

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
April 13, 2004

Carol Moder called the meeting to order with the following members present: Arquitt, Austin, Belmonte, Bilbeisi, Binegar, Chaney, Damicone, Ebro, Finchum, Fullerton, Gasem, Gelfand, Greiner, Henderson, Johannes, Lamphere-Jordan, Lehenbauer, Mokhtari, Mott, Murray, Phillips, Raff, Redwood, Sirhandi, te Velde, Terry, and Weiser. Also present: T. Agnew, J. Arms, R. Beer, P. Bell, L. Bird, D. Bosserman, G. Causin, L. Condit, B. Darcy, M. Dickson, J. Douglas, G. Gates, N. Gonzales, A. Goodbary, M. Heintze, B. Henley, B. LaBonte, D. Lane, B. Masters, E. Mitchell, T. Nixon, K. Perry, M. Rockley, H. Shipp, K. Smith, J. St. John, M. Strathe, J. Weaver, A. Webb, and G. Wiggins. Absent: Martin and Morgan

HIGHLIGHTS

NCA Self-Study for Reaccreditation Update.....	1
E-mail Migration.....	2
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee.....	4
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	9
Reports of Standing Committees	
Budget.....	9
Campus Facilities, Safety and Security	10
An Improved Process for Campus Planning.....	10
Faculty.....	12
OSU Racial and Ethnic Harassment Policy	12
Research.....	15
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	16
Rules and Procedures.....	16
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Staff Advisory Council	17
A&S Faculty Council.....	17
Emeriti Association.....	18
Student Government Association	18
New Business.....	18

Due to a problem with the Faculty ListServ the March Minutes were not received by all faculty. They will be approved/corrected at the May 11 meeting. Raff moved acceptance of the April 13, 2004 Agenda with the following change: move the Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee Report from 6.f to immediately following the E-mail Migration Special Report. Binegar seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended.

SPECIAL REPORT: NCA Self-Study for Reaccreditation Update – Brenda Masters

Masters reported OSU is in the process of an institutional self-study. During the fall of 2005, Oklahoma State University will undergo an accreditation site visit from the Higher Learning

Commission (HLC), A Commission of the North Central Association (NCA). The NCA is one of six regional institutional accrediting associations in the United States. Oklahoma State has been continuously accredited by the NCA since 1916. In preparation for the site visit, the university is undergoing an institutional self-study. The processes of the institution, and the outcomes of those processes, are being analyzed to determine if they support the mission. A steering committee, organized around the new NCA accreditation criteria, has been formed to guide the process. Members of the NCA Self-Study Steering Committee may contact you for information. Subcommittee Chairs include: Mission and Integrity, David Buchanan; Preparing for the Future, Kouider Mokhtari; Student Learning and Effective Teaching, Jonathan C. Comer; Acquisition, Discovery, and Application of Knowledge, Nigel R. Jones/Lowell Caneday; and Engagement and Service, Larry Sanders. The process includes developing a Steering Committee structure, criteria initially addressed by subcommittees, focus on involvements and communication, provide documents and drafts through the website, <http://accreditation.okstate.edu>, prepare the final Self-Study Report and facilitate the evaluation visit, and respond to the draft and final report from the NCA. Concerns from the 1995 visit included: Lack of clear institutional values, directions, and plans with critical self-assessment; low faculty salaries and salary compression; lack of buy-in to assessment as a means of program improvement; Library has a serious space problem; retirement plan, move away from TIAA-CREF (quoted: “The large unfunded liability in the state retirement system, and the projected move away from TIAA-CREF, are of serious concern to faculty and staff and may cause significant recruiting problems in the future.” – 1995 NCA Response to OSU); and lack of diversity at upper levels. The website will provide information about the self-study to the public and will archive the support materials for the accreditation report. Although the website is in the initial stages of development, main page content will lead you to the report that OSU provided to the NCA for the last site visit in 1995, the response written by the NCA evaluators to OSU early in 1996, a list of the NCA Steering Committee, and the new NCA Accreditation Criteria. E-mail messages can be sent to: accreditation@okstate.edu. Masters ended by saying “the institutional self-study provides the opportunity for us to understand and improve our university and your cooperation is essential to an effective process.” Moder asked for questions. Henderson said at OSU/OKC they had a NCA visit that was completely separate from the one at OSU/Stillwater and that was after President Schmidly’s commitment to “one university, many campuses” and would that still be the case. Masters replied that would still be the case because the NCA accreditation is specifically for a single institution and the degree programs in that institution – it does not cover the entire system. The site visit OSU will have covers the institution of Oklahoma State and the degree programs that OSU has and those are also on the OSU/Tulsa campus and they will be a part of the study and she thought that OSU/COM had two Master’s programs that are related to OSU Master’s programs and are degree programs.

SPECIAL REPORT: E-mail Migration – Gary Wiggins

Wiggins reported one of the things Information Technology had been working on the last few months was e-mail. There were things in the basic infrastructure that needed backfilling, reinforcing and possibly changed. He said every discussion he had with people he sensed the current Lotus Notes environment was not stable and as it was moved away from certain things would get worse before they got better. There have been very severe problems with the Lotus environment since Spring Break and these have had a variety of causes. Some of these were

