

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

250 Student Union

December 9, 2003

Carol Moder called the meeting to order with the following members present: Arquitt, Austin, Bilbeisi, Binegar, Chaney, Damicone, Ebro, Fullerton, Gasem, Gelfand, Greiner, Henderson, Johannes, Lamphere-Jordan, Lehenbauer, Martin, Mokhtari, Morgan, Mott, Murray, Phillips, Raff, Redwood, Sirhandi, Terry, te Velde, Van Delinder, and Weiser. Also present: T. Agnew, B. Arjmandi, R. Beer, D. Buchanan, G. Gates, A. Goodbary, S. Harp, M. Heintze, B. Henley, D. Hunt, M. Middlebrook E. Mitchell, V. Mitchell, J. Moss, A. Tree, J. Weaver, and C. Wei. Absent: Bays

HIGHLIGHTS

Strategic Planning Update.....	2
Academic Services for Student-Athletes and Recent Academic Performance.....	3
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	5
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	5
Recommendation – Faculty Responsibility for Curricula	6
Budget	7
Recommendation – Unit-Based Course Fee Structure	7
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security	8
Faculty.....	8
Recommendation – Sabbatical Leave Policy.....	8
Research.....	10
Rules and Procedures.....	12
Student Affairs and Learning Resources	13
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Graduate and Professional Student Government Association	14
Women’s Faculty Council	14
Old Business	14
Retirement Lawsuit Update	14
Reorganization of the Division of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources.....	16
New Business.....	16

Moder asked for additions or corrections to the November 11, 2003, Minutes. Arquitt corrected a statement she had made in her update from the Academic Standards and Policies committee as follows: "They have been presented with a proposed **new** degree – Bachelor of University Studies" is incorrect. It is not a new degree; the draft is a proposed **change in an existing** degree. Binegar moved acceptance of the November 11, 2003 Minutes as amended. Henderson seconded. The Minutes were approved as corrected. Lamphere-Jordan moved acceptance of the December 9, 2003 Agenda. Raff seconded. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: Strategic Planning Update — Dave Buchanan

Buchanan reported strategic planning is proceeding on schedule. Updated plans were received on, or about, December 1 from almost all units. These updated plans included revised mission statements, vision statements, core values and strategic goals and the first draft of the critical success factors and objectives. Strategic planning committee members from Stillwater met to review the area plans and to draft critical success factors and objectives for the Stillwater campus. The entire committee will meet next week to perform a similar update for the system plan. All plans will be submitted to the Task Forces for review. Each Task Force will review plans for a specific aspect of the plan: Academic Excellence-Undergraduate, Academic Excellence-Graduate, Research and Creative Activities, Outreach/Service, Student Development, Leveraging Resources, Faculty and Staff Development, Economic Development, Partnerships/Collaborations, Image Enhancement, Diversity. Each Task Force will have 12-15 members and will include faculty, staff and administration. Following this review the plans will be returned to the units for update and addition of strategies. The next deadline for units to submit revised plans with strategies is March 15. There will be a series of Town Hall meetings during February and March to reveal the plan to internal and external constituencies. Current plans are for an internal Town Hall meeting at each of the five campuses. There will also be public Town Hall meetings in Tulsa, Oklahoma City and Stillwater. The Stillwater meeting will also be available for viewing at several sites around the state. The President will conduct the Town Hall meetings. Raff said at the last Regent's meeting he understood them to vote an additional \$100,000 for Mary Chicoine, Strategic Planning consultant, and said this would bring the total amount of money allocated to her activities to over a quarter of a million dollars and ask, "what is she doing?" Moder said the amount was \$270,000. Buchanan indicated that he did not know the specifics of the financial arrangement with the consultant so could not comment on that. He added she has been working closely with the Strategic Planning Committee and has met many times with numerous units around all the campuses to assist with strategic planning and has, in his view, done very good work for OSU. Raff asked Joe Weaver what the breakdown was of the \$270,000 and Weaver replied it was primarily a professional consulting contract, and not salary per se, plus her travel expenses to and from Chicago. Moder asked Buchanan to clarify that there are no Assessments now and that they are the same as Critical Success Factors. Buchanan indicated that the Critical Success Factors requested in November and the Assessments which were originally scheduled to be requested in March are quite similar. As a result, the only additional detail in the March 15 submission will be the Strategies. Johannes asked Buchanan if input from the various departments had been looked at and said they had sat down as a faculty and were told certain things were to be included even though they had nothing to do with Chemical Engineering and added that if things did not dramatically change in the near future this whole thing was somewhat of a sham because faculty sent back what they thought they were expected to send back. Buchanan said that, other than Core Values, there should have been no instruction to suggest that units should adopt specific elements of the System plan. Even with the Core Values, units may include additional items which they believe to be important and unique to that unit. In further response, he reported that there was variety in the quality of the first draft of plans submitted earlier in the fall but that he felt like most units have taken the work seriously and that the plans were, generally, quite good.

