

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
May 10, 2005

Lionel Raff called the meeting to order with the following members present: Arquitt, Austin, Bell, G., Bell, P., Binegar, Chaney, Cruz-Rodz, Darcy, Johannes, Jordan, Lamphere Jordan, Lehenbauer, Martin, Martinez, Moder, Mitchell, Moomaw, Murray, Phillips, Rockley, Sirhandi, te Velde, Terry, and Toetz. Also present: Agnew, Brown, Causin, Elliott, Emslie, Gates, Giles, Hallgren, Heintze, John, Kirksey, Meinkoth, Ransom, Schmidly, Shutt, Strathe, Thornton, Vincent, Weaver, and Woodford. Absent: Bilbeisi, Fullerton, Greiner, Henneberry, Mott, and Rouch.

HIGHLIGHTS

Voting for Replacement Councilors for Vacant Positions.....	2
Presentation of Certificates to Out-Going Faculty Council members	2
Governor’s Commendation to Lionel Raff Presented by President Schmidly	2
Presentations of Gavels to Faculty Council Committee Chairs.....	3
Introduction of New Faculty Council Members	5
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	5
Remarks and Comments from President Schmidly	5
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	6
Recommendation: Total Hours Required in a Curriculum	6
Recommendation: Default Attendance Policy.....	7
Recommendation: Changes to University Policy and Procedures	
Document 2-0821, Academic Affairs. March 2001. APPEAL OF	
A FINAL GRADE NOT INVOLVING ALLEGATION OF	
DISHONESTY OR MISCONDUCT	9
Jason Kirksey, Chair, Black Faculty and Staff Association	12
Athletics	15
Budget.....	17
Campus Facilities, Safety and Security	20
Faculty.....	22
Recommendation: Approval of “Policy Statement to Govern	
Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of	
the Faculty of Oklahoma State University”	22
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology	23
Research.....	24
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	26
Rules and Procedures.....	27
Student Affairs and Learning Resources	28
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Emeriti Association.....	29
Staff Advisory Council	30

Raff made one correction to the April 12, 2005 Minutes. Page 12, Line 14 read: "Raff noted that in the 2004 Faculty Budget Survey out of 15 items asked, 'Provide Money for Cost Neutral Items in Health Insurance' was #15". This should have been #13. Increase Faculty Salaries was correct as #5. Moder moved acceptance of the April 12 2005 Minutes as corrected. Lamphere Jordan seconded. The Minutes were approved as corrected. Binegar moved acceptance of the May 10, 2005 Agenda. Lehenbauer seconded. The Agenda was approved.

Voting for Replacement Councilors for Vacant Positions

Raff reported there were three vacancies on Council. These were due to the fact that Tom Phillips was elected Vice Chair, Reynaldo Martinez will be leaving OSU and Marcella Sirhandi will be going on sabbatical. The Nominating Committee has nominated Dr. Steve Hallgren, Associate Professor, Forestry, to replace Tom Phillips for one of the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources positions; Dr. Catherine Sleezer, School of Educational Studies, to replace Rey Martinez as one of the College of Educations positions; and Dr. Gilbert John, Associate Professor, Microbiology and Molecular Genetics to replace Dr. Sirhandi for one of the College of Arts and Sciences positions. According to the by-laws of Faculty Council these replacements must be voted on by Council. These faculty members were asked to leave the room. Council voted on each faculty member separately and all were approved unanimously. Terms will begin June 1.

Presentation of Certificates to Out-Going Faculty Council Members

Raff presented out-going Councilor certificates to: Carol Moder Vice Chair – 2002-2003 Chair – 2003-2004 Past Chair – 2004-2005; Shida Henneberry – College of Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources, 2004-2005; Don Murray – College of Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources, 2002-2005; Dale Toetz – College of Arts & Sciences, 2004-2005; Alyson Greiner – College of Arts & Sciences, 2002-2005; Dennis Mott – Spears School of Business, 2002-2005; Suzanne Bilbeisi – College of Engineering, Architecture & Technology, 2002-2005; Andrea Arquitt – College of Human Environmental Sciences, 2002-2005; Terry Lehenbauer – Center for Veterinary Health Sciences, 2002-2005; Jami Fullerton – OSU-Tulsa, 2003-2005; Reynaldo Martinez – College of Education, 2004-2005; and Marcella Sirhandi – College of Arts and Sciences, 2003-2005.

Governor's Commendation to Lionel Raff Presented by President Schmidly

President Schmidly made the following remarks and presented Lionel Raff with a commendation from Gov. Brad Henry:

"As the out-going Councilors are recognized today, I would like to make a special presentation at this time. This presentation is to the out-going Chair, Dr. Lionel Raff.

Lionel was elected to the position of Vice Chair of the Faculty Council in the Spring of 2003. The following year he assumed the position of Chair of the Council and, in my opinion has served his fellow faculty very admirably. Indeed, he has been presented with many interesting

and challenging issues during his tenure. Each time a new issue arose, Lionel very carefully considered all aspects and views, which was evidenced by his thorough responses.

I have appreciated Lionel's calm and rationale approach throughout all sorts of discussions.

Today, I am especially pleased on behalf of Brad Henry, Governor of the State of Oklahoma to present Lionel with this Governor's Commendation which reads:

"This commendation is hereby presented to Lionel Raff with gratitude for your service as Chairman of the General Faculty and Faculty Council at Oklahoma State University. Your distinguished service is a true reflection of your commitment and dedication to higher education. I would like to express my appreciation for your efforts and extend my personal best wishes for all your future endeavors." Signed by Honorable Brad Henry

Presentations of Gavels to Faculty Council Committee Chairs

Raff presented engraved gavels to 2004-2005 Committee Chairs for enormous service throughout the entire year and highlighted some of the committee's activities:

Linda Austin, Faculty Committee — Worked diligently to establish the Clinical Professorship Track. Her committee completed a line by line evaluation and modification of the revisions that have been suggested to Appendix D and her committee is still working in reviewing five cases in regard to Reappointment, Promotion and Tenure.

Alexander Rouch, Research Committee — Completed the development of Research Professorships which are now part of Appendix D; played a key role in getting research journals returned from the Library Annex to the main library and then monitoring the implementation of the compromise agreement that was reached; and this committee has been diligent in monitoring developments at the Research Park on Sangre Road.

A. J. Johannes, Rules and Procedures Committee — Revised Appendix A & B under which Faculty Council is now operating; conducted two elections of the General Faculty; and are now working to initiate electronic voting.

Shida Henneberry, Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security — Gave recommendations for future Orange Peels to correct some of the unforeseen problems in the past; addressed the issue of bike safety and awareness; initiated no-smoking signs within 24 feet of buildings; campus recycling test program was launched; raised concerns over poor road conditions; initiated discussions with Mrs. Schmidly on campus beautification; and is now representing the Faculty Council on the Campus Master Planning Committee.

Mark Rockley, Academic Standards and Policies — Completed a survey on the effectiveness of valedictorian scholarships which they found out were very effective as verified by the committee; will bring three recommendations to Council at this meeting regarding revised policies for the Academic Appeals Board to include provisions for appeals in handling academic dishonesty charges, recommendation for the establishment of a uniform policy on student

attendance in classes and the committee crafted the recommendation for rank and class evaluations, and a recommendation that faculty should control degree requirements.

Tom Phillips, Student Affairs and Learning Resources — Crafted the compromise that led to the return of peer-review journals from the Annex to the Library and took care of the concerns of the faculty and the Library; crafted the recommendation for the reestablishment of the Student Tech Fee Committee; and a recommendation that was approved, but not yet implemented, regarding log-in procedures for campus-wide computer labs to benefit students.

Earl Mitchell, Budget Committee — Conducted the Faculty Survey to determine the priorities of the faculty; handles the Faculty Council Budget that provided up-graded equipment to the Faculty Council Office; initiated a study of how Work Study students are used, which is still in progress. It seems Work Study students are doing routine office work and they will try and get them into undergraduate research and work more conducive to further their education.

Terry Lehenbauer, Retirement and Fringe Benefits — Met with Legislatures trying to insure passage of House Bill 2226 which will add approximately \$5,000 to every staff member's retirement; crafted the compromise recommendation that will give faculty and staff access to their vested TIAA-CREF funds; brought a recommendation for the survey of Big 12 schools on health care benefits; and are now engaged in crafting the RFP's that will go out to try and improve the premiums and benefits obtained from those health services; and played a role in obtaining long-term care insurance that has been implemented.