specifically tied to the migration. The plan is to take all the different e-mail systems used at the five OSU campuses and compress them into a single e-mail system using Microsoft Exchange/Outlook. In March 100 IT employees were moved to the new environment and it is working well enough that they are in the process of moving the first non-IT department which will be Career Services and hope to have all departments on the new system by Christmas. Wiggins said e-mails will automatically be sent from the old e-mail addresses to new e-mail addresses for 60 days after the new e-mail address is created. Wiggins said in the next few days faculty and staff will be mailed a postcard telling them to go to a certain website and tell the Microsoft Exchange/Outlook active directory environment who you are and you will be given an activation code which is used once and thrown away. Identify yourself with that code along with some other information that will confirm it is you and you will activate yourself in the new environment. It does not change your e-mail and all it does is to let the new system know that you exist and lets you choose your new e-mail address and the password you will be using when the switchover is made. One or two days before the switchover either an IT employee or someone from the department being migrated, or both, will show up for a pre-conversion conversation to discuss procedures. At migration time a technician will go to the persons desktop and work with them in completing the migration and that will involve 30 minutes to 1½ hours depending on the complexity. Once that happens and you are migrated your e-mail, calendars, archives, contacts, etc., will be done during that session. You will be logged on to Exchange Outlook and the technician will make sure it works before they leave. Then in the next day or so either your technical contact or someone from IT will do a follow-up to make sure the migration has been successful. Wiggins said some concerns being expressed at some of the forums included e-mail addresses on business cards, with professional societies, etc., and could that address be retained. Wiggins said "yes." He explained e-mails will automatically be sent from old e-mail addresses to new e-mail addresses for 60 days after the new e-mail address is created. During that time you can request that you keep your old address for a full year and at the end of that year you will get an e-mail saying your year is about up and do you want to use it for another year. If you do you go to the same website and "re-up" to have your old e-mail address retained for an additional year. Wiggins said other concerns were, "what if I don't like Outlook and want to use Eudora or something else?" Wiggins replied any UNIX standards-based client will work including Eudora and they plan on supporting Eudora specifically and the Help Desk people will provide support. Wiggins said they will have a guest mechanism in place so that people visiting campus will have access to e-mail. One reason this change is being made is to save approximately \$240,000 per year on licenses for Lotus and Novell. The Novell license is scheduled to expire June 30. They have negotiated an agreement where the license can be extended for employees on all five campuses through June 30, 2005. There are some units like the Physical Plant that might want to keep Novell forever and if they do there are mechanisms through State contracts to do specific Novell licensing for those units. Wiggins ended by saying, "you will see faster e-mail, a single sign-on both for the active directory and the e-mail areas, a better interface to wireless, better synchronization for PDA's, better collaborative tools, the Outlook/Exchange tools can be used in other systems as they go forward, and a web interface that is essentially the same as on your desktop." Sirhandi asked if there would be a mechanism to deal with SPAM and Wiggins replied, "Yes, if you're in Office 2003 there is a SPAM filter. It's not a super SPAM filter but is better than nothing." Binagar asked about Linux. LaBonte responded saying that Linux users should not expect any difficulties. Binagar said he had heard

that the local mail servers are going to be shut down one by one. Wiggins said their policy on that is that local mail servers will be permitted if they meet security requirements. The Security Committee has completed their report and he will be sharing it with Faculty Council presently. Local servers will also be required to provide directory information, and they need to be properly supported. IT's position is that it is the decision of the academic area whether they want to run their own servers. The administrative areas will probably all migrate with the exception of Physical Plant which might have some technical issues. There is significant expense in making it secure, providing directory information and providing adequate support and Wiggins' impression is, unless they do not want to incur the costs, is that they will interact with any servers that meet those requirements and the security requirements will be put into play before they are adopted. Binegar said he couldn't understand why Wiggins thought the security additions would be so expensive because his department had been running Mail for 15 to 20 years. Wiggins replied he wasn't saying they would in every case but in some cases they might. Operationally they "punted" that to the Deans and the Provost. Binegar asked if port 25 was not going to be turned off in general and Wiggins replied, "No." Raff asked about faculty that do not use Lotus Notes, do not want to use Outlook, but use some other e-mail service. Wiggins said technically you could go into Outlook and forward anything you get there anywhere you want. Again, operationally they "punted" that to the Deans, Colleges, Department Heads and Directors. Johannes said he sent his outgoing mail and received his mail through cox.net. Wiggins said there were two choices. The web client for Outlook is about as good as the desktop client and the other choice, which is not operational today but will presently, is for you to set up a BPN connection from your home and just work as if you were on campus.

Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee Report – Mark Weiser

Weiser presented a PowerPoint presentation with comments as follows: The purposes of this committee have been supplanted by new committees hand-picked by IT. Many IT issues have come up this year that have sometimes slowed or prevented the work of everyone in this room and across campus. Some of these have been discussed by the committee in small groups and by e-mail. We will dive deeper into these specific issues over the next two months, but time is short before reorganization of the Committee and Council, so I bring it forward for discussion now to see what areas we should focus on. I have been a defender of IT since Dr. Wiggins' arrival, believing that he had the skills and background, and feeling that we needed to give him a chance to take things in a new direction. When negative issues arose, I sometimes explained plausible reasons why things could work that way, thereby quieting an issue. I now must apologize for possibly letting that go too far. Some of the items may sound like an attack on individuals of the IT Division as a whole; however, I will only present the facts for discussion and label the few items of speculation clearly. I frequently hear about IT troubles on campus, but I can't remember anyone calling me to tell me how great things are. I'm not just talking about the past year – people only speak up when they are mad. These rumblings of discontent in IT have been growing stronger and stronger, particularly this semester, so a very informal survey was done to determine the scope of the problems and make sure that what I was hearing wasn't simply a very vocal and discontented minority – it was far from that. Because of my professional and academic experience in IT, I fully expected it to confirm my suspicions of pervasive problems; however, even I was surprised at just how bad it is. We asked about inability or major impediments to accessing e-mail and online files, as well as overall service level trend. Metrics