SPECIAL REPORT: Academic Services for Student-Athletes and Recent Academic Performance — Marilyn Middlebrook

Middlebrook, Associate Athletic Director in Academic Affairs, had prepared a Power Point presentation and distributed a handout with the information included. She said benefits of the OSU system, as it is set up, differs somewhat from the way Academic Services is set up nationally in that OSU is “housed” in Academic Affairs, not the Athletic Department, is overseen and monitored by Athletic Council and the Office of the Provost, and athletic certification of eligibility is conducted in the Office of the Registrar, not ASSA. She added she has nothing to do with certification which was a definite benefit and this keeps the certification out of academics. She said they certainly did work with the Registrar’s Office and Ada Davis, Certification Officer, very harmoniously, but Davis is under no pressure from ASSA. Middlebrook stressed she worked “with” the Athletic Department and Coaches but answered directly to Gail Gates and Marlene Strathe which made it much easier for her and feels there is a national movement to head that way. ASSA provides individual/group tutoring, only to student athletes; mentoring; and referral services in cooperation with the writing center, career services, MLRC, counseling center, wellness center, multicultural center and other available resources. They provide daily monitoring of student-athletes and monthly educational programs that encourage success as a student. Sports majors (provided by Institutional Research) include: Football – 23 different majors across 110 students. These numbers do not reflect any freshmen or sophomores because they do not formally declare until their fifth semester; however, they are encouraged to be within their department as a Freshman. Majors include: Agriculture – 3, A&S – Economics (6), Sociology (7), Psychology (1), Political Science (2), Medical Technology (1), and Geography (1); Business – 19; Education – 20; Engineering – 3; and Human Environmental Sciences – 4. Men’s Basketball – 10 majors; Psychology (1), Marketing (2), Athletic Training (1), Education (3), Physical Education (1), Engineering (1), Aviation (2), Family Relations (1), International Business (1), and Graduate (1). Women’s Basketball – 7 majors; Political Science (1), Sociology (5), Economics (1), Chemical Engineering (1), Design, Housing and Merchandising (1), Physical Education (1), and Marketing (1). Academic Year Highlights for 2002-03 included: OSU senior student-athletes who exhausted their eligibility last year have graduated or will graduate this year at 97% (69 out of 71); 22 individual Academic All-Americans/Scholar-Athletes (2nd in the Big XII Conference) for 2002. Qualifications for the Verizon award include a 3.2 GPA, starter or key reserve, and significant contributor to team success. Qualifications for the National Coaches Association include a 3.5 GPA and a more than significant contributor to team success. Men’s Basketball, Men’s Golf, Softball and Wrestling led/tied the Big XII conference in Academic All-Big XII selections (2002-2003); 34 student-athletes made the President’s Honor Roll (4.0 GPA) last Fall 2002 and 29 made the list for Spring 2003. Fifty-eight student-athletes made the Dean’s Honor Roll (3.5 GPA) last Fall 2002 and 59 made the Dean’s list in the spring 2003. Kyle Eaton (football), Management Information Systems (May 2003 graduate) was the 2003 National Football Foundation and College Football Hall of Fame Scholar-Athlete award recipient (\$18,500) and earned postgraduate scholarships worth in excess of \$29,500, plus additional academic awards. Lauren Bay (Softball), International Business major (December 2003 graduate) was selected as the Oklahoma NCAA Woman of the Year. The 2003 NCAA Leadership Conference selection went to Jade Lindly (Softball) and Ivan McFarlin (Men’s Basketball). There were 1,172 nominations from 302 institutions and 273 were selected. Two OSU/Wentz scholars were student-athletes; AFCA Honorable Mention Academic Achievement Award – 1997 Football graduation rate over 87%;