Birne Binegar, Long-Range Planning and Information Technology — Faculty Council charged this committee with investigating allegations of the Information Technology Division which was a major effort. Raff added the university is far better off and IT is now working very well. Binegar worked with IT on security of staff software, and serves as the Council representative on the Strategic Planning Committee.

Don Murray, Athletics Committee — Reported on student-athlete grades by major sports and gender; enlightened Council on the new NCAA rules by having Rick Allen present a special report; first to address the issues of professors providing a timely syllabus to each student at the beginning of each semester and referred this issue to the Academic Standards and Policies Committee; provided faculty with a budget from the Athletic Department as provided by Athletic Director, Harry Birdwell; reviewed and rendered an opinion on Board Rule 10-3-4 and reviewed and made a critical change in the COIA proposal to make sure that athletic scholarships be awarded on the same basis as those awarded to the general student body; conducted focus groups on the perception of cheating among athletes and found that the perceptions are mainly due to what happened in high school and not what is happening here on campus. Raff added that he believed that Murray and his committee had focused on giving the student athlete the best chance to succeed as a student.

Carol Moder and Diane LaFollette were both presented with roses for their service to Council.

Introduction of New Faculty Council Members

Raff asked Johannes to introduce the new Faculty Council members. Johannes asked the following to stand if they were present: Tom Phillips, Vice Chair; Birne Binegar, Secretary; Anthony Brown and Scott Gelfand, Arts & Sciences; John Veenstra, College of Engineering, Architecture & Technology; Charles Ransom, William S. Spears School of Business; Brian Carter and Kristopher Giles, College of Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources; Beulah Hirschlein, College of Human Environmental Sciences; James Meinkoth, Center for Veterinary Health Sciences; and William Dare, OSU-Tulsa. Also, newly appointed representatives as mentioned earlier in these Minutes – Hallgren, John and Sleezer were reintroduced. Johannes added that a third of the Councilors are elected each year.

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

- 05-02-01-BUDG *Competitive Graduate Student Stipend and Tuition Package:* Included in budget proposal for FY 2006. Under review as the FY 2006 budget is developed.
- 05-04-01-ASP *Optional Record of Class Rank on Transcript:* This recommendation was defeated by faculty vote.
- 05-04-01-ASP *Total Hours Required in a Curriculum:* To President Schmidly
- 05-05-02-ASP *Default Attendance Policy:* To President Schmidly
- 05-05-03-ASP *Changes to University Policy and Procedures Document 2-0821, Academic Affairs. March 2001. APPEAL OF A FINAL GRADE NOT INVOLVING ALLEGATION OF DISHONESTY OR MISCONDUCT:*
To President Schmidly

REMARKS AND COMMENTS – President Schmidly

The President reported on what he knew regarding the budget and said it would probably be decided by the next meeting. He said negotiations are on-going and he hopes the numbers will be improved. As of now, what has been agreed to in the budget is a \$72 million increase for higher education. Twenty-nine million of that is to service bond payments. Subtracting that out, \$43 million is available to flow to the State Regents for operational issues. The Regents take off approximately \$10 million to fund OLAP and a number of other statewide higher education issues. That leaves about \$33 million of new money available to flow through the formulas. OSU gets about 14 percent of that which is approximately \$4.6 million. If that is the amount received, it has to be balanced out with a tuition increase to get enough money to pay for required cost increases that have gone up, over which there is no control, and also to provide any kind of raise package, plus the ability to improve the things like graduate student stipends. As it stands now they are looking at about an eight to nine percent increase in tuition. This would allow most of the essential things including funding for a three percent raise and making some forward progress on the Reward, Restore and Grow the Faculty initiative. Schmidly said the Provost had just returned from a meeting of other Big 12 Provosts and he will meet later with her to discuss what the other Big 12 schools are doing and she has suggested they might want to revisit the raise issue. Presidents Boren and Schmidly have embarked on an initiative to obtain

\$30 million on additional money added to Higher Education. The point they are trying to make is that they need at least \$66 million flowing through the formulas in order to return to '02 levels because salaries are so far behind the regional and national averages and they would like to do more in the salary program to be more competitive in faculty retention and hiring. Also, they would like to hold tuition lower than eight or nine percent, more in the four or five percent range. They have visited Mike Morgan, leadership in the House and talked with leadership in the Governor's Office. Negotiations are under way to see if more can be done for higher education. Everything is still in play, there are still opportunities; however, nothing is guaranteed. Schmidly said, "We are not going to take a cut and there is some increase. It appears now we will be able to keep tuition below the double digit increase".

Mitchell asked what was the status of the Agricultural Experiment Station Research Initiative. Schmidly replied it was still in play and added there was a request for \$5.4 million to restore lost funds. Last year \$3.8 million was restored to Extension as a result of the Special Initiative and they are trying to do the same for the Experiment Station because they get no benefit from tuition increases and they have been extremely hard hit the last three or four budget cycles. Schmidly said he would either go to the Capitol later today or next Thursday and visit with all the key Cowboys in the Legislature and see where OSU stands on all these initiatives. There is also a \$10 million initiative to take care of the teaching hospital situation for the medical school in Tulsa. There are a number of key issues and a real opportunity to succeed with them.

Moder asked if the projected raise program would be effective July 1 or October 1, due to the fact that a recommendation was passed last year by Faculty Council and accepted by Administration for raises to go into effect on July 1 and then given the choice of a larger increase October 1 that date was chosen. Schmidly replied that had not yet been discussed and the goal is to get the raises as early possible. He asked Joe Weaver what the cost was last year to annualize the salary program and Weaver replied about \$950,000. Schmidly added that had to be factored into the \$4.62 million and has to plug that annualization and he feels that is not a good way to do business if it can be avoided; however, if it is the only way to give a 4 or 5 percent salary increase he may do it again.

Toetz said he understood state agencies do not pay overhead on grants and contracts. Weaver replied some do and some do not and it depends on the agency. Toetz asked if it was not time to re-evaluate that given the fact that the State of Oklahoma is not supporting the university as it once did. Schmidly said they would look into the matter.

Phillips asked if the 8 to 9 percent tuition increases would apply to graduates and undergraduates and Schmidly said at this point he thought so. Moder asked if that was in-state and Schmidly replied it was more for out of state and that Weaver had been doing a tuition model and it is still in play. Weaver said until they knew what the appropriations were nothing is definite. Schmidly said it had to be under 10 percent if at all possible and added he would like to see the students receive a break since there had been three consecutive years of pretty large tuition increases.

Johannes asked about the money going to pay off bonds and was that in regard to the new bond issue. Schmidly replied there are still other bond issues around in higher education and it covers that plus the potential for new bonds. He added that all the \$29 million would not be used this

year because everything will not be built. This could be where some of the budget relief is realized and there are discussions on-going with the State Finance people, the House and the Senate regarding the legality of doing this. Schmidly said there will definitely be a tax reduction and this will impact education.

Arquitt said tuition revenue depended a lot on enrollment and asked if there were any projections on what new student enrollment would be. Heintze replied that it looked like the total population for the Fall would be equal to or a little more than last year but not a great deal and added they projected a slight growth on the other campuses and good numbers from NOC.

Schmidly announced that \$2 million had been received from Conoco-Phillips for scholarships and faculty development to be distributed among several colleges and also the SBC Foundation has given OSU \$3 million to fund one of the largest college student transfer scholarship programs in Oklahoma and to support academic enhancement initiatives at OSU.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Mark Rockley

Rockley presented three recommendations to Council as follows:

Title: Total Hours Required in a Curriculum

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that:

There be acknowledgement that the Faculty within each academic department are responsible for determining curricular requirements for each degree offered and that no administrative officer of the Oklahoma State University impose arbitrary maximum limits on the number of credit hours in any degree program. Included in this responsibility is the understanding that the Faculty of each department or academic unit set forth the standards, curriculum, and numbers of credit hours that support proficiency in the subject matter, meet OSU General Education requirements, meet appropriate program accreditation 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 the high standards of performance expected of a comprehensive university.

Rationale:

Most degree programs should have the goal of degree completion within four academic years of full-time enrollment. However, 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.)

This recommendation passed unanimously.

Second recommendation as follows:

Title: Default Attendance Policy

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that:

It be noted for the record that the authority to establish an attendance policy belongs with the faculty and that the university adopt a uniform default attendance policy regarding the relationship between the course grade awarded and the attendance of the student. Moreover, it is specifically recommended that this default attendance policy shall be: “No penalty will be assessed for class absences.” It is further recommended that this attendance policy would be in force in the absence of a written policy provided to the student within the first three lectures of a semester.