of time lost were applied to VERY conservative salary figures to try to place an economic amount on this time loss to the university. To make sure I couldn't sway the findings by calling or avoiding those who previously complained about problems, disinterested students did the survey. We had an admittedly small sample size (100 attempts, 62 usable responses), but it spanned every division outside of IT. One alarming thing was that multiple people declined to answer for fear of repercussions. Other disturbing issues that have been verified over the past two months include: Electronic mail (unable to access or send e-mail, or exceptionally slow in past two days – 42% unable – 44% slow – 40.66 minutes wasted); access to files on server (unable to access server files, or exceptionally slow in the past two days – 17% unable – 21% slow – 3.75 minutes wasted); and economic impact (22.2 minutes per day per person – used even hourly workers to determine hourly wage across the university – loss in productivity, \$22,913 each day in Stillwater - \$27,809 each day system-wide). These were very conservative figures. If someone knew they had wasted time, but couldn't estimate the amount, it was excluded. If someone indicated they were sometimes unable to access mail or files, but said that no time was lost (which would be pretty much impossible), we applied a zero, thereby artificially deflating this figure. Wages deflated – hourly wages even applied. That's \$139K a week, \$600K a month, or almost \$7 million annually. If this time isn't needed, then we apparently have hundreds of unnecessary employees. Targets and findings: common targets: 4-nines/5-nines/6-nines – hard to determine at OSU – 209 recorded “outages and interruptions” in 10 weeks; common ITD solution is nightly rebooting (meaning services are unavailable) — 525600 minutes every year (all days considered) – Annually: 99.9: 876 hours; 99.99: 87.6 hours; 99.999: 8.76 hours; 99.9999: 53 minutes — 10080 Weekly: 16.8 hours; 1.6 hours; 10 minutes; 1 minute — 2700 Work hours/week: 4.5 hours; 27 minutes; 2.7 minutes; 16.2 seconds. Overall perception of IT services ability to access IT resources has...declined 58%; improved 1.7%; the remainder said they stayed the same. The bottom line is that a functional and reasonably reliable system changed to a dysfunctional one; hemorrhaging time (and that time is valuable); and the majority see a clear decrease in service quality during the current IT administration's short tenure...and all this in less than a year! The most frequent question about IT I get is “WHY?” “Why does it work this way?” is more and more frequently, “Why doesn't it work?” At the first public forum Wiggins deferred decisions to Microsoft and this worried me, but it could be interpreted to mean features within an application. However, the adoption of the Outlook/Exchange system is puzzling. I'm not saying that Outlook/Exchange is necessarily a bad choice. What is odd is that there doesn't seem to be a good rationale for THIS solution. Here are some reasons that have been proffered at different times when I and others have asked the VP and Directors: Money – now it's clear that we'll need increased hardware resources, although it should have been clear earlier. Money saved on licenses may need to be spent on security enhancement to offset the many security issues that Outlook/Exchange brings. Desktop transition time alone is about \$700,000, per ITD estimates, applying very conservative labor costs. Note that none of them said, “We did a requirements analysis across units and within the budget constraints; this is the one that best met the requirements”. In fact, I checked. When asked directly by a faculty member if their current e-mail addresses could and would stay active indefinitely, the Director in charge of the migration said, “absolutely”. You'll just specify that when you activate. Now the word is that we will have a year – good thing all the academic publications I have with weiser@okstate.edu are removed from library shelves and burned in less time than that and now earlier in this meeting Wiggins reported you could renew your e-mail

address each year if so desired. Finchum remarked, "An e-mail address cannot be seen as permanent even if one remains in the same job, any more than a mailing address or phone number". Weiser continued. Following Spring Break 20% or more of Lotus Notes resources were removed and moved over to support the exchange backend and when people returned from break they had large amounts of e-mail. When asked "why?" the answer was "I took a gamble and lost". At \$1253/minute for a system-wide productivity loss, that was quite a gamble! Instead of spending \$20 - \$50 in staff time to watch loads as the days began, realize this was a bad idea. Instead, computers were removed and rebuilt for the new MS backend, with no easy way back. That one decision may have cost over \$100K – ¼ million in lost productivity. What will happen after the transition? People sending you messages are notified that you are unreachable, even though you get the e-mail; even on campus, Notes will give you a *duplicate address* error; you may not be able to access your online files for an undetermined period. When Exchange is down, forwarding is down; and, address resolution will be done through a server product prone to failures, rather than one that has worked consistently for over a decade. If those transitioned are any indication, the following is likely: NONE of these issues should have caught them by surprise. Did it need to happen this way? No. The solution should have been based on a systems analysis and design. It may even have yielded an Outlook/Exchange, Active Directory solution, but almost definitely NOT with the completely centralized structure to which we are moving. Neither we nor the ITD know, however, because they didn't follow this well-established best practice. We'll see later that neither best-practice nor even policy drives this new ITD. Even with this solution as a given, it could have been managed on a similar time frame to go MUCH more smoothly, if the proper people were in place. "The Team" includes: VP of IT/CIO with a majority of experience in Institutional Research; Director of Software Services with an extensive background in programming and software development and Director of Technology Support with minimal pertinent experience. The Director of Software Services has an excellent background in software development and adequate experience in UNIX administration. Unfortunately, this covers only 1 out of his 5 areas of responsibility, with little background or knowledge in the other areas. He is largely responsible to driving the Outlook, Exchange, Active Directory migration. The Director of Technology Support has one year of truly pertinent experience at that level of technology management (that I can find). How could this have happened? The four pillars of Technology Management are: the managing the Technology itself, managing People, managing Money, and managing Perception Technology: DNS/DHCP; removal of Notes capacity; order of transition; use of consultants; adoption of imaging software; and lack of competence to support migration and basic function. People: Wiggins wanted to bring in two director candidates before announcing the job. After being told this was contrary to policy, he brought them in as "consultants" and had them effectively interview many of the staff that they were to supervise after they were hired, after the job was opened. Neither Director was thought of very highly, but it was clear that they had to be included in the selected pool. One Director had airline reservations and an agenda with his future employees even before recommendations for his position were made. Packets were forwarded late one afternoon and he was here the next morning. In one case, the Chair of the Search Committee was apparently changed to one who would rank the selected candidate highly (or at least include her in the selection pool). The other Director process was similar – some on the committee not even perceiving sufficient competence to do the job, yet no other candidate was brought in. Now, there's even a Federal lawsuit alleging improper hiring practices. One