www.afca.com – Academic Achievement link. Student-Athletes earning Big XII Commissioner's Honor Roll recognition for the Fall 2002 and Spring 2003 semesters totaled 413 – Fall 2002, 207 and Spring 2003, 206. In 2002, there were 22 individual Academic All-Americans/Scholar-Athletes awarded and eight sports were nationally recognized as All-Academic teams with a team GPA of 3.0. Also in 2002, there were 97 student-athletes who made the Academic All-Big XII Team. These athletes had to participate in 60% of varsity games, have a 3.2 or above GPA for the first team and a 3.0-3.19 GPA for the second team. Middlebrook then displayed a chart that showed academic performance comparisons over eighteen semesters. Middlebrook said she felt maintaining a strong retention rate at OSU was of the utmost importance and they are still in the process of doing some analysis to find out how they can improve that rate and get those numbers up. Raff asked Middlebrook how she accounted for the enormous grade inflation in the last ten years and she responded one thing was the drop/add policy. She continued and said the athletes have to stay within the 12 hours but gave an example of a student in 1992 taking 15 hours and if they were flunking a four or five hour course they would have received an "F" and that would have remained on their transcript and now they can drop that class within the timeframe and not receive an "F". In Athletics, if that "F" would drop the student below 12 hours, the athlete would have to keep the "F" because of NCAA regulations. Gasem asked if Middlebrook could think of a system similar to OSU's and if she were impressed by their performance in this arena, what are they doing differently and how did she see OSU getting there. Middlebrook replied she thought there was not a system better than what OSU has. With the money that is dedicated to student-athletes and the populations we have met, she does not feel there is a program academically in our unit that prepares students. She said she had been asked to take this to the national level and build a model for it. She feels the key is the people that are hired within the unit and not so much the program. Hiring excellent people who care about students and work with them on a day to day basis. Middlebrook said she had come from the College of Education and had worked with students there and she did not do anything different with student-athletes. She felt she brought a philosophy of success, honesty, strong academic integrity and working with the faculty and asking them how can her unit can help the students do better in the classroom. Binegar said since the ASAA is under the Provost's Office how was it funded. Weaver replied out of E&G funds and Binegar then said, "not the Athletic Department budget." Fullerton (Journalism & Broadcasting) said she had occasion to work with Middlebrook's office on several occasions and it had been a real pleasure. Phillips asked if there was any way Athletic funds could be tapped into to support the program. Middlebrook said at this point there might be a move toward that direction or private funding. She added they are the number two lowest budget in the Big XII and only \$6,000 away from the lowest budget and added that is something that needs to be improved on. Henley said since the budget comes out of academic funds how does the effort made on behalf of student-athletes compare to similar efforts for students in general who are not athletes. Middlebrook said since she came from the other side (Education) and she had the same kind of budget then that she has now and feels it should be and can be but does not think it is. Each college has units and each department has advisors that could, if they choose to, implement the same kinds of services, and some of them do, but uniformly they do not all agree it should be done. It truly is a philosophical difference. She invited all present to visit their facilities or to tutor, teach, or give a presentation – they would love to have you.

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

01-04-01-BUDG	<i>Market-Driven Salary Increase to Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty:</i> Administration will continue to look at faculty salary issues. Special award program for Fall 2003 was finalized, and funding for salaries will be a legislative priority. Recommendation will be shared with the Equity consultant.
02-12-04-RFB	<i>Maternity/Family Leave Recommendation:</i> Pending. With completion of the Big 12 survey, the administration is now finalizing a proposal for further consideration by appropriate faculty and staff committees.
03-02-06-EXEC	<i>Tulsa Bus Policy:</i> 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 being given to providing a shuttle bus to OKC with possible Jan. 1 start up date.
03-10-02-RFB	<i>Long Term Disability Policy (3-07500):</i> Pending. Cleared by Legal Counsel earlier this week. Will be sent to the E-Team for review as soon as possible.
03-11-01-ASP	<i>Awarding Posthumous Degrees:</i> Pending. Recommended policy was approved by Instruction Council, with minor modifications, during their Nov. 21 meeting. The modified draft will be reviewed by the Deans Council at an upcoming meeting.
03-11-02-ASP	<i>Retention of Grade Books and Records:</i> Pending. Recommended policy was approved by Instruction Council, with minor modifications, during their Nov. 14 meeting. The modified draft will be reviewed by the Deans Council at an upcoming meeting.
03-11-04-FAC	<i>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:</i> Pending. Administration is reviewing campus policies for needed modifications.
03-10-01-RFB	<i>Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee: Cafeteria Plan Recommendations (Spring 2002):</i> Accepted. Completed and in process for implementation.
03-12-01-ASP	<i>Faculty Responsibility for Curricula:</i> To President Schmidly
03-12-02-BUDG	<i>Unit-Based Course Fee Structure:</i> To President Schmidly
03-12-03-FAC	<i>Sabbatical Leave Policy:</i> To President Schmidly

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Andrea Arquitt

Arquitt reported the committee has examined the Academic Misconduct policies from the Big 12 schools. These institutions do not have both dishonesty and misconduct provisions. They believe one category with appropriate penalties for violations would be simpler and preferable. They also discussed materials from the Center for Academic Integrity and all felt that this was a more positive way to proceed. Arquitt had met with Dr. Bird, Peg Vitek, and Dr. Gates to

discuss how OSU should handle Academic Integrity. Dr. Strathe joined the Center for Academic Integrity (<http://www.academicintegrity.org>) for OSU; this organization has much to offer in policy development, guidelines and implementation. They agreed to proceed with Dr. Gates appointing a committee to work on the document and Dr. Bird to work with the leadership in the Student Government Association, Graduate and Professional Student Government Organization and the International Student Organization to explore the desirability of developing a campus Honor Code. Dr. Neil Luebke from the AS&P committee will serve on Dr. Gates committee. The organizing committee will meet periodically. Arquitt added this seems like a path to a positive change for this campus and their plans include developing a Policy on Academic Integrity to replace Academic Misconduct and Dishonesty. The goal is that all of this can be completed for implementation by Fall 2004. In another matter, the committee recently received input on the appropriate use of the grade "AW" – Administrative Withdrawal and will be working on a modification to the grading policy to reflect this. Next week they will continue the discussion with the administration on a transfer GPA policy.