Rationale:

There have been several instances in which faculty have issued a grade for a student in a course based on an arbitrary statement regarding attendance policy by the students. This can be arbitrary and capricious. Such actions reflect badly on the faculty member involved. By instituting this ‘default’ policy, students always have a reference point for successful grade appeal.

Furthermore, the Student Government Association has specifically approved and forwarded a motion to the Faculty Council requesting that the use of attendance policies which penalize students for absences be prohibited.

Furthermore, mandatory attendance result in a public health threat.

Furthermore, it is the responsibility of the faculty to dispense knowledge and create new knowledge. It is not the responsibility of the faculty to engage in behavioral modification.

Furthermore, the university environment is a transition zone between the dependent and mandated classroom attendance when an individual is living in a home environment under the authority of the parents and state law, and the independent action of the individual which results

in necessary attendance at the work place. Therefore, this transition must be made by the student and the student should not be deprived of the opportunity to learn this responsibility.

Moomaw offered a friendly amendment that if no attendance policy is adopted by the faculty that attendance cannot be used to determine grades. Sirhandi seconded. Binegar said another concern he had was the fact in the statement, as it is originally written, or in the friendly amendment it does not affirm the importance of attending class and Council might want to take the position that attendance in class is very important. Moder asked if there was an existing policy this would go into. Rockley answered this would be a standing policy and a Policy and Procedures Letter would need to be written. Johannes said this had been beaten down for at least 20 years. Rockley did not accept Moomaw's suggestion and Moomaw withdrew it. Moder then introduced a friendly amendment, and Mitchell seconded, as follows: "If this recommendation is passed by Faculty Council and accepted by the administration, the Academic Standards and Policy Committee will work with the administration to draft an appropriate Policies and Procedures Letter." If passed, this will be added as the last sentence in the first paragraph of the above recommendation.

Mitchell called the question. The recommendation passed, with the friendly amendment added, 24 for and 1 against.

Third recommendation as follows:

Title: Changes to University Policy and Procedures Document 2-0821, Academic Affairs. March 2001. APPEAL OF A FINAL GRADE NOT INVOLVING ALLEGATION OF DISHONESTY OR MISCONDUCT

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that:

The Policy and Procedures document 2-0821, which is cited above, be modified and amended as noted in the attachment.

Policy and Procedure document 2-0821 sets out procedures for the appeal of a final grade not based upon allegations of dishonesty or misconduct. Soon allegations of dishonesty and misconduct will be renamed violations of academic integrity and for this reason the newer term will be used here. The intent of the document is the same.

General Rationale:

The Academic Appeals Board (AAB) hears cases of grade appeals not involving issues of academic integrity. There is mistrust by some faculty members who have been involved with the process of a grade appeal. In particular, there appears to be lack of due process, no possibility of an appeal of a decision, and discrepancy between policy and practice regarding the kinds of cases heard. The revision to this policy clarifies those issues, requires training for members, modifies composition of the board, and provides for decision appeals. These changes also formalize communication between the AAB, the Faculty Council and faculty members regarding AAB policies and actions.

Specific changes or points of clarification are given in the attached Policy and Procedures Document. The specific rationales for the proposed modifications are also given, but will be removed when the document is formally submitted to the President. The rationale for other editorial and grammatical changes should be self evident.

Darcy offered a friendly amendment as follows:

2.01 c. Each party is permitted to have one silent observer of their choosing present during their part of the hearing and the right to call a short recess and consult with the observer outside the hearing.

Rationale: An unlimited number of silent observers is not workable.

2.04 Both parties have five (5) business days to file a written appeal with the Provost's Office of the AAB decision. The ad-hoc panel hearing the appeal will be the Chair of the Faculty Council (Chair, non-voting), the Provost, the Chair of the ASAPC and the President of the Student Government Association (if the appeal involves an undergraduate student) or the President of the Graduate and Professional Student Government Association (if the appeal involves a graduate student). The ad hoc panel may either uphold the decision of the AAB, nullify the decision, or return the case to the AAB for rehearing. Grounds for appeal will be the failure of the AAB to follow its own policy and procedures or if new information related to the original decision becomes available. To be heard, the appeal must include specific written information stating the grounds of the appeal.

Rationale: The amendment clarifies the steps of the appeals process and permits the ad hoc panel to nullify the decision of the AAB.

Rockley accepted the friendly amendment.

Other minor changes were suggested and accepted and will be changed in the document before it is sent forward to administration. If you are interested in obtaining a copy of Policy 2-0821.9, which is 10 pages in length, please contact Diane LaFollette at x48790 or lafolet@okstate.edu.

Gordon Emslie, Dean of the Graduate College, said in 1.03.c.2. it states: "It is very important to note that the Board, while considering all the above issues does not engage in the following activities:....Hearing cases involving graduate oral or qualifying examinations or theses/dissertations". He asked what happens if a student wishes to appeal the result of a qualifying examination. Rockley clarified that what is being said is that the qualifying exam rests with the dissertation committee. Moder said the Academic Appeals Board is not allowed to hear cases of whether a grade on this exam is fair or not and that rests with the departmental faculty and this is saying the same thing about the oral exams. Toetz said the committee was operating under the assumption that in the future a graduate committee was to be put in place that would deal with graduate appeals. Darcy asked if it would be acceptable to ask next year's ASP committee to look into graduate appeals and work with the graduate college. Mitchell

stated, "Graduate students are under the purview of the Graduate Faculty Council and they have that responsibility".

Raff called for a vote and this recommendation passed unanimously.

Rockley then presented the committee's Year-End Report for inclusion in the Minutes.

Several issues were addressed by the ASAP committee during the 2004-5 academic year.

1. Faculty Evaluations should be seen only by faculty:

Dr. Strathe was asked to agree to a 20 year old and still outstanding Faculty Council resolution that only faculty would view their evaluations. Dr. Strathe would not approve this resolution.

2. Grade inflation:

A set of data for the last 20 years regarding the distribution of grades was obtained from institutional research. There was clear evidence of grade inflation across all colleges, averaging ca. 0.01 per year over the last 15 years. In response to this, and the consequent damage to the credibility of a degree awarded by OSU when grades have little discriminatory value with respect to relative student performance, a resolution was introduced to provide an optional rank-in-class assessment along with class grade. This resolution failed.

		Grades for 2003-2004						2003-4 1990 % incr.		
		A	B	C	D	F	W	GPA	GPA	
AG SCI	LOWER DIV.	1,390	1,099	681	246	138	216	2.94	2.60	13.3
	UPPER DIV.	3,211	1,974	1,086	339	196	307	3.13	2.92	7.1
A&S										
	LOWER DIV.	19,173	17,276	10,997	4,344	3,573	5,631	2.80	2.50	11.9
	UPPER DIV.	9,632	7,377	3,713	862	784	1,957	3.08	2.91	5.9
BUSINESS										
	LOWER DIV.	2,247	2,364	1,941	712	449	809	2.68	2.39	12.2
	UPPER DIV.	5,608	7,735	4,944	1,290	718	1,454	2.80	2.60	7.7
EDU.										
	LOWER DIV.	2,458	971	351	84	158	327	3.36	3.23	4.2
	UPPER DIV.	4,443	1,701	457	116	174	270	3.47	3.44	0.8
ENG.										
	LOWER DIV.	1,727	1,332	864	313	270	442	2.87	2.50	14.9
	UPPER DIV.	3,025	2,874	1,470	316	211	378	3.04	2.86	6.2
HES										
	LOWER DIV.	1,604	1,234	594	206	143	221	3.04	2.69	13.2
	UPPER DIV.	3,064	2,378	981	174	138	312	3.20	3.11	2.8

3. Value of the valedictorian scholarship:

Data was obtained from Dr. Heintze which indicated that incoming freshmen who received valedictorian scholarships received a 1st year GPA that was better than their peers with the same ACT scores by approximately a 0.6 letter grade difference.

4. Three recommendations were introduced at the May faculty meeting.

The first moved to establish authority of the faculty over matters of curriculum, an authority denied by the administration one year before.

The second recommendation attempted to establish a default attendance policy to avoid situations in which arbitrary penalties were imposed on students for failure to attend lecture and to prevent unnecessary attendance at lectures by sick students.