Director is widely known to loudly lash out at employees for things as simple as making suggestions. I personally overheard one of these episodes and informed Wiggins. He indicated that he never heard about such an outburst and made it clear that any employee knows they could come to him with those actions. Interesting considering the same Director tore into a delivery guy in Math Sciences so loudly that multiple IT employees came out to see if someone needed help. They characterized his actions as “humiliating”, “embarrassing”, and “almost absurd”. This incident was so loud that a Professor stopped his large class in MS101 to investigate. Police were even called. Wiggins was given the police report, several ITD employees witnessed this, yet it appears that nothing was done, nor did his attitude change. One Director will not allow posting of advanced degree designation, such as EdD, PhD, etc., because it’s “contrary to a team environment”. – We sure wouldn’t want to value attaining a high level education at OSU! Money – We don’t really know – our request of almost two months for records has been ignored until last week. Last night after 5:00, because they knew this presentation was being made this afternoon, we were given some of the easy stuff on the finances, but I didn’t get it until at this meeting by Carol. Almost \$500K in the hole in one area. No one knows because we haven’t been able to get the figures. Estimates are between \$500K and \$2.5 million. Even an “open records” request would have taken about a month. Wiggins now controls central Tech Fees and expects to take over college portions of Tech Fee. Deans have called him concerned about this. There is no student oversight on Student Tech Fees. Low paid, experienced leadership has been replaced with high paid, inexperienced Texas Tech University staff. Per ITD’s time estimates, desktop migration alone will cost \$700K+ in time. Wiggins plans to centralize control of the college portion of Technology Fees effectively stripping the ability of colleges to make decisions to best meet their unique technology needs. One year “hold harmless” granted, however, Colleges are being told to plan five years out. Technology upgrades done on revolving three-year basis. This will help balance his budget and increase his control, but will not provide the best improvement directly to the students who paid their dollars in individual colleges. Perception – Microsoft campus agreement; calendar signs and ITD advertisements; college dog and pony shows; and high performance computing center. These are identical to his Texas Tech initiatives. These were fantastic and really give a good impression internally and externally. The problem - We have flashy signs, a nifty calendar, but e-mail doesn’t work and files are sometimes inaccessible (as well as many other things). To get this, staff have been abused (and many left), inordinate amount of money has been or will be spent, and the level of technology support is only declining. It is like a Ferrari with no wheels or engine. Our role? – New advisory committee selected by Wiggins, not constituent groups; financial information request ignored; security drafts months late, after release to overall committee. Next chapter...stopping the downward slide. Inadequate technology knowledge in trusted management; violations of hiring policies and subsequent mistreatment of employees; fiscal issues...but frankly, since he has removed an appointed voice from the faculty (via this Council) and answers directly to the President who hired him, I’m not sure what, if anything can be done. Fullerton thanked Weiser for his presentation because she said she had been convinced by the IT department that she is just “too stupid” to use the computer and that was why she had been having all these problems the last two weeks and she was so pleased to hear that everyone had been having problems because she teaches in Tulsa and had not had feedback from other people. Arquitt asked if Weiser had any information on whether or not software that was previously approved by the Student Technology Committee or being funded out of that was still being approved or whether that is

being continued on in the student tech labs or whether that software is now out of date and no longer being provided. Weiser replied he didn't know and Wiggins left before he started his presentation. He added he did know that money that was approved in his area by the students and signed off on by a previous Provost now must be requested and have an additional approval from Dr. Wiggins. Moder replied that was one of the pieces of information was requested. Gasem asked if perhaps these were just the pains of a transition period and hopefully once everything is completed we will go back to optimal operations. Weiser replied, "Absolutely not" and in fact these "pains" as you put it started before the transition period and were greatly aggravated because of poor decisions. Weiser continued this migration could have been done very smoothly if you had people with more experience. Mitchell said his office staff reported e-mail is slow but better than a year ago and Weiser replied they were part of the 1.7% that were satisfied. Phillips said he had experienced horrible service with e-mail but when you turn on NPR you find it's happening everywhere that 60-80% of all e-mail is "junk" and like molasses running through capillaries. He also said from the time he arrived on campus eight years ago he heard CIS was really in bad shape and the people were blaming the staff and now it's the same thing and was wondering if there was some other common denominator. Weiser replied he was a network expert and we have not been at capacity on our internet connection in the last four months other than tiny unnoticed spikes. He added e-mail is handling almost double the mail it should because of SPAM which is why a good SPAM solution should have been implemented first to lower that traffic and then migrate only about half the traffic. Rockley asked if there was any truth to the allegations that an active directory will give the ITD access to every file folder on your disk or computer. Weiser replied that was accurate; however, if they ever would be actually a policy issue. Directory rights flow down and they will be the administrators of the tree. Binagar commented on the remark earlier by Finchum about e-mail addresses and that anyone could change a job and he said that what people that are not faculty and not tenured don't understand is that they plan to stay at the institution with dedication for the rest of their careers and if their e-mail address changes as often as the IT administration changes is not acceptable. Finchum stated, "I am a faculty member, and I am tenured". Finchum also added your building address could change just as easily as your e-mail address. Gasem asked how best to move this forward. Weiser said he would visit the departments and find out what their needs were not how to make this solution fit their requirements. There never was a logical approach to figuring out what the right decision might be.

Lionel Raff presented the following Motion to Council:

"In view of the preliminary findings of the Faculty Council's Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee (IT), it is clear that a thorough and in-depth review of IT operations, practices, policies, and management is warranted. If the "problems" have been overstated or if they are more rumor than real, this needs to be determined and communicated to the Faculty, the Administration, and the Staff. If, on the other hand, the problems are real and substantive, this too needs to be determined and aired. Therefore,

I move that the Faculty Council formally charge the Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee with the task of conducting a thorough investigation of the hiring policies, personnel management, technical management of IT matters, and the budget and fiscal affairs of the IT Division. This investigation should include extensive interviews with IT

management and staff, examination of relevant budget matters, hiring policies, personnel management, and technical decisions within the IT Division. The Faculty Council IT Committee shall be empowered to solicit whatever technical assistance from other OSU Faculty and Staff as it deems necessary. At the conclusion of its investigation, the Chairman of the Long-Range Planning and Information Technology Committee at the time shall prepare a complete report of its findings for presentation to the Council. It is expected that the University and the IT Division will cooperate fully with this investigation and that it will be completed in a timely fashion.”