Arquitt then presented the following recommendation:

Title: Faculty Responsibility for Curricula

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: no administrative officer of the Oklahoma State University impose arbitrary maximum limits on the number of credit hours in any degree program. The understanding is that the Faculty of each department or academic unit sets forth standards that support proficiency in subject matter, meet OSU General Education requirements, and conform to the policies of the State Regents for Higher Education. Within the context of these requirements it is the responsibility and obligation of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University to ensure curricula that meet high standards of performance expected of a comprehensive university.

Rationale:

There are no data to support the suggestion that the number of credit hours in any degree program at Oklahoma State University is the cause of students not completing degrees in a timely fashion.

There are many reasons for exceeding the minimal State Regents' Curriculum Hours requirements including but not limited to the need for:

- Broad educational experience in a complex world society
- Accreditation agency requirements
- Increased availability and desirability of internships
- Professional school prerequisite requirements

According to AAUP policy statement on Government of Colleges and Universities:

"The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process.....The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met and authorizes the president, and board to grant the degrees thus achieved."

(AAUP Redbook. V. The Academic Institution: The Faculty. Accessed at <http://www.aaup.org/statements/Redbook/Govern.htm> on 11/18/2003.)

Bilbeisi asked what the minimum number of hours was for a degree and Arquitt said the State Regents have set a minimum of 120 hours. Bilbeisi then asked about the Masters Program and Arquitt said this policy did not address graduate programs. Weiser said the Masters Program has a set number of hours also but they are set outside the university. Moder asked for a vote and the recommendation passed unanimously.

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

Gelfand reported the Office of State Finance issued an update today concerning the November revenue collections. They are above the prior year estimate and preliminary reports show the general revenue fund collections totaled 339.3 million in November. That is 22.3 million above the same month one year ago or 7 percent. The year-to-date collections are 56 million above the estimate for the first five months and in the news release the office stated, quote, “that it gives us a bit of a cushion should revenue collections turn downward at some point toward the remainder of the fiscal year and we are growing more and more confident that state agencies will not face budget reductions during the current fiscal year.” Gelfand added this was very good news.

Gelfand then presented the following recommendation:

Title: Unit-Based Course Fee Structure

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: the current structure of itemized unit-based fees for courses be maintained.

Rationale:

The current course fee structure, in which academic/administrative units request fees for courses, allows for transparency; specifically, the current structure permits one to know the stated purpose of the fees and whether the fees are spent in accordance with said purpose.

Those making decisions at the academic/administrative unit level know the needs of the department and are best positioned to allocate efficiently money raised from fees. The current structure ensures that the decision-making power with respect to fees remains at the academic/administrative unit level.

Fullerton, Budget Committee member, commented that a lot of what they do in committee meetings was to be pro-active and they wanted to make recommendations before decisions on issues had already been made. The reason for a recommendation stating that no change be made was because changes were being talked about and could virtually affect the individual departments and the committee felt it was important to bring this issue forward now so they could be pro-active in the future.

Moder asked for a vote and the recommendation passed unanimously.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY — Khaled Gasem

Gasem said their committee had shared a recommendation with the Faculty Council Executive Committee and they suggested the committee study possible mechanisms for an improved facility planning process. The committee feels it now has a possible mechanism for implication and this would show the cost-benefit analysis of what could take place. Gasem also shared the outline for this improved process with members of the administration and he is awaiting feedback. They hope to bring a recommendation to Council next month for their consideration.

FACULTY — Linda Austin

Austin reported the recently convened Appendix D Committee had met once, at which time they received the proposed changes to Appendix D with some supplementary material. In addition to some superficial changes, there are two serious alterations suggested: the first concerns changes in the process by which administrators are hired, and the second is the process by which university employees are terminated. Austin will provide more details as she learns them.

Austin then presented the following recommendation:

Title: Sabbatical Leave Policy

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that:

1. The Provost communicate in writing to the Deans and the general Faculty that, though the usual sabbatical proposal would normally include a substantial percentage of the time be spent away from the home campus, serious consideration will be given to proposals without such extended time away from campus provided that the project proposed is worthy and would more likely be completed without relocation.
2. In addition to insurance and TIAA-CREF benefits, the university agree to make contributions to OTRS retirement plans at the level of the full-time salary of faculty who are taking a reduction in salary for their sabbaticals.
3. The university agree to treat royalties for all copyrighted materials produced by faculty while on sabbaticals in the same manner as they would if the same materials were produced by faculty while not on sabbatical.
4. The university make it an immediate and high priority to solicit funds for an endowment to supplement sabbaticals so as to avoid financial hardship for faculty taking sabbaticals and to make it more likely that there will be a larger number of sabbaticals and that the projects planned for the sabbaticals would be carried out successfully. These funds, under the direction of the Vice-President of Research, could be used to provide relocation costs, living expenses (so that faculty don't have to pay home mortgage and rental costs simultaneously), allowances for travel while on sabbatical (to reach places where research must be completed, to consult with experts, to collaborate on their work with other professionals, or to discuss their work with them), to purchase any needed equipment that might not be available (laptop computer), etc. These expenses would be requested at the time of the proposal, but could also be requested after the sabbatical began. We suggest that the university aim at

designating a \$1 million endowment for this purpose beginning in FY05 and that the endowment be brought to a full \$5 million by FY07. As the endowment increased, some of the funds could also be used to subsidize departments that were having difficulty dealing with the absence of those faculty who were on sabbatical (for example needing certain courses taught or simply greater teaching power to cover normal commitments).