The third recommendation addressed the issues associated with the academic appeals board and proceedings. The major issues which were addressed were: establish a system for higher appeal; route appeals dealing with issues of academic integrity to the appropriate body on campus.

General conclusions:

- Only 56% of entering students complete the bachelor's degree after 6 years of attendance.
- The inflation of grades is evident from the presented data.
- It is well known that grade inflation is tied directly to the use by administration of teaching evaluations as a criterion for awarding pay raises to faculty. OSU is no different in this respect.
- Students are permitted to drop courses late into the semester (in some cases just prior to final exams).

The prognosis must be that shortly all students graduating from OSU will achieve nearly perfect grades (because courses in which the grades are not perfect will be dropped), the students will take longer than 6 years to get a simple B.S. degree, retention at OSU will continue to rise (because no students will fail out), and all faculty will be teaching with evaluated performances that approach perfection.

Raff announced that Darcy had asked to change the order of the Agenda. Darcy then moved that the Chair of the Baack Faculty and Staff Association, Jason Kirksey, be allowed to make comments. Moder seconded.

Kirksey said he had come to Faculty Council regarding the recent Alumni Association scholarship selections. A student was selected as one of OSU's Top Ten Seniors from the Alumni Association who was one of the students pictured in the Alpha Gamma Rho incident. In the fall of 2002 the AGR fraternity had a party with "black face", mock lynchings, homophobic and KKK sayings, etc. For Kirksey it is not about the student, it is about this institution and it is

about our unwillingness to do what is right. He feels that this student should not be held up as a model of the student body. Kirksey added he felt that over the past two years President Schmidly had made a tremendous effort to improve the environment on campus. He had a meeting with the President earlier in the year and he felt incredibly good about him being President with respect to the AGR issue.

Kirksey said, "We have an image problem. The problem isn't diversity, it's race, and until we're willing to address that problem we will not get any better or make any progress." He asked Council to address this issue with whomever it needs to be addressed. Kirksey added, "The larger community has to recognize these problems/issues or we're not going to get any better. We're talking about recruiting minority students, enhancing diversity and I will not do one thing to encourage, entice, or suggest, that another black student come to this campus the way things are now. I love this university, I did my undergraduate and master's here, I came back as a faculty member in the face of some much better offers. I care a tremendous amount about this university. I wouldn't be here if I didn't. But we've got to be willing to address these issues."

Arquitt asked who was on the selection committee and how could it be conveyed to them these kinds of things are not acceptable. Darcy said, "The Alumni Association makes the selections and once that happens the administration embraces them and says, 'These are our top students' and that is the problem." Phillips asked if the Alumni Association knew this student had been involved in the AGR incident and Kirksey replied he did not think so but was not sure. He has a meeting scheduled with Dr. Jerry Gill, Executive Director of the Alumni Association, to discuss this matter. Kirksey felt someone in the Alumni Office should have been responsible for checking this out. He also understood the student offered to give back the award and the Alumni Assoc. said no.

Mitchell said the picture of this young man was still on the web. He had sent e-mails to various individuals including Jerry Gill and raised some serious questions about procedures. He served on a committee in the College of Agriculture to select outstanding students and several AGR students came before the committee and they had to answer to that committee in regard to the incident. The committee discussed whether they wanted one of these students representing the College of Agriculture and the answer was, "no". Mitchell continued that to be outraged by this you have to have degree of sensitivity. He said Pat Bell had received a threatening letter from the KKK and it had to be turned over to the FBI and then when Mitchell's wife ran for office here in Stillwater there were KKK signs on her posters. He said the City of Stillwater and the Mayor made a public statement saying this was unacceptable behavior in our community and those signs disappeared. Mitchell said, "The outrage, that's what's missing." Mitchell raised some questions to Jerry Gill about how outstanding seniors were chosen, did they look at their record, did they look at their commitment to diversity, and he added he could not remember an African American student as an outstanding Top Ten Senior and there were people like Mario White, who was a Truman Scholar, and those kinds of things are the outrage. Mitchell did the training for the AGR House, after the above mentioned incident, and he wanted them to understand what it meant when you stood up with a "black face" and a KKK sign with a hood. He said the young man in question has done a fine job in terms of being a good student and that is not what the issue is. There are some situations where you can never represent something. He could be an outstanding student and get lots of awards but to be chosen as an outstanding student

for the Oklahoma State University Alumni Association with that picture still on the web right now is outrageous on the part of those who made the selection. Pat Bell said about the picture, "They were hanging a black person in effigy, such as the one of the website, and that is certainly a communication problem."

Kirksey said, "I personally feel, not speaking on behalf of the Black Faculty and Staff Association, speaking as an alum, speaking as a faculty member, as a black citizen in this community, and more importantly as a tax payer in the state, if we're not willing to rescind that award from the kid there's nothing that fixes it. The suggestion is that, well, we're going to change the process next year. The damage is done. This is a wound that has for the most part healed and now we've managed to rip it wide open again and that's something that I for one won't sit idly by and watch and I think it's very very sad if we sit by once again as a university and say, 'This too will pass.' This has a horrible, horrible impact for us. I got phone calls, emails, and letters from people all over the state telling me stories and their terrible experience with Oklahoma State University. This place has a horrible reputation in the black community and until we're willing to stand up and address that and figure out what we can do to change our image it's not going to get any better. We can hide our heads in the sand all we want but it's not going to get any better and it's not going to go away."

Martinez asked Kirksey if it was the purpose or desire of the Black Faculty and Staff Association, at least to his understanding, to request that this recognition be rescinded. Kirksey said, "No, that's me." Martinez said he was asking for his opinion and Kirksey said, "Yes it is my opinion and my request but I can't say what the membership will do. I don't want my feelings to be unilaterally imposed on the Association. My personal feelings are clear, but as far as what the Association does we'll deal with that on Tuesday." Kirksey said for the last five years anytime anyone has mentioned having a race-based scholarship they have been told that OSU's name can not be associated with that at all. He feels the same burden should be placed on the Alumni Association.

Johannes asked who picks these students. Are they voted on by the student body? Moder replied, "No" by the Alumni Association. Mitchell added there was a selection committee.

Kirksey ended by saying, "If you don't condemn it you condone it and as long as the university sits idly by and does nothing that's our problem and that's the problem around this state with black folks not coming here. You've got Langston University 30 minutes up the road. Why in the world are those black students not willing to drive 30 minutes to come to one of the only comprehensive universities in the state? We don't like the answers to the questions. Look at the numbers of black students on this campus. How many black students are graduating in the State of Oklahoma and how many of those black students even apply to this university and those are the questions we need to be trying to find out."

Phillips called the question.

Darcy moved that Faculty Council shares the outrage of the Black Faculty and Staff Association over the selection of the Top 10 Seniors and supports the efforts of the Black Faculty and Staff Association to address the problem. The motion passed unanimously.

ATHLETICS — Don Murray

Murray reported on April 11 he had attended the 12th Annual Student-Athlete Academic Awards Banquet and distributed program brochures to that that wanted them. He then distributed copies of “Classification & Major of OSU Student Athletes – Fall 2004” compiled from data provided by Gail Gates, Office of Academic Affairs and “Oklahoma State University Academic Performances Report, Student Athletes – Fall 2004” also compiled from data provided by Gail Gates, Office of Academic Affairs. If you are interested in receiving copies of either of these reports please contact Diane LaFollette at x48790 or lafollet@okstate.edu.

Murray said the Athletics Committee was especially good at working well together, the meetings were well attended, they had a focus and seemed to move along rather quickly and forward. Some future issues Murray suggested, since he is rotating off Council, is to work on a document with the Athletic Council to better define the scheduling of academic sports so that the student athletes do not miss as many class days and also have the committee get back into the routine of visiting with student athletes.

Murray then presented the committee’s Year-End Report for inclusion in the Minutes.

The committee developed a 2004 - 2005 agenda at its first meeting; however, some topics were never addressed. This report will only deal with the topics discussed or reported.

This committee provided the Faculty Council with an academic progress report on student athlete grades and majors. Data were easily obtained through Dr. Gail Gates and the Office of the Registrar (these lists did not show student names). These data were for the spring 2004 and fall 2004 semesters and were organized by sport. The initial report was then reorganized to show major by sport, grade level, and gender. No statistical analyses were performed on these data; however, there did not appear to be any trend in the major selected by the student athletes. There was certainly no trend for the student athletes to select an “easy” major what ever that might be.