Motion passed unanimously.

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 was finalized, and funding for salaries will be a legislative priority. Recommendation will be shared with the Equity consultant. Adjustments made to \$40K for identified tenure-track faculty.
- 02-12-04-RFB ***Maternity/Family Leave Recommendation:*** Pending. The Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee has received endorsement of Staff Advisory Council and is awaiting the recommendation from Faculty Council.
- 03-02-06-EXEC ***Tulsa Bus Policy:*** Pending. J. Hess and K. Gasem have discussed an interim policy on faculty ridership. J. Weaver and Hess composed a revised policy looking at financial implications. Hess is expected to forward a proposal to Bosserman and Weaver in the near future.
- 04-01-01-RFB ***TIAA-CREF Vested Accounts Recommendation:*** Pending. Under study. Report expected Fall 2004.
- 04-03-01-ASP Accepted. Presented to Council of Deans in Feb. 2004; OSU Board of Regents in March 2004; and posted with OSRHE April 2004 with anticipated approval May 2004.
- 04-03-02-RFB Accepted. A draft of the bill has been posted on the HR website. Actuary report is under review. Working on language of bill to ensure it covers what OSU intends and what OTRS will agree to.
- 04-04-01-CFSS To President Schmidly
- 04-04-02-FAC To President Schmidly

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

Gelfand was going to give a report on the Oklahoma State Office of Finance revenue report that is usually placed on their website the second Tuesday of each month. However, it was not there as of today's meeting. At the Spring General Faculty Meeting on April 20 Gelfand will be presenting the results of a faculty survey prepared by the Budget Committee.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY AND SECURITY — Khaled Gasem

Gasem presented the following recommendation to Council:

Title: An Improved Process for Campus Planning

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: the University adopts a Campus Planning Process comprised of:

1. A well developed Campus Master Plan, which is responsive and strongly linked to the University Strategic Plan
2. A Facility Planning Office (FPO), which includes specialists in architecture, landscape architecture, art, horticulture, safety, and facility management

This office, which reports directly to the President, will:

- Uphold implementation of the Campus Master Plan
- Provide expertise in developing the Campus Master Plan
- Oversee Project Concept Development
- Provide leadership for the Project Design Group
- Provide first-level approval to new projects with strict adherence to the Campus Master Plan

3. A Facility Planning Committee (FPC), which includes members of the Administration, College representatives, Faculty Council representatives, and Student Government representatives

This committee will:

- Develop, coordinate, and implement the Campus Master Plan
- Form the Project Design Group
- Approve Capital Projects
- Interface with the Regents

4. A robust mechanism for consultation with all University constituencies

Rationale:

- Growth and the changing demands on campus facilities are inevitable. In managing both, we should insist on quality in function, preserving traditions, and seeking innovation. For it is certain that mediocrity in the physical environment and in facility planning impedes the ability of the University to envision great intellectual ideals.
- To develop OSU into a world-class institution of higher learning, we should not merely accept adequate accommodation for our needs, we should insist on an environment of function, quality, beauty, and tradition.
- Clear campus development plans, thorough project development processes, and efficient implementations are essential ingredients for effective campus development.

- Campus development processes should have the required checks and balances of planning, implementation, and accountability. Moreover, a methodical protective mechanism should be in place to prevent external pressures from creating undesirable and costly outcomes.
- Faculty and other constituencies share the responsibility with the administration and the Regents for planning the future of OSU. Thus, struggles among administrators, deans, and donors must not be the mechanism for campus development.
- Campus development planning is a primary function that should be given its appropriate role and its adequate funding; especially, since we are striving to grow our university to prominence on limited resources.
- On February 3, 1990, the Faculty Council passed a recommendation to improve the facility planning process as outlined in the CFSS report “*University Long-Range Planning for Facilities.*” We agree with the findings of the report and urge the administration to implement the above recommendation, which is a refinement of the original effort.

Gasem distributed “A Campus Facilities and Infrastructure Strategic Plan: Input from CFSS” which is listed below.

Goal

Improve the aesthetics and functional utility of the building, grounds, and amenities of the University; and equip and maintain all facilities to support a world-class academic enterprise in an attractive campus environment.

Objectives

1. Assess current resources and project future needs.
2. Develop and implement a Campus Master Plan that is responsive and strongly linked to the University Strategic Plan.
3. Develop an effective administrative structure for facility planning and management to uphold the highest standards for aesthetics, utility, and safety.
4. Maintain an up-to-date Capital management Plan detailing the capital development priorities.
5. Develop and maintain the IT facilities and the library at levels that support “best practice” developments in teaching and research.
6. Develop efficient academic and facilities scheduling protocols that optimize the use of campus resources.
7. Promote awareness and institute policies that support environmental sustainability at OSU.

Moder asked for questions or comments. Sirhandi asked if there was any way this committee could control or at least be informed of outside kinds of filtrations within the campus that influence it. She gave an example of a certain sculpture brought to campus and no one was told about it and this was a very bad sculpture and this upset the Art Department. This was brought in by someone that was very influential. Gasem responded that was why element number 2 was instituted and that is having a panel of experts looking at everything that happens on campus and given first level approval. Phillips asked if there was already a Master Plan and did this supercede anything. He had heard of something called the Bennett Plan. Gasem responded this

had actually started with Dr. Bennett's plan and then evolved and it has been updated historically a few times. He said they are actually asking for a comprehensive campus development plan where all the functions would be included and charted for a time horizon of at least ten years and shared with all the campus and student committees and once adopted becomes the rules of how to proceed forward. Raff said he was going to support this recommendation but does know that administration has a problem with number 2 that has to do with expense and feels OSU has employees on campus qualified to complete these functions better than anyone that could be hired externally. Gasem said it might cost from one-quarter to one-half million dollars to implement this plan and he feels this is a very small amount compared to the multi-million dollar buildings built on campus to make sure OSU has a safe, beautiful environment.

Recommendation passed unanimously.