5. The university begin publication of a document, similar to, but separate from, "Research Reports" that would compile faculty reports on sabbaticals for dissemination to the general university community, the Regents, and to the legislature and general public in order to gain support for this vital program of the university.
6. The university should specifically ask Deans to report on the robustness of the sabbatical activity in their college each year during their annual review.

Rationale:

A task force report was prepared in 2000 for the Faculty Council detailing the difficulties with sabbaticals at OSU. However, despite a lot of good will the problems continue.

- a) We still rank at the bottom of the Big 12 with respect to the percentage of faculty taking sabbatical leave (chart was distributed with Agenda – if you are interested in seeing this chart e-mail Diane LaFollette – lafolet@okstate.edu)
- b) There is a widespread belief that sabbaticals that do not include a provision for substantial time away from the home campus have no chance of being approved, and so many faculty who have specific writing projects that they may simply need extended time to complete, but who have circumstances that would make it extremely difficult to spend a significant time away from home, simply skip submitting proposals.
- c) There are documented instances where faculty did not take sabbaticals because they wanted to write textbooks or produce other copyrighted materials. The faculty member would collect the royalties on such publications if they were to produce them while conducting their normal activities (when it may take much longer to find the time to do this work) but since that was their major activity during the sabbatical, the university would claim it was contract work and claim all monetary rights to the materials.
- d) Were the university able to provide extra support for faculty on sabbatical and eventually even make it easier on departments to deal with the absence of a faculty member, there would be even more enthusiasm for proposals both on the part of the faculty members and also on the part of the administration of the department and the college.
- e) It is necessary to communicate the great benefits of the sabbatical leave program since it seems that it is not well understood outside of faculty circles.

Moder asked for a vote and the recommendation passed unanimously.

RESEARCH — John Damicone

Damicone reported on the following two items:

Research Service Facilities – The committee is working on the development of a recommendation for the establishment of a research infrastructure fund to assist research service facilities on campus that serve multiple colleges. Funds would be from the portion of F&A funds retained by the University and would be used to meet equipment and staffing needs above those provided by units, colleges, and user fees. Itemized budgets have been requested from each facility to be used to develop a cost estimate.

Establishment of Non-Tenure Track Research/Clinical Professor Faculty Lines – The committee received a proposal from the Provost for modifying faculty titles in Appendix D. The modifications fall under the former classification of “Temporary Faculty” which would be renamed “Non-Tenure Track Faculty”. Such positions could be filled without a national search. Non-tenure track faculty appointments are to be made in response to short-term or emergency needs of the University. Unit administrators, after receiving faculty input, would recommend appointments. Appointees do not have voting rights. Along with “in residence” and “visiting” faculty titles, descriptions of Research and Clinical Faculty are added. Under the Research Faculty track, top research scholars would be appointed to enhance the major research programs and initiatives of the university. Appointees are professional investigators capable of independent investigation and publication. Research faculty serve as PIs or PDs on research grants and are significantly funded through external grants. In rare cases where a research faculty is considered for teaching, a separate part-time teaching appointment is required. Research faculty are subject to normal University policies related to A&D, reappointments and promotion, and for serving on graduate faculty committees. Research faculty would have to apply for a tenure track position should one open. The Research Committee is generally in favor of adding a research faculty track, with appropriate limitations. The committee reviewed the proposal and had several concerns centered on the liberal, non-specific nature of the current proposal. These concerns include:

- 1) A cap on the number or percentage of such faculty appointments
- 2) Salary amount and source
- 3) Teaching should be off-limits
- 4) Advising graduate students
- 5) Terms of appointment
- 6) Appointments for “emergency” needs

The committee is going to study the matter further and may propose a modification with appropriate safeguards. The committee chair believes that the Faculty Committee should consider the “Clinical Faculty” track since it involves instruction in a clinical setting rather than research.

Earl Mitchell made one correction and said that Clinical Faculty do clinical research and that was a major area of research funding for Clinical Faculty. NIH has a Division of Research Resources which is a large, critical research area and does support many faculty doing clinical research.

Raff said he had spoken to several faculty in Physics and Chemistry regarding this plan and they all believed that supporting these people being funded with State money, “hard” money, and the ability of the loophole that they can teach, would be a direct assault on tenure. The only way Raff would ever support this is that if faculty were only paid with “soft” money and not allowed to teach in these positions.