Rick Allen, Associate Athletic Director for Compliance, provided an update on NCAA recruiting changes, academic reform, and incentives/disincentives. The recruiting changes were enacted to control the “celebrity atmosphere” and reduce the “sense of entitlement” that often occurs when “blue chip” recruits visit campus.

This committee, for the second year, discussed the lack of a clear or firm university policy regarding instructors being required (it is now suggested) to provide a syllabus to each student at the beginning of each semester. Repeatedly, a policy to provide a syllabus to students is rejected by the faculty and/or Faculty Council on the grounds that it infringes on academic freedom. Since this issue applied to both the general student and the student athlete, it was referred to the Academic Standards and Policies Committee where it lacked the support for a recommendation.

With data from Athletic Director, Harry Birdwell, the committee prepared a financial report that was presented to the Faculty Council. According to the financial manager for the Athletic Department, Mr. Jason Lewis, the revenue for the department is around \$47M. Currently, the

Athletic Department owes the university \$2M and is making the second of five installment payments of \$500,000. The report also contained information about athletic activities which were paid with general university funds. Specifically, the four are as follows: 1) the Academic Services office, 2) tuition fee waivers for out-of-state student athletes who are on scholarship, 3) the office for Big XII and NCAA compliance, and 4) the rental fees paid by the university for the use of athletic facilities. There was also a breakdown of scholarships by sport/gender. There are 227.2 full scholarship equivalents, 141.2 for men and 86 for women. This is unchanged from 2003-2004.

This committee was asked by the President's office to review and render an opinion on the revision of Board Rule 10-3-4. The Athletic Director, Harry Birdwell, and his associates revised the Board Rule which was originally written in 1988. The revision included greater oversight and management of the Athletic Department by the University President and CEO. The revision also updated some of the language in the older version which included changing the Big VIII to the Big XII. This committee agreed with and supported the revised Board Rule and prepared a recommendation which was passed by the Faculty Council that amended the old Board Rule.

This committee was asked by the Chair of the Faculty Council to review and provide a recommendation on a proposal prepared by the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) regarding Academic Integrity in Intercollegiate Athletics: Principles, Rules, and Best Practices. This committee thoroughly reviewed the 18-20 page document which the COIA wishes to present to the NCAA for its consideration. The committee unanimously agreed to write a recommendation to approve, with provision, this reform initiative. This committee recommended approval of the COIA proposal only if amended with the following: Under subsection (Need-based scholarships) in Section 2 (Scholarships) insert the following statement - **“Athletic scholarships will be awarded on the same basis as those awarded to the general student body”**. The recommendation passed unanimously by the Faculty Council.

This committee presented a resolution to recognize the many accomplishments of the OSU wrestling team, Coach John Smith, and his staff. The resolution passed unanimously. It is believed that this is the first time that the Faculty Council has complimented a sport and its coaches for their accomplishments both in competition and in the classroom.

Thanks to Bob Darcy, for the first time in three years the committee did have student athletes as representatives. The process of asking SGA to name these individuals does not work - promises are made, but representatives are never appointed. The two students on the committee this year, Alliya Anderson and Lori Allen, were active participants and the committee appreciates their service.

A researcher, Don McCabe, invited to make campus presentations by the Provost, reported on an academic integrity survey he did at OSU and elsewhere. Two students, Thomas Plischke, a graduate student in a sampling class, and Alliya Anderson, a student athlete and public relations major with focus group experience, researched the question of perceived cheating by using a total sample of 12 undergraduates which were divided into two focus group sessions. Plischke and Anderson found that perceptions among these 12 students regarding athlete academic cheating were not based on direct observation at OSU. Rather, students tended to be

generalizing from their high school experiences. Further, Plischke and Anderson found that these 12 students' concept of cheating, also deriving from their high school experience, was of instructor favoritism toward athletes more than the athletes actually plagiarizing or copying.

Respectfully submitted: Lori Allen, Rick Allen, Alliya Anderson, Patricia Bell, Chris Cashel, Bob Darcy, Marilyn Middlebrook, H. David Moll, Don Murray, Chair, Patrick Murphy, David Yellin

BUDGET — Earl Mitchell

Mitchell thanked the Provost's Office for providing funds to the Faculty Council budget which provide office secretarial support and maintenance. He noted the budget provided below does not include expenses that will be incurred between now and June 30. Mitchell also thanked the President's Office for providing money for a Foundation account and added he thought this spoke well for the relationship Council has with Administration.

Mitchell presented the committee's Year-End Report for inclusion in the Minutes.

BUDGET

The Budget Committee was asked to approve and provide guidance for the expenditures of funding allocated to the Chair of the Faculty Council for release time to account for the activities of the chair. Professor Lionel Raff decided to not use the funds and instead utilize the funds for Faculty Council expenditures to upgrade equipment and cover the cost of Faculty Council Business.

FACULTY SURVEY

The Faculty Survey is an annual event to determine the priorities of the faculty. The Budget Committee seeks information on the faculty concerns that have budget implications. This is important to determine the priorities.

RESOLUTION

Competitive Graduate Student Stipend and Tuition Package

(Motion from the Budget Committee)

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: The graduate student stipend and tuition package be competitive.

Resolution: Whereas the University has committed itself to the program to Restore, Reward and Grow the Faculty, and Whereas the graduate student stipend and tuition package at Oklahoma State University is not competitive with that available from other comprehensive research universities, the Faculty supports University efforts to make the graduate student stipend and tuition package competitive with those of other universities.

Rationale:

1. Faculty have made a competitive graduate student stipend and tuition package a high priority when surveyed this year and last.

2. Graduate students are an essential component of Oklahoma State University's research and teaching effort. Oklahoma State University must be competitive in attracting the best graduate students.
3. Oklahoma State University must be concerned with the welfare of all its components. It should not ask graduate students to make sacrifices other parts of the University are not asked to make.
4. If Oklahoma State University is to recruit and retain research faculty it must be able to offer them the ability to recruit the best graduate students.

This resolution was passed by the Faculty Council and accepted by the administration.

The State Question 705 - "The Oklahoma Lottery"

The State Statute 705 was passed quite handily. The distribution of funds is listed on pages 13 and 14 of the document. This is supposed to be an additional source of funding that goes beyond appropriations. Forty-five percent is to be distributed to K-12 and early childhood development programs including pre-kindergarten. Nevertheless, the distribution to higher education is listed in Section 14C.2. The board will have to delineate a formula for distribution because it is not stated how the funds are to be divided between Higher Education including institutions not under the OSRHE and Career Tech, construction for K-20, capital outlay for K-20, Technology K-20. There is a component to distribute for endowed chairs through the OSRHE.

Since this is one of the new sources of education funds, should we be concerned about the development of the board and its mandate to distribute these funds within the loose guidelines of the statute?

Higher Education is in there but it is possible to get a small portion of the resources with competition from Career Tech and common schools.

Faculty Salary Survey

We discussed the faculty salary survey that is done every year. Merle Gilliam (retired) began this survey several years ago that went to the AAUP. The consensus is that we should seek the Faculty Salary Survey by rank and department from Institutional Research with comparison to the Big 12. The Faculty Salary Survey was completed and made available to the Faculty at the Spring Convocation.

Work Study Program

The discussion about the Work Study Program centers on whether there are work-study students working with faculty in academic departments. The general consensus is that most of the students are working but they are doing clerical and menial tasks in administrative offices and departments.

The information to be sought:

- 1) How many students are on Work Study?
- 2) How many are assigned to faculty to help teaching and research?
- 3) How many graduate students are on Work-Study and what are they doing?
A delegation met with President Schmidly to present a plan to assign Work Study Students to faculty doing research. The intent is to enhance the research experience of undergraduates who are eligible for work-study and to provide students with experiences in their disciplines.
This suggestion we received by the President.
(This is one activity that needs to be followed up in the next academic year by the Budget Committee.)

Budget and expenditures Report

Maintenance**					Balance available
3000	Supplies & Misc. Expenses	\$3,500	-\$3,459	\$0	\$41
5000	Travel	\$8,355	-\$2,218	\$0	\$6,137
7100	Contractual Services including telephones and postage	\$2,020	-\$4,174	\$0	<u>-\$2,154</u>
		<u>\$13,875</u>			<u>\$4,024</u>
					-\$914
					\$3,110
	FY 2004 Carry Forward Balance				\$5,039
	One-time funds from Gen Univ for purchase of computer and printer				\$2,388
					<u>\$10,538</u>
	Balance as of April 30, 2005				\$10,538

NOTE: This does not include expenses associated with moving office areas within the suite.