FACULTY — Linda Austin

Austin presented the following recommendation to Council:

Title: OSU Racial and Ethnic Harassment Policy

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: the Racial and Ethnic Harassment Policy below be adopted by Oklahoma State University

1.01 Oklahoma State University (OSU) is committed to creating and maintaining a community in which students, faculty, staff, guests, and visitors work, study, teach and learn together in an atmosphere free of all forms of harassment, exploitation or intimidation. In employment, racial/ethnic harassment is prohibited by law under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. In the educational context, racial/ethnic harassment is race discrimination that interferes with the faculty's right to inquire and teach, and with students' opportunities to participate fully in the educational programs offered by OSU. Such discrimination is prohibited by law under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

POLICY

2.01 OSU seeks to eliminate and prevent racial/ethnic harassment in employment, educational programs, university-sponsored activities and activities carried out on University property. This policy is in addition to current University policies concerning discrimination, and applies to all students, faculty, staff, campus residents, guests or visitors. Persons in violation of this policy will be subject to remedial or corrective action as set forth in this policy. Enforcement of this policy shall be consistent with the freedom of speech guaranteed by the First Amendment to the United States Constitution and the University's commitment to free inquiry and expression as stated in Section 1.02 of University Policy 5-0601, Extracurricular Use of University Facilities, Areas For the Purpose of Expression. At the same time, it is hoped this policy will deter discriminatory and harassing conduct not protected by the legally defined boundaries of free speech and expression, in fulfillment of the University's duty to promote and protect its educational environment.

2.02 This policy shall not limit the scholarly, educational, and/or artistic content of any written, oral, electronic, or other presentation or inquiry falling within justifiable academic standards covering course contents and pedagogy. OSU is committed to academic freedom for all members of the academic community. Accordingly, academic freedom shall be liberally construed but shall not be used as a pretext for harassment. When appropriate, faculty are advised to inform students that content and teaching strategies properly employed in higher education may be controversial and/or discomfiting to some individuals.

DEFINITIONS and EXPLANATIONS

3.01 Racial/ethnic harassment is defined as an act, or series of acts, hostile towards the dignity of an individual, carried out on grounds related to race, color, ethnicity or national origin.

3.02 Racial/ethnic harassment can also be defined as a hostile environment that unreasonably interferes with the work or academic performance of those of a particular race, color, ethnicity or national origin. OSU will make every effort to create and maintain an environment free of harassment.

3.03 All forms of racial/ethnic harassment, including unintentional interference in educational activities and opportunities of racial and ethnic minorities, will be dealt with in a serious manner. Hostile actions or environments constitute harassment, even though those against whom the hostility is directed are not present. Since a failure to respond to an act of harassment may be interpreted as condoning the act, all incidents of harassment should be investigated.

3.04 Determination of whether any conduct or environment constitutes harassment will involve as complete an examination as possible of the context of the conduct, including the past records of those involved, and of the environment itself.

3.05 Not every act that might be offensive to an individual or a group necessarily will be considered a violation of this policy. Whether a specific act violates the policy will be determined on a case-by-case basis with proper regard for all of the circumstances. Due consideration must be given to the protection of individual rights, freedom of speech, academic freedom and advocacy. The Provost will rule on any claim that conduct, which is the subject of a formal hearing, is constitutionally protected by the First Amendment.

REGULATED OR PROHIBITED CONDUCT

In determining what conduct can be regulated or prohibited by the University, the protection of freedom of expression guaranteed by the United States Constitution must be observed. University Policy 5-0601, Extracurricular Use of University Facilities, Areas For the Purpose of Expression, states in Section 5.01 that "The First Amendment of the Constitution protects and guarantees freedom of speech by prohibiting any law which would serve to deny or limit expression. Through the Fourteenth Amendment, this prohibition is extended to all actions of state government, including those of publicly-supported universities. Accordingly, expression may not be denied or limited based upon content, unless it is determined in a state or federal

court proceeding that such speech or expression is not protected by the Constitution." The United States Supreme Court has ruled that expression which presents clear and present danger, fighting words and obscenity may not be protected by the First Amendment. For a definition of these terms see Section 14.01 of University Policy 5-0601.

4.01 Examples of acts that may constitute racial/ethnic harassment take a variety of forms. Examples of conduct that may constitute racial/ethnic harassment include, but are not limited to: physical harassment, verbal and nonverbal harassment, as well as print and electronic harassment that interferes with the participation of the targeted population in the life of the University; misconduct and violations of the law or University Policy.

INTIMIDATION OR RETALIATION

4.02 Threats or other forms of intimidation or retaliation against complaining witnesses, other witnesses, any reviewing officer, or any review panel shall constitute a separate violation of this policy. Such actions are prohibited and may also be subject to direct administrative action.

PROCEDURES

5.01 Introduction. The University administration is charged with the responsibility of providing assistance to all who believe that they have suffered harassment by persons associated with the University and its programs and activities. This assistance includes providing advice, information and counseling; actively attempting to bring about informal remedies; receiving and investigating complaints; determining appropriate sanctions; and resolving grievances and disputes associated with University policy and procedures. The specific administrative offices and personnel charged with these responsibilities depend, in part, on whether those suffering the alleged harassment and those causing the harassment are University employees and whether they are affiliated with the University as students, faculty, staff or visitors. Ultimately, the responsibility for enforcing this policy lies with the University Provost, President and Regents.

5.02 Obtaining Advice, Information and Counseling. Anyone may seek advice, information or counseling on matters related to racial/ethnic harassment without having to lodge a formal complaint. Persons who feel they are being harassed, or are uncertain as to whether what they are experiencing is racial/ethnic harassment, are encouraged to talk with persons with whom they feel comfortable. Such informal discussions can be handled departmentally by deans, department chairs, or heads of administrative departments.

The Vice-President for Institutional Diversity will be informed of any complaint, either formal or informal, of racial harassment. The following offices are also available to provide assistance: Director of Affirmative Action and Ombudsperson, 408 Whitehurst, 744-5371, chernan@okstate.edu; Vice President for Institutional Diversity, 408 Whitehurst, 744-9154; Student Conduct Office, 306 Student Union, 744-5470, mev@okstate.edu; Vice President for Student Affairs, 201 Whitehurst, 744-5328, lebird@okstate.edu.