Cheng-i Wei. Associate Dean for Research, Human Environmental Sciences stressed the importance of having assistant research professor, associate research professor, and research professor categories on the OSU campus in order to move research activity forward and compete with other universities for fame, grant supports, exchange scholars, and quality students and faculty. Professor Wei used three land grant universities (UC Davis, University of Florida, and Auburn University) that have better research achievements than OSU for comparison to indicate how far we are behind. Since he also worked with individuals of that category who were supported by his grants, he believed his statement would clarify some of the questions asked at the meeting, such as the promotion process or soft money vs. state fund support issues. As a department head, in the past, he also helped faculty of this category get promoted. As a college T/P committee member at the University of Florida, he was involved in evaluating application packages for promotion from individuals of this category. That year, they had a total of 80 T&P application packages in the college.

Bahram Arjmandi, Regents Professor, Nutritional Sciences Department made the following comments:

Our faculty should not consider the Research Professor position as a threat rather they should consider it as an opportunity to enrich our university and the faculty at large.

A Research Professor position should not be considered as a substitute for postdoctoral fellows. Research professors should be well qualified professionals who have strong interest in doing research with perhaps limited interest in teaching.

Based on my personal observations, the proposal reviewers seem to favor proposals that come from research professors rather than tenured faculty when everything else is equal. Therefore, our institution would be at a disadvantage compared with the institutions that have Research Professor positions in attracting extramural funding.

These positions also offer our young researchers the opportunity to thrive without being a treat to our faculty. With absolute sincerity, I believe that we should favorably consider the Research Professor position.

Sirhandi said it sounded like to her that science was being discussed and since Art is her field she is thinking in terms of the English Department, Art, Department, Foreign Languages Department and it would ruin these departments.

Moder said this was not being voted on today and would asked that anyone with further comments to forward them to John Damicone or his committee

RULES AND PROCEDURES — A. J. Johannes

Johannes reported that the R&P committee, after having obtained input from the general faculty at the Fall General Faculty Meeting on November 21, is in the process of discussing recommended changes to OSU Charter and Bylaws of the General Faculty and to Appendix B, Bylaws of the Faculty Council. Some of the changes would include:

Name change from Faculty Council to Faculty Senate

The President of the University would no longer preside at regular meetings of the Faculty Senate but shall have a permanent invitation to attend regular meetings when the schedule permits or appoint either the Provost or an appropriate vice-president as a representative of the President.

Change to a two-year term for the Chair and the Chair would preside at regular meetings and be a voting member of the Faculty Senate. To implement this action without requiring six years of service from Faculty Senate officers, the following changes are recommended:

The current office of Vice-Chair be modified and one new Faculty Senate office be created. The new office shall be called “Chair-Elect”. The modifications of the office of Vice-Chair are that he/she will serve a term of three years and not be immediately eligible for re-election as Vice-Chair. The Vice-Chair will not assume the office of Chair of the General Faculty. Elections of the Vice-Chair will be staggered with the election of the Secretary to provide continuity.

A new officer of the General Faculty be created. This officer shall be known as the Chair-elect and be elected at the end of the first year of the sitting Chair’s term of office. The Chair-elect will serve a term of one year after he/she will assume the office of Chair of the General Faculty for a term of two years.

Advantages to above changes are as follows:

- a. Only one additional year of service is required from the Chair and Chair-Elect.
- b. It provides a stronger platform for the Chair to execute initiatives that advance faculty concerns and initiatives.
- c. The procedure ensures that there are always four officers on the Executive Committee of the Senate. During the Chair’s first year of service, the officers are Vice-chair, Chair, Secretary, and Past Chair. During the second year of the Chair’s term, the officers are the Vice-Chair, the Chair, the Chair-Elect, and the Secretary.
- d. The plan provides for one additional member of the Faculty Senate. This provides broader representation and provides one additional vote.

To obtain broader representation from the General Faculty and to promote a broader rotation and diversity in leadership positions of the Faculty Senate, we recommend that at least one of the two nominations advanced by the R&P Committee for Vice-Chair and Chair-Elect be from the general OSU faculty who are not currently serving on the Faculty Senate. We further recommend that the number of signatures required for nomination of additional candidates for these offices be reduced from fifty (50) to fifteen (15).

We recommend the implementation of electronic balloting for all Faculty Senate positions.

Changes to the 60-day rule for filling vacancies are proposed to accommodate the situation when the vacancy occurs one month prior to or during the summer term.

The wording of many sections of the Charter and Faculty Council bylaws must be altered to implement and conform to the above recommendations. These are detailed in the two attachments sent to Council members with their Agendas. The first lists the changes that must be made to the Charter and Bylaws of the General Faculty. To submit these recommendations to the General Faculty requires a two-thirds vote of the Faculty Council. The second document lists the changes that must be made to the bylaws of the Faculty Council. These changes can be approved by a majority vote of the Council. The R&P Committee recommends this vote be taken prior to the submission of the recommended changes to the Charter of the General Faculty. It should be understood that a positive vote on changes to the Faculty Council bylaws be contingent upon approval of the changes to the charter by the General Faculty.