* 70% of Diane LaFollette's salary is paid from the Faculty Council account. The remaining 30% is paid from the Emeriti Administrators account.

** Permanent increase in base maintenance budget was approved by Provost Strathe. Funds were transferred from Academic Affairs' base budget.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Shida Henneberry

Tom Woodford, committee member, commented on the Master Plan process in progress and much work will be going on over the summer. He hopes a comprehensive package will be presented to those interested, including faculty, very early in the Fall. He encouraged faculty to look at the Plan and get involved and make comments.

Raff encouraged all to pass on to their constituents any concerns about campus problems, traffic, etc. because it does work. He gave an example of a secretary in his department that suggested “No Smoking” signs be erected within 25 feet of buildings and he passed this on to administration and this was accomplished.

Dr. Henneberry submitted the committee’s Year-End Report for inclusion in the Minutes.

Committee members included: Shida Henneberry (chair), Suzanne Bilbeisi (Faculty Council member), Armando Cruz-Rodz (Faculty Council member), Charles Leider (general faculty member), Tom Woodford (general faculty member), Bob Swaim (emeritus faculty member), Steve Bolin (grad student rep), Austin Hanes (non-residential), John Houck (and Jeffrey D. Stewart) (Ex-Officio Member), Sarah Kimball.

Meeting dates, activities, and accomplishments for 2004-05 academic year are reported below:

- 1. Meeting Dates:** The committee met on October 22, November 19, December 17, January 21, February 18, March 25, & April 15.
- 2. Orange Peel (OP):** Areas of concerns included the type of the bands at OP and the type of the crowd that it has attracted. Dr. Henneberry met with Dr. Lee Bird, Vice-President for Student Affairs and Mr. Mike Robinson, Chief of Campus Police to discuss these concerns. Nikki Ebert, 2005 Orange Peel Committee Chair and Chris Parker, Orange Peel Committee, were invited and were present at the CFSS March meeting. They stated that given the amount of funding and the fact that there is only one date for OP, their choices are limited. Nikki distributed copies of the memo from Kent Sampson, OSU Student Union Interim Director to Dr. Lee Bird, regarding OP 2004. The following statement is a direct quotation from the memo and addresses some of the concerns that were brought up during CFSS meetings:

“Music style – Without question the 2004 show headlined by “Incubus” catered to a younger crowd, indeed many from high schools and out-of-town. In discussion with both “04 Orange Peel Executive Director as well as the “05 Orange Peel Executive Director, certainly the intent is to appeal to the OSU college student base while attracting alums, families, and local business sponsors. As you know, this is quite a challenge when we are offering only one night (September 16, 2005) and have no real date flexibility here. To do well financially, Orange Peel must indeed “sell” to a broad spectrum (and it has in half of the past nine years) for college students alone (given college expenses) have never yet been able to financially carry the show (best turnout at 65% of ticket sales).

Without a doubt our student leaders also learned much regarding talent selection due to the challenge posed by a local church.

Fan Behavior - ... The crowd was the most rowdy in my nine years of observance. ... Admittedly, for the newly selected Express Personnel Services, this was a unique and new challenge as well. Without question,

the nature of the entertainment has a huge impact on crowd behavior. I believe with the experience and training Express Personnel has now gained through football, basketball, and wrestling seasons, combined with continued cooperation and planning with OSU police, I am confident fan behavior can be managed.”

- 3. Bike Safety and Awareness:** CFSS recommended bike safety signs to be installed on campus and consequent to the recommendation, signs were installed at crosswalks. Also, the Daily O’Collegian ran a couple of articles regarding bike safety.
No-smoking Signs with regard to no smoking within 25 feet of buildings were also installed following FCSS recommendation (and more specifically, Dr. Sarah Kimball’s query).
Auditory Signals for hearing impaired were discussed for implementation on the corner of Monroe and University.
- 4. Campus Recycling:** A campus test off program was launched and lots of individuals participated from residential halls and service agencies (such as the United Way and Habitat for humanities). A pilot program for recycling of telephone directories started two months ago in the agricultural economics department with Dr. Sarah Kimball spearheading the program.
- 5. Poor Road Condition:** In response to concerns that have been raised about the intolerable road condition between soccer ground and the new dorms parking lot on McFarland, Mr. Jeff Stewart (Physical Plant Services, for Mr. John Houck) stated that the road will be completely re-done this summer.
- 7. Campus Beautification:** Dr. Sarah Kimball reported that she has spoken with Mrs. Schmidly about campus beautification and Mrs. Schmidly has stated that she is quite interested in participating in campus beautification planning. The CFSSC members stated that they would like for the administration to consider appointing a campus beautification committee or for the Faculty Council to appoint an advisory committee for campus beautification.
- 8. Campus master planning:** Dr. Tom Woodford was appointed as CFSS representative to the Master Plan Steering Committee. Concerns have been raised regarding campus master planning and the way the Benham Group has handled input from faculty and other stakeholders. The lack of meetings, progress reports, the short notice for the Benham Group’s charrette, and in general a lack of openness regarding planning efforts were among some of the concerns. These concerns were discussed during the March meeting of CFSS Committee.
- 9. Campus Recycling Committee:** CFSS committee recommends that Campus Recycling committee to become part of CFSS committee. Dr. Henneberry has reported this request to Dr. Bob Darcy, vice chair of Faculty Council.
- 10. Parking Committee:** This is part of CFSS committee, represented by Suzanne Bilbeisi. Plans for Multi Modal Transit Facility are in process.

FACULTY — Linda Austin

Austin said this past year the committee worked on the clinical track, reviewed Appendix D and the RPT cases and also did the Big 12 Fellowships.

Austin presented the following recommendation from the Faculty Council Executive Committee:

Title: Approval of “Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University”

The Executive Committee recommends that the Faculty Council approve the revised “Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University” and send it to the General Faculty for a vote in the Fall.

As background Austin said the committee to revise Appendix D met early in 2004. This committee included the Provost, herself, Carol Moder as well as Sue Redwood who was a Council member until May of last year, and others. Revisions were finished in May and the Provost introduced the new Appendix to the general faculty at college meetings last Fall and it was also placed on the web. Faculty were invited to comment and suggest revisions. The plan was then to submit the Appendix to a vote of the General Faculty; however, the document was brought to Faculty Council and the Council reverted it to the Faculty Committee for review. This committee began meeting January and met on the average of twice per month. This effort inevitably introduced new revisions to the Appendix. Austin said she came to Faculty Council at least two times and reported the committee needed more time to review and the Provost extended the deadline at least twice. Austin said Raff estimates that at least 100 faculty members and administrators have contributed to this revised document. The Faculty Committee finished their review in March. Austin created a summary of changes which were sent to the Provost and Raff and review. At the end of April Raff and Austin met with the Provost to discuss her response to the changes. Austin created a list itemizing the differences between the document recommended by the Faculty Committee and the one that emerged as the result of the meeting with the Provost. This list was sent to members of the FC Executive Committee for review. The Executive Committee discussed the present state of the document and concluded to bring the above recommendation to Council. Except for Austin the Faculty Committee objects to this procedure. They want the document returned to them for review over the summer. They consider it improper for the Executive Committee to have made this recommendation and asked her to convey that. Austin stated she felt that further consideration by the Faculty Committee would impact the process needlessly and she does not feel, at this point, it would result in a better document. She added she was not criticizing the Faculty Committee and they worked very hard on this document. Austin said she had seen the Faculty Committee nullify some of the work of the Appendix D Committee, reject some of the recommendation of the Regent’s Professor Committee and create provisions in one section that contravene the recommendations of the Research Committee Faculty Council passed last year. Austin said this was fine and part of the process but also showed that there will never be a document that everyone agrees own.

Moder seconded the recommendation from the Executive Committee.

Raff added he completely concurred with Austin's remarks and asked for discussion. Arquitt said she would not support the recommendation because she had not read the document. She added she had been on the Appendix D committee when it had been revised previously and there had been numerous, lengthy meetings looking at the language very carefully before it was approved and submitted. She feels that something that governs faculty appointments and their professional life is too important to hurry it through. Darcy said he did not feel this had been a document that had been hurried at all and feels this must go to a vote of the faculty in the Fall. He added he hopes the faculty support this document and the work of the administration and the many, many, many faculty members who have put huge amounts of time into this.