Procedures for counsel, resolution, and appeals will adhere to the terms and guidelines of applicable University policy and procedures. These are described in detail on the University website, under “Policies and Procedures.” Complainants should consult the relevant document:

For faculty: Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of OSU, Appendix D, Section E, OSU Faculty Handbook.

For Administrative and Professional, and Classified Staff: 3-0746: Grievances And Appeals for Administrative/Professional and Classified Staff (see 3 .04)

For students: 2-0823: Student Discrimination Grievances

Rationale:

The University should make every effort to create and maintain an environment free from harassment. OSU does not now have a specific policy on record against acts of harassment that include unintentional interference in educational activities and opportunities of racial and ethnic minorities. Members of these racial and ethnic minorities strongly believe that the existence of a policy covering intentional and unintentional harassment, including actions that create a hostile environment and interfere with their academic performance, will deter discriminatory and harassing conduct that is not protected by the legally defined boundaries of free speech and expression.

Moder asked for questions or comments. Karen Smith said she noticed in the policy there was no mention of the person being harassed making a statement to the person doing the harassing and directly addressing that person. Austin said that issue had been noticed and because the policy is so broad and covers so many circumstances she felt that would depend on what the situation was and each instance would have to be dealt with separately. Moder added that in referencing the other procedures many include the definition already. If possible and if the conditions warrant that an individual would provide the people involved the possibility of talking to each other. Moder felt this was assumed under the existing procedures. Dickson asked if harassment of other groups was addressed such as Women, Gays, Lesbians, etc. Austin said there was a Sexual Harassment Policy and a Violence in the Workplace Policy. Belmonte stated that the Sexual Harassment Policy on this campus does not include sexual orientation. Raff asked the status of a sexual orientation recommendation that was passed several months ago. Moder said she believed it was accepted by administration. Mitchell said it had been passed on to the Regent’s Office. Jason Kirksey said he was an advocate of this policy and had worked on the original draft policy. He feels this policy is symbolic of what this university wants to stand for and whether or not it is truly a diverse campus, open and welcoming to those groups that have been underrepresented and until 50 years ago excluded from being on this campus. Kirksey very strongly encouraged adoption of the policy.

Recommendation passed unanimously.

RESEARCH — John Damicone

Damicone reported the committee has been working on developing a recommendation to amend Appendix D to include a research non-tenure track research professorship for several months. They have been trying to come to some mutual agreements with administration so they can go forward. Details will be given at the Spring General Faculty Meeting.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Sally Henderson

Henderson commented on the still pending maternity/family leave recommendation made several months ago and the fact that Dr. Bosserman mentioned last month they were still waiting on a response from Faculty Council which Council was unaware of. The R&FB committee made some recommendations which were discussed in FC Executive Committee and some changes were agreed upon. Henderson will take the recommendations back to the R&FB committee for their input. She also invited Dr. Bosserman to attend the meeting if possible. In another matter, Henderson said there would be a survey forthcoming via e-mail concerning faculty affected by Annual Leave. Henderson thanked Anne Matoy and those responsible for providing an update in regard to House Bill 2226 provisions. This included some calculations to possibly help in making clear what calculations would be used in a retirement situation and all calculations provided were for high-base retirement options and none for low-base. The committee will request the ones for low base. Moder added, in regard to House Bill 2226, the Bill is in committee at the present time. She was asked to attend a meeting last week in which Senator Morgan made it very clear to representatives of OTRS, OU and OSU suggesting that he and Representative Ingmire want this bill passed this session and is trying very hard to get OTRS to provide the information on to OSU and OU to verify what the cost of getting out of OTRS would be in order to fund the unfunded liability. There is still some discussion about what that figure is. OTRS's figures are higher than OSU and OU. The actuaries are being given the data and are supposed to come to an agreement within the next 20 days. On April 14, OU, OSU and OTRS and the Senate staffers are redrafting the bill to make sure it includes all the provisions and language asked about and particularly concerning the retirement formula. The intention at this point seems to be very clear to redress the retirement formula problems for those both above and below the cap. Moder said she was assured that all interested parties would be able to look at the draft to make sure all agree it says what they want it to say and added the administration and faculty have been working very closely in this regard. After the bill is finalized it will go back to both Houses to be approved. Moder feels if it does pass that a huge issue with the retirement formula will be resolved. She thanked Ron Beer and Terry Lehenbauer for writing letters in support of the bill which were helpful and encouraged anyone else to contact Sen. Morgan or Rep. Ingmire and let them know how valuable this bill would be.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Lionel Raff

Raff presented Faculty Council election results as follows: Vice Chair, Bob Darcy, Department of Political Science; College of Arts & Sciences (two three-year terms), Patricia Bell, Department of Sociology; and Mark Rockley, Department of Chemistry; (one-year term) Dale Toetz, Department of Zoology; College of Engineering, Architecture & Technology (three-year term), Thomas Jordan, School of Architecture; College of Business Administration (three-year term), Ron Moomaw, Department of Economics; College of Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources (three-year term), Gregory Bell, Department of Horticulture; College of Education (three-year term), Rey Martinez, School of Teaching & Curriculum Leadership; Multicultural Representative (three-year term), Earl Mitchell, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; OSU/Oklahoma City (three-year term), Armando Cruz-Rodz, Department of Science; and OSU/College of Osteopathic Medicine (three-year term), Alexander Rouch, Department of Pharmacology & Physiology. Raff added on April 29 at 1:00 p.m. there will be an orientation meeting for new Councilors. Moder added new Councilors will be invited to

attend the May 11 FC meeting as guests and their first official meeting will be June 8. Moder also reminded all committee chairs that year-end reports will be given at the May 11 meeting.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Staff Advisory Council — Liz Condit

