail account and internet access.
3. Membership willingness to participate—Membership willingness requires that members provide Faculty Council (FC) with their preferred e-mail address and an indication of their willingness to participate in e-balloting.

Process—Votes cast electronically would be entered and tallied electronically. Eligible voters are given a set time period, usually 15 days, to respond to an electronic ballot invitation. They are provided with a URL to go to and sign up for the ballot. They simply log on to a website, verify their user name and password, mark their choices in the election, and submit the input electronically after reviewing their choices.

Johannes said the above proposal was being brought to Council to see if there was an interest in pursuing this matter further. Sirhandi asked what it would cost. Johannes said he hoped it would end up saving money. To conduct an election, at the present time, costs approximately \$1,500 for the entire election. Weiser said Dr. Wiggins had stated that things critical to the operation of the university should be cost free and the implication he would derive from this is that this cost would be born by the IT Division. Moder clarified that the R&P Committee was only asking Council if they should go forward in investigating this issue; for example, how much would it cost, should it be done, is it feasible, etc. Council voted for the R&P Committee to proceed with investigating this matter.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Arts & Sciences Faculty Council — Gary Webb

The Arts & Sciences Faculty Council met on Wed., November 5, 2003. A copy of the new draft A&S Personnel Procedures (for Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure), developed over the last two years by the A&S Policy & Planning Committee, recently was approved by OSU Legal Counsel, and was distributed to all ASFC members. They will begin discussions of the document at the December ASFC meeting. The search committee for the new Dean will meet imminently for the first screening of candidates. Reportedly 48 candidates have applied for the Dean's position.

Staff Advisory Council — Terry Dark

Dark announced the "Can OU Food Drive" overall winner was Grants & Contracts Financial Administration. Other winners included the English Language Institute and the Library. SAC continues to work on recommendations for performance appraisal reform and are generating a proposal at their next meeting for administration to review. Staff Appreciation Day is currently scheduled for April 16.

NEW BUSINESS:

Moder reported to Faculty Council there had been a violation of Appendix D in the hiring of an Interim Director of Communications to replace Natalea Watkins on a temporary basis. Michael Heintze hired this individual with no faculty consultation. Moder has received a letter of apology from Dr. Heintze saying that he was perhaps over deliberate in making this appointment because OSU had the opportunity to hire someone who was very well-qualified and would accept the position with no remuneration. Dr. Strathe, in follow-up, sent out a memo to all administrators reiterating the paragraph in Appendix D in regard to administrative positions and affirming the administrations commitment in following this policy and asking them to follow it in all cases in the future. Moder added this affirmation on the part of the Provost was much appreciated and it was hoped no further violations will have to be reported.

Dr. Strathe said some questions had been raised in regard to the Fall semester calendar one of which was that Fall Break kept moving around and the date published was sometimes not actually when it was held. There has been some question as to why OSU starts much earlier than other institutions. Strathe just wanted to bring these issues to the faculty's attention and added VP Bird will begin discussion with the students regarding these issues and then faculty input will be sought. Moder said comments could be e-mailed to her and she would forward to Strathe.

Moder announced the Fall General Faculty Meeting would be held on Friday, November 21, 2003, beginning at 3:00 p.m. in the Student Union Theater. Issues for faculty discussion will be proposals for changing faculty governance structure (Faculty Council vs. Faculty Senate) and also a discussion of central vs. local administrative control of budget and decision-making. Following the meeting there will be a reception in the Oklahoma Room.

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is December 9, 2003.

Respectfully submitted,
Birne Binengar, Secretary