John Thornton, Emeriti faculty representative on the Faculty Committee, brought up a procedural question. He said the Faculty Council's working agencies are its standing committees according to the By-Laws. It states, "They shall formulate and recommend actions and policies for approval by the Faculty Council." Thornton said the standing committees make recommendations, they come to the Council, there is vigorous debate, and then, if accepted, Council sends them to the General Faculty for a vote. He feels Council is not seeing the recommendations of the Faculty Committee on this issue and they have a right to see and debate them before the General Faculty is asked to vote on them. Thornton added that the compromised version which he understood was being voted on today and which he thinks very few people have seen, contains only about a third or half of what the Faculty Committee recommended. He thinks Council owes it to the General Faculty, the administration, and the committee that worked so hard on it to at least give consideration to their full recommendation before it's voted on. Thornton said there is a policy in place, Appendix D, which has served very well for a long period of time and it is not to say there can not be improvements but there is no real urgency or emergency which requires that it be sent to the President. He urged Council not to vote on the question before them and to send it back to committee.

After a lengthy discussion, Binegar made a motion to Table the recommendation until the June 14 Faculty Council meeting. Martinez seconded. The motion to Table passed with 16 "yes", 4 "no", and 1 abstention. Binegar then made a motion that the proposed DRAFT document of Appendix D, with changes, be posted on the Council website at: <http://facultycouncil.okstate.edu/> for review. Johannes seconded. Motion passed.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Birne Binegar

Binegar presented the committee's Year-End Report for inclusion in the Minutes.

In April of 2004, Faculty Council charged the Long Range Planning and Information Technology Committee with investigating allegations of the technical, fiscal and personnel mismanagement within the Information Technology Division. This investigation was carried out during the summer of 2004 and indeed many of the allegations were confirmed. The LRPITC investigation also uncovered serious improprieties, involving the misappropriation of computer software. At the same time, mission critical services such as email and backups were suffering from frequent outages and outright losses. By July of 2004, the IT situation at OSU had become a major crisis. The University responded by restructuring the IT Division, with the Vice President for Administration and Finance overseeing the operations IT Division and with

Darlene Hightower elevated to Chief Information Officer. At that juncture the investigation of the IT Division effectively ended, and the recovery of proper IT administration began. At the October meeting of Faculty Council, the LRPITC delivered its report on the IT Division, bringing closure to the matter.

Throughout the 2004-2005 academic year, the LRPITC has been active in consulting with the IT Division, and in assisting its recovery from last year's debacle. Committee members are currently serving on the search committees for the Director of Technology Support and the Director of Server Administration. Committee members are also serving on a task force to select an anti-spam solution for OSU. The chair of the LRPITC is co-chairing the recently reconstituted Student Tech Fee Committee and is also serving on the university's Strategic Planning Council.

Issues for 2005-2006

1. Re-establishment of monies for faculty computing (which was \$500 per faculty member per year before the budget shortfalls).
2. Re-establishment of the authority of the Student Tech Fee committee.
3. Monitoring the implementation of security solutions to ensure that faculty concerns over privacy and independence are heeded.

RESEARCH — Alexander Rouch

Lionel Raff presented a committee update and Year-End Report for inclusion in the Minutes in the absence of Dr. Rouch.

Update:

1. Selections were made for the Regents Distinguished Research Award on 3 May 2005. All nominees possessed excellent qualifications. Formal announcement of the winners is forthcoming.
2. A draft of a new OSU Conflict of Interest policy was just completed. The research committee will review the draft and submit suggestions to the VP for Research.
3. The research compliance office is developing plans to obtain formal accreditation for research involving human subjects. The research committee will likely support these efforts. It is expected that Dr. Steve O'Geary, chief compliance officer, will present the rationale for this in a special report to the Faculty Council in an upcoming meeting.

Year-End Report

Members: Alexander Rouch, Chair, John te Velde, Ron Moomaw, Earl Mitchell, Glenn Zhang, Denver Marlow, Darrell Berlin, Richard Whitney

1. **New Positions in Research Office:** In August 2004, committee members participated in interviews for new research-related positions at OSU. Three candidates were interviewed for

the position of Assistant Vice President for Technology Development and Director of the Office of Intellectual Property Management. This new position will report to the Vice President for Research and be responsible for identifying research that holds promise for technology transfer and commercialization. Since the interviews occurred in the summer, not all committee members participated. Those who did agreed that all three candidates were well qualified and had significant experience with respect to the described job responsibilities. Three candidates were interviewed: Dr. John Rambosek, Dr. Steven Price, and Dr. Patricia Cotton. Dr. Price was selected and began the job on 1 December 2004.

Research Committee members also participated in the selection process of the new Assistant Vice President for Sponsored Research. Two individuals were interviewed: Dr. Toni Shaklee and Dr. Galya Hudson. Dr. Shaklee was selected and began immediately. Dr. Shaklee's position is on an Interim basis. Filling the position on a permanent basis will depend on budget and require a national search. The Research Committee should participate in that search.

2. **Research Park at Venture 1** (Highway 51 & Sangre): Dr. McKeever briefed the committee about the short history, current status, and future plans of the facility. This is a multi-unit facility with two floors. Each floor contains approximately 17K sq ft. The general design is for OSU faculty to occupy the top floor and for private companies to occupy the bottom floor. The OSU electron microscopy lab will be moved to the bottom floor of the building. The **purpose** of the facility is to foster faculty-private sector interactions and promote technology transfer. Faculty assigned space in the facility have projects connected to private companies. The committee discussed the need to monitor the progress of this place. One concern is that costs will outweigh benefits – time will tell. On the other hand, some feel that this is the type of investment necessary to enhance the research capacity for the university and thus, the investment is worthwhile. However, it must be recognized that there will be a drain on research resources during the interim period needed to create the resources required to produce success. Next year's committee should revisit the park and report on the progress of filling the facility with more faculty and private companies.
3. **Library Annex Issue:** The committee discussed the library annex situation at a number of meetings since the issue arose. The issue dealt with the removal of a vast number of research resources from the basement of the library to the annex for the purposes of creating more student space in the library. The primary concern for researchers was the difficulty of obtaining articles for grants, manuscripts, teaching, etc. The chair participated in two special meetings held to discuss plans for dealing with the annex. The Research Committee was in the process of preparing a recommendation for the Faculty Council for the library personnel to return all journals that could not be obtained on-line and move those journals that are electronically available to the annex. After the meetings, the plan was agreed upon by all parties to begin the process of returning those journals. At the time of this report, Dean Johnson, has worked with departments of Math, Physics, and Chemistry. Her office will soon begin to work with departments in the College of Agriculture. It is expected that by September 2005, all departments whose journals were moved from the basement of the annex will have been contacted. The Research Committee is pleased and satisfied with the

response of Dean Johnson and her personnel. The Research Committee should continue to monitor the progress on this issue.

4. **Oklahoma Research Authority (ORA):** The Research Committee discussed the state plan for creating a \$1 billion research endowment to support research and the transfer of innovation and technology to Oklahoma's private sector. The plan calls for establishing the ORA – an 11-member Board of Directors made up of individuals from the private sector. The Board will be guided by two advisory committees, one composed of national leaders from research and industry and the other of leaders of the Oklahoma research establishment. At the time of this report, the state government has not acted on this plan. Time will tell whether or not such a grandiose plan will materialize. The Research Committee expressed concern that the written plan contained little emphasis on the two comprehensive universities in Oklahoma. Some committee members felt that the ORA should contain representatives from both universities. This issue was discussed at the joint meeting of OSU-OU faculty representatives in March. The Research Committee should remain alert of any action taken by the government on this and keep the Faculty Council informed.
5. **Research Award:** Chair served on the selection committee for the Regents Distinguished Research Award. Selections were made on May 3, 2005. All nominees possessed excellent qualifications.
6. **IRB Compliance Accreditation:** Dr. Steven O'Geary, OSU Compliance Officer, presented to the committee the plans to apply for accreditation of the OSU-Stillwater Human Research Protection Program. An application for accreditation will be submitted to the Association of Accreditation of Human Research Projects. This agency is the gold standard for granting accreditation. The Research Committee feels that the benefits outweigh the costs and support these efforts.

Submitted by Al Rouch, PhD, Chair, 9 May 2005

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Terry Lehenbauer

Lehenbauer presented the committee's Year-End Report for inclusion in the Minutes.