Some discussion arose in regard as to whether or not the President or their representative would be present at every meeting. Johannes said there were many Faculty Senates where the President is not invited at all and he feels this is wrong but feels this is something Faculty Council should decide on as a whole. Raff said in a recent meeting with the President he asked him if he preferred a Council or Senate and he felt the President preferred a Senate and when asked if he would attend the meetings he said he would anytime his schedule permitted.

Johannes said the R&P Committee hoped to bring forward changes in the Bylaws to Council at the January meeting which would only take affect if the Charter was ratified by the General Faculty. Moder told Councilors it would be helpful if they and their colleagues would sent input back to the committee proposal by proposal so they can see if there are some things that are generally supported and some things that are not supported and those can be taken into account.

Johannes said there were four excellent faculty on the R&P Committee from four different parts of the university that discussed this issue in great detail and they will never be able to present something to Council that is perfect.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Pat Lamphere-Jordan

Lamphere-Jordan reported that the SA&LR Committee will hold its first meeting in mid-January. If there are issues that the committee should address, please forward those concerns to her prior to January 15. One issue that the committee will address is the oversight for expenditures of software and hardware from monies collected from the Student technology fees. Under the reorganization of the various technology committees, this function has not been publicly assigned to one of those committees. The search committee for the Dean of the Libraries has been opened and Brad Bays will serve as the Faculty Council representative on that search committee. Moder said it had been mentioned as to whether OSU Foundation officers were being moved from the Colleges back to the Foundation to raise money for the stadium. Moder had asked President Schmidly whether that was the case and he confirmed that it was the case and although his priority is scholarships and the academic programs he feels that he is unable to raise money for those while the stadium is “hanging over his head” and therefore the priority for the next two to three years will be raising money for the completion of the stadium

and the Alumni Center and the Foundation has been reorganized in order to accommodate that. Arquitt asked if any of the Deans were objecting to this and Moder said she did not know. Lamphere-Jordan said she thought this was having more of an impact than anticipated. Raff said, "The Deans served at the pleasure of the President and the faculty do not." Gasem thought it would have been much more productive if the President and the administration had waited to see the outcome of the strategic planning and where the university is headed and how the resources would be allocated and what the priorities were based on the faculty input before this decision had been made. Gasem added this was one reason why some of the faculty was very suspicious about this process which is supposed to be a guiding principle for the future of the university.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Graduate and Professional Student Government Association — Justin Moss

Moss reported that for the past two years the university has supplied all GA's, TA's and RA's, that are at least one-quarter time, health insurance and even though it is not the best program it is something. The GPSGA has worked with the insurance company in regard to a buy-up option where the students can purchase a better health plan. Two years ago a survey was conducted and 75 percent of the graduate students said that they would purchase the buy-up plan. This plan began in August and only 7 percent signed up. They are trying to educate everyone again and have worked with the insurance company and they are letting students go ahead and sign up in January even though they missed the August sign-up date. The deadline is January 28 and the cost is \$110 per semester and can be deducted out of their payroll check. Moss added they are also working with the insurance company and the Graduate College in working toward having as good a standard insurance plan and as the buy-up plan for all grad students.

Women's Faculty Council — Jean Van Delinder

Van Delinder reported the Women's Studies Film Festival is being shown on both the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses this year. They are working on the 2004 Task Force Report on the Status of Women Faculty at OSU and this report should be distributed to Faculty Council in the Spring. They have submitted their strategic plan through the Division of Institutional Diversity, formerly known as the Office of Multicultural Affairs. They have obtained a copy of a job satisfaction survey from OU and are working on doing a similar survey here. The key findings of the survey at OU, that would benefit retention of all faculty, included salary, spousal accommodation and workload strategies to help tenure-track faculty manage their teaching commitment so that progress toward tenure on research can be achieved. Women faculty expressed dissatisfaction with their departmental climate and peer support. Women faculty also asked for strategies to ensure fairness in tenure procedures as a way to improve morale among women faculty. In addition, all untenured faculty thought tenure procedures were unfair.

OLD BUSINESS:

Retirement Lawsuit Update – Lionel Raff

Raff said an e-mail message had just been sent out by the President that speaks from the President's point of view on the Retirement Lawsuit and the Regents meeting held December 5 and Raff suggested everyone read that message. He continued that one of the positive things in