Condit reported the Annual Carnation Sale conducted by the Council to raise money used to fund OSU Staff Scholarships will be conducted in conjunction with Administrative Professional Day, April 21, 2004. Flowers will be delivered on April 20, 2004. Deadline for ordering is April 15, 2004. This is a great opportunity to show staff you appreciate their hard work and support Staff Advisory Council's Scholarship Fund as well. Applications for the 2004-2005 Staff Scholarship/Tuition Assistance will be accepted until 5:00 p.m. Friday, May 14, 2004. The Council has finalized plans for Staff Appreciation Day. It will take place April 27 on Willard Lawn. Rain location is the SU Ballroom. The food vendor this year is Cherokee Strip. For a number of years, administration and the Staff Advisory Council set aside one day a year to honor and recognize the contributions made by staff employees. Last year, the Staff Advisory Council split the Staff Appreciation Day and the Staff Awards Program focusing on staff appreciation on one day and conducting the awards program on another day. The current Council membership plans to continue holding these two events on separate dates. Condit thanked all faculty that have volunteered to help serve lunch during Staff Appreciation Day. Good news – TIAA/CREF will donate \$500.00 to help offset some of the expenses for the picnic. The Council was given an update from representatives from HR concerning broad banding. There are two ways to broad band for positions on campus such as custodian which already exist. The first is a career development plan which means there is a clear progression within the title. The second is more difficult to broad band. This requires a hiring range to be developed and is, for example, for a position that does not have a clear progression such as a coordinator. Twelve point six percent of campus positions have been broad banded thus far. One hundred twenty-one positions in career development plans, 290 in the hiring range. HR goal is to have 25% by the end of the fiscal year. There was much discussion within the Council regarding past practices for hiring staff that did not have a degree but were otherwise qualified for a position based on their years of service to the University and work experience. It was explained that it would depend on the preferences of the hiring department and what they require for the job. SAC elections are soon. All nominations are now in. There was some concern with the Academic Affairs division because of the reorganization of the University. It was decided to send out information to Academic Affairs to let them know who is eligible within that area to run or nominate someone to run for a vacant seat on Council. SAC is also working to restructure their constitution upon completion of the University's reorganization. The Council recommended, after some discussion, a letter be sent to President Schmidly on behalf of SAC in support of the Retirement & Fringe Benefits committee recommendation with an emphasis on redressing the retirement benefits formula for all employees of comprehensive universities. A motion was made, seconded, and approved by a voice vote. The Council's next meeting is Wednesday, April 14, 2004, 1:15pm-3:00pm in 412 Student Union Case Study 2.

A&S Faculty Council — Bill Henley

The ASFC elected new officers to begin in May: Dennis Bertholf (Math), Chair; Larry Talent (Zoology), Vice Chair and Faculty Council liaison; and Lisa Lewis (English), Secretary. The fall

A&S convocation is tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, Sept. 14 at 3:00 p.m. in the Wes Watkins Center. It will double as a welcoming reception for new Dean Peter Sherwood and his wife.

Emeriti Association — Ron Beer

The OSU Emeriti has now entered into a formal contract with Kirkpatrick-Pettis and Signa of Omaha, Nebraska to develop a full-scale retirement campus. The Board of Trustees, of which Esther Winterfeldt is Chairperson, has held several detailed planning sessions with the developers and is in the process of creating a focus group of 20 or so people to react to the planning document. Initially, approximately 80 independent living and 50 assisted care units will be constructed on the 35 acres of donated land. The land is a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Milton Morris, in honor of Chris White, a distinguished faculty member in the College of Agriculture, deceased, and the father of Mrs. Morris. First occupancy is expected to occur in 2006. The Emeriti Council has formally created a program referred to as Life-Long Learning for Seniors. It will provide programs for all interested senior adults in the greater Stillwater Community. An oversight board, co-chaired by Elaine Wilson and John Baird, is comprised of members representing a variety of community interests, including the Stillwater Senior Citizens Center, Parks/Events and Recreation, various university entities, and general citizens. They anticipate the program will be located in the Seretean Wellness Center and in working closely with the Gerontology Institute. Its Mission: Life-long Learning for Seniors enriches lives by providing educational opportunities through community and university partnerships to enhance quality of life for senior adults. Its Vision: Life-long Learning for Seniors will help make Stillwater a leading retirement community in the nation and Oklahoma State University a national leader in continuing, community education. OSU has long been distinguished by the role it has played overseas, sharing knowledge and information, developing educational systems, exchanging faculty, and eventually students in foreign lands. Thus an International Relationship committee has been officially formed by the OSU Emeriti Association to raise money among OSU alumni in various countries to create endowed scholarships and eventually faculty/staff exchange-support for individuals from which the donor money comes and OSU. Experiential internships, developmental programs, mentoring, provision for host-families, etc. will be developed as the program evolves. The slate of officers for 2004-05 is: Ronald Beer – President; Larry Perkins – President-elect; Jo Ann Seamans – Vice President for Activities; Bob Henrickson – Treasurer; Mary Alice Foster – Secretary; Immediate Past President – Larry Jones; and new councilors: Jim Stritzke, Elaine Wilson and Lynn Sisler.

Student Government Association — Josef Douglas

Josef thanked Council for their support of the Racial and Ethnic Harassment Policy.

New Business:

Moder reported Dr. Glenn Dowling, the salary consultant hired to do an equity salary survey, will be on campus to report the results of his survey on Thursday, April 22. The time set aside for Faculty Council and other interested faculty parties is 10:30 a.m. in the West Watkins Center, Rooms 101-102. Moder added anyone interested in the results or to ask questions of Dr. Dowling was welcome to attend. A question was asked if the results of the survey would be posted on the website and Moder said she would try and find out.

Moder invited all faculty to attend the Spring General Faculty Meeting to be held on Tuesday, April 20, 3:00 p.m., Student Union Little Theater. Three critical issues facing OSU will be discussed: the Budget, Information Technology and Research. President Schmidly has told Moder he will attend to make an administrative response and to answer faculty questions and concerns. She urged all to attend and ring colleagues. A reception will follow in the Regency Room.

The meeting adjourned at 5:43 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is May 11, 2004.

Respectfully submitted,
Birne Binigar, Secretary