During the past year, two recommendations from the Retirement & Fringe Benefits Committee (RFB) were approved by Faculty Council and accepted by the Administration. In particular, recommendation 04-10-02-RFB – *Access of Vested Funds in TIAA-CREF Accounts*, which replaced 04-01-01-RFB – *TIAA-CREF Vested Accounts Recommendation*, provided specific ways for OSU employees with vested TIAA-CREF account funds to withdraw those funds without prior separation of employment from OSU. Provisions were made for loans, fund transfers to 403(b) plans, limited withdrawal of retirement funds for retirement-eligible employees, and withdrawals due to recognized extreme financial hardship situations. The other recommendation was 04-10-01-RFB – *Survey of Big 12 Health Insurance Benefits, Premiums, and Costs*. This survey was conducted by Human Resources (HR) and results of this survey were presented at the April 2005 Faculty Council meeting.

RFB has recommended to the Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee that a request for proposals (RFP) process should be initiated for health care plans. The option for major medical insurance combined with a health savings account and better ways to promote wellness among employees are among the opportunities which should be explored during this process. OSU switched from having a self-funded health insurance program to the State Plan (OSEEGIB) on July 1, 1999, and RFB believes that it would be appropriate at this time to investigate other health care plan options.

A letter requesting a ruling by the Internal Revenue Service to approve the option for employees who were mandated to participate in OTRS prior to July 1, 2004, to choose between OTRS and the Alternate Retirement Plan (ARP) was sent by OTRS on February 8, 2005. The ruling from IRS is expected within a year. In anticipation of a favorable response, RFB will need to work with HR to ensure that appropriate materials and information are available to employees for helping to make this one-time, non-revocable retirement plan decision between OTRS and ARP.

A RFP process is underway to solicit and evaluate proposals from additional vendors in addition to TIAA-CREF for 401(a) plans. Dr. Peter Shull, Department of Physics, is a member of the RFB committee and is the Chair of the Retirement Investment Options Subcommittee (RIOS) of the Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee. TIAA-CREF will be meeting this month with RIOS and HR to explain their expanded offerings for investment options which should be available later this year and early next year.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — A. J. Johannes

Johannes presented the committee's Year-End Report for inclusion in the Minutes.

Committee members: A. J. Johannes, Chair; Terry Lehenbauer; Bob Darcy; Tom Jordan

In addition to our normal duties of running the FC elections and running the nominating committees, the Rules and Procedures Committee investigated possible changes to the Faculty Council Charter and Bylaws. Suggested changes were studied and Faculty input was obtained in several forums including a general faculty meeting. The suggested changes were put to a vote of faculty and changes were overwhelmingly accepted to both Appendix A and B (these have now been implemented after acceptance by the President and Board of Regents). The R&P Committee also ran a special vote of the faculty on a proposal to run a rank in class experiment. This was turned down by the faculty, but there were voting irregularities. Johannes added that the recommendation failed by a vote of 214 against and 174 for and since there were approximately ten voting irregularities noted he did not think it was necessary to conduct another vote because it would not change the outcome.

The R&P committee will try and run all elections electronically next year in an attempt to stop any irregularities or to devise balloting procedures which will stop any fraud.

Rockley moved that another vote of the General Faculty on the "Optional Record of Class Rank on Transcript" recommendation be held immediately because of voting irregularities. This

motion failed for lack of a second. Rockley then moved the recommendation be voted on again in the Fall. Johannes seconded. This motion failed by a vote of 9 against and 8 for.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Tom Phillips

Phillips presented the committee's Year-End Report for inclusion in the Minutes.

The standing Committee on Student Affairs and Learning Resource (SALR) for the academic year 2004-2005 was composed of nine member, of which the chair plus three other faculty were all members of Faculty Council, two members were from the general faculty, one member was an emeritus faculty, and the other were two students, one undergraduate and graduate student. The committee had six regular meetings at near-monthly intervals throughout the year, and also participated in meetings with the Search Committee for the Director of Undergraduate Admissions, Library Administration, the staff of the Vice President for Student Affairs, and the Senate of the Student Government Association.

An agenda of seven topics was formulated by the committee at its initial meeting and all were discussed to some degree throughout the year. Four topics resulted in significant activity by the SALR committee as described below.

- **The Library.** It was discovered that the Library was moving bound volumes of journals from their main stacks to remote storage in the Annex on Boomer Road, north of campus, and that movement of certain journals was creating hardship for faculty and students involved in research. SALR served as a mediating body, together with the Research Committee, in discussions among concerned faculty, Library administration, and OSU administration, specifically the Provost's Office. An agreement was ultimately reached between the library and concerned parties that should result in retention of needed bound journals in the Library on campus, as determined through library discussions with academic departments, and movement of other items to the Annex that could logically be moved without significant impact on scholarly activity.
- **The Student Technology Fee Committee.** SALR discussed the fact that the committee with oversight for use of the Student Technology Fee was disbanded by Vice President Wiggins and it was not clear how the money was being spent or if it was being spent according to the original intentions under which the fee was created. SALR drafted a recommendation to the President, passed at the November 9, 2004 meeting of Faculty Council, titled "Re-constitution of the Student Technology Fee Committee." Since that time, Dr. Bosserman has overseen the re-formation of the new committee, now referred to as the committee for the Student University Technology Services Fee. The committee has apparently met once in 2005 and has allocated funds appropriately. The Faculty Council standing committee on Long Range Planning and Information Technology, through appropriate representation, will monitor activity of this committee in the near future.
- **Computer Lab. Log-in Procedures.** Log-in procedures for campus-wide computer labs. Are inconsistent and vary widely with regard to the login identifications and

passwords required by students. SALR made a recommendation to the President titled, "Login Procedures for Student Computer Labs," that was approved by Faculty Council at its March 8, 2005 meeting. Administration accepted the recommendation and Dr. Bosserman is working with the Information Technology Division to devise a consistent login procedure.

- **Conduct and Supervision of African-American Greek Organizations.** SALR participated in several discussions during Spring 2005 on the topic of recent inappropriate and unsafe incidents at social events on and off-campus sponsored by African-American Greek organizations. Substantial input was received from Dr. Earl Mitchell, former Associate Vice President of Multi-Cultural Affairs, and Mr. Ival Gregory, Manager for Greek Life. Although no specific recommendation was generated from the discussions, SALR became keenly aware of concerns over faculty and/or staff supervision in the form of a traditional faculty advisor, which is required of all student organizations except Greek organizations. Greeks must have adult supervision, but such supervisors are alumni of the organizations to allow for participation in private meetings for the organization. SALR feels that rules governing supervision of Greek organizations, particularly with regard to security at social events, need to be reviewed and well articulated.

Potential agenda items for discussion and action by SALR in 2005-2006, which include some topics discussed this past year, are the following:

1. Determine if the Student Health Center is meeting the health needs of all OSU students.
2. Investigate the possibility that tuition waivers could be increased concurrently with increases in tuition.
3. Discuss the possibility of establishing a child care facility on campus for young children of OSU students, and pursue this issue in joint discussion with SGA, GPSGA and the NTSO.
4. Rules regarding supervision of student organizations, including Greek organizations, and with particular attention to the role and appointment of faculty advisors, should be reviewed and well articulated.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Emeriti Association — Theodore Agnew

Dr. Agnew reported in the absence of Ron Beer that the Emeriti Association had a very successful initial meeting for the community on starting the new Learning In Retirement Program. They fed 150 people at the initial orientation meeting held at the Stillwater Public Library. Dr. Agnew said he had been a Faculty Council Chair 41 years ago and wanted to comment on what he has seen as an evolution of the Council and added it had become institutionalized, in many happy ways, personified best by the presence of Diane LaFollette as the person who does the work for the Council in many ways. He also added in those days they had less of an opportunity to deal with administrators than is now available.

Staff Advisory Council — Carey Warner

Warner sent the following report for the Staff Advisory Council. “As representative of the SAC, I will not be able to attend today's Faculty Council meeting due to deadlines within my department. As for the liaison report from the SAC, I would like to extend a thank-you to Dr. Raff and Faculty Council members who graciously assisted us in serving lunch during the Staff Appreciation Day Picnic that took place April 26, 2005. Currently, the SAC is working on selecting recipients for the Staff Scholarship/Tuition Assistance Program and reviewing ballots for installation of new SAC representatives. Our next meeting is scheduled for May 11, 2005 at 1:15 p.m., 412 SU.”

Johannes moved the meeting be adjourned. Darcy seconded. The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is June 14, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,
Birne Binigar, Secretary