that message was that he (the President) was trying to move as quickly as possible to improve the present program that he improved significantly last summer and move the now 11 percent plan to an 11.5 plan. This is not a promise but Raff felt this was very upbeat. Raff then distributed Retirement Newsletter Number 12 which will shortly appear on the Faculty Council website (<http://facultycouncil.okstate.edu/>). He then reported on the outcome of the December 5, 2003, OSU Board of Regents meeting where the Regents refused to negotiate with the faculty and staff over appropriate recompense for damages suffered by the forced change to the 7-11 program in 1993. The motion declining to negotiate was placed before the Board by Regent Burns. Raff felt the motion placed on the floor by Regent Burns was disingenuous in the extreme and added the Regents did not have the authority to "pay the claim" since the lawsuit names not only Oklahoma State University as defendant, but also the Oklahoma Teacher's Retirement System, and the State of Oklahoma. The request was not that the Regents "pay the claim", but that they enter into good-faith negotiations in an attempt to reach an acceptable middle ground for awarding recompense. If such a compromise could have been reached, the Regents would not have "paid the claim". Rather, the compromise would have been presented to the Court as being agreeable to both sides. After certification of the class, the Court would have made the adjudication as to whether or not the compromise was acceptable. If acceptable, the Court would have certified it as the decision of the Court and ordered its payment. Raff said, "Regent Burns is a skilled attorney. He is very well aware of this. Yet, he advances a motion having nothing to do with our request that the Regents begin good-faith negotiations with the Plaintiffs." Raff continued, "not only have the Regents refused to honor the request of the Court, they have also refused to honor the recommendation on recompense made by Judge Joseph W. Morris who the Regents selected, hired, charged, and paid as an external unbiased consultant to determine damages to OSU employees." Raff stated, "Regent Burns continues to tell the media that the change was income neutral" and in Raff's presentation to the Regents he went through a scenario where he said there is not a corporate CEO in the country that would have destroyed a 22 year old retirement program, eliminated an annual raise program, and angered every employee simply to effect an income-neutral change. Raff said, "The very suggestion that such a thing was done is absurd." He continued, "The Regents barred the President from speaking and he honored their order. He was present and remained silent and I do not think that was appropriate because we have the right for our administration to speak to the issues and we were denied that right." Raff said he felt after two years of pseudo negotiation, the Regents suddenly have shut down any possibility of negotiations. Raff stated, "In place of good-faith negotiations, they have substituted a ploy in which they claim they cannot "pay the claim" and, therefore, cannot enter into negotiations over recompense. They refuse to honor the report and recommendations of their own consultant. They have denied the faculty and staff the right to have the President of the University address the issues and they continue to claim the change was income-neutral to members of the class. These arrogant actions show extreme disrespect for the faculty of Oklahoma State University." Raff said from this point forward they will be involved in legal proceedings and will meet with their legal counsel probably next week to discuss strategy. The Attorney General or his representative will move for dismissal of the case on the grounds that we are beyond the statute of limitations which is correct – that is five years – the change was made in 1993 and the suit was filed in 2001; however, there is another statute that says when there is fraud or misrepresentation the defendants cannot plead statute of limitations as defense. Raff ended by saying, "the fraudulent retirement benefits formula was published by the presiding entity of OTRS, over Tommy Beaver's name, and circulated by the Personnel Services Office of

this University for a number of years with no warning to faculty and staff that the formula was entirely bogus and fraudulent. It will be up to the court to decide which is correct. If we lose in District Court our attorney will appeal to the Supreme Court of the State and if we lose there then it's over. If we win in either of those places and are granted our day in court, before a jury of peers, we have the high moral ground and I expect to win."

Reorganization of the Division of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources – Carol Moder

Moder reported she was asked by President Schmidly to get input from the faculty of that college in regard to their reorganization and she wanted to thank the faculty that sent her extensive comments about this issue. Moder has forwarded these comments to the President. She reported that in many cases the comments reflected a very deep concern that there was no faculty consultation about the reorganization, no justification for the reorganization made public to the faculty, they were not invited to participate in looking at what they felt would be inappropriate reorganization of their college and that the figures that were provided were not very well explained nor did they justify reorganizing and handicapping the programs that were very productive that were being reorganized. This item had been placed on the December Board of Regents Agenda but was pulled from the Agenda as administration have decided to reconsider and obtain more faculty input on this issue before proceeding further. Moder added President Schmidly had said it might be a good idea to consider the strategic plans before going forward with the reorganization and she hoped this is what happens. Moder ended by saying she would be glad to continue to be the faculty voice to administration and for those present to let the Ag faculty know they can send further comments to her.

NEW BUSINESS:

Moder announced the Faculty and Staff were sponsoring a Red Cross Blood Drive on Wednesday, December 10, 2003, Exhibit 1 & 2, Student Union, 9:00 a.m.-2:00 p.m. All faculty and staff members were encouraged to donate blood to assure adequate blood supplies for our region.

VP Heintze, on behalf of the President, announced that President and Mrs. Schmidly will host a holiday reception for all OSU Stillwater campus employees on Thursday, December 18, 8:00-10:00 a.m., in the Student Union Atrium. All are invited to attend.

Lamphere-Jordan asked if it would be possible, perhaps in early Spring, for the Executive Committee to have a workshop/planning session to identify some key programs/problems for an action plan to consider some issues that have been occurring recently. Moder said they would certainly take that up.

The meeting adjourned 5:15 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is January 13, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,
Birne Binegar, Secretary