

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES  
250 Student Union  
January 10, 2006

Bob Darcy called the meeting to order with the following members present: Austin, Bell, G., Bell, P., Binegar, Brown, Carter, Chaney, Cruz-Rodz, Dare, Gelfand, Hallgren, Hirschlein, Jordan, Lamphere-Jordan, Martin, Meinkoth, Mitchell, Phillips, Raff, Ransom, Rouch, Sleezer, te Velde, Terry, and Veenstra. Also present: Agnew, Beier, Bosserman, Colton, Elliott, Gates, Goodbary, Hawkins, Hunger, Schmidly, Strathe, Weaver, Webb, and Wieder. Absent: Giles, Johannes, John, Moomaw, and Shabazz

**HIGHLIGHTS**

---

Recognition of Retiring Faculty Member Dennis Bertholf.....	2
Special Committees.....	2
Academic Ledgers for the Strategic Plan.....	2
Smoke-Free Campus at OSU Center for Health Sciences.....	4
Status of Efforts to Place Print Shop Employees.....	5
Recommendation: University Printing Services Employees.....	5
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	6
Remarks and Comments from President Schmidly.....	7
Resolution in Appreciation of Boone Pickens.....	8
Reports of Standing Committees	

Academic Standards and Policies	
Recommendation: International Education Scholarship Fee.....	8
Recommendation: Academic Integrity Policy.....	9
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security.....	10
Faculty.....	
Recommendation: <a href="#">Recommended Revisions to The Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, etc. of the Faculty of OSU Approved by the Faculty Council and General Faculty in Spring 2005</a> .....	10
Research.....	11
Retirement and Fringe Benefits.....	12
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Graduate Faculty Council.....	13

Lamphere-Jordan moved acceptance of the December 13, 2005 Minutes. Cruz-Rodz seconded. The Minutes were approved. Darcy moved to amend the January 10, 2006 Agenda to include a Special Report by David Bosserman; a recommendation concerning University Printing Services Employees; an update from Al Rouch, Chair, Research Committee; recognition of a retiring faculty member; and a motion regarding special committees. Jordan moved acceptance of the January 10, 2006, Agenda as amended. Gelfand seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended.

#### **Recognition of Retiring Faculty Member — Birne Binegar**

Binegar said he wanted to acknowledge the retirement of a colleague of his in the Department of Mathematics, Dennis Bertholf, who served six years on Faculty Council, six years on the Academic Appeals Board, served on the Arts & Sciences Faculty Council; served on Habitat for Humanity; a great citizen and colleague and he wishes him well. Darcy elaborated on Binegar's comments. He said he had worked with Bertholf over the past 29 years and he was someone the faculty could always call on and always rely on. As an example, Darcy said he needed to appoint a special committee to handle a very delicate matter and Bertholf agreed to work on this matter right up the time of his retirement which is February 3.

#### **Special Committee — Bob Darcy**

Darcy said last summer he asked the Faculty Council to allow him to appoint a special committee to deal with post-tenure review. He now is requesting this special committee merge with and become part of the Faculty Committee. Then, the Faculty Committee will become the place where post-tenure will be dealt with. Darcy asked for a motion to that affect. Tom Jordan moved, Pat Bell seconded. Darcy asked for discussion. Binegar asked if they would be ex officio members or voting members of the committee. Darcy replied they would be voting members. Tom Phillips is already a voting member of the committee and Tony Brown would become a voting member. Binegar said he would object because Brown is Chair of another committee and he is being asked to “weigh-in” on another committee as well. Darcy replied he has asked Brown to do this and he has agreed and said chairs of committees have severed on additional committees in the past. Darcy added there is no restriction for someone to serve on more than one committee. He then called for a vote. The motion passed with two “no” votes and two “abstentions”.

### **SPECIAL REPORT: Academic Ledgers for the Strategic Plan — Christie Hawkins**

Christie Hawkins, Director, Institutional Research & Information Management, presented the following report to Council:

- A. The Strategic Plan identifies two main ranking goals for OSU:
  - 1. Top Tier as ranked by U.S. News Best National Universities Survey
  - 2. Top 75 Research Universities as ranked by Top American Research Universities Report.

The academic ledgers are used to benchmark and track changes in areas important to these ranking goals, as well as for budget planning and resource allocation.

- B. Five years of data that includes:
  - 1. Student Information – headcounts, ACT/SAT averages, retention/graduation rates, student credit hours, and class size.
  - 2. Faculty Information – headcounts and FTE, student-faculty ratios, salaries, and awards.
  - 3. Research – Sponsored programs broken down by research, instruction, and outreach, # of doctorates granted, and # of post-doc appointees.
  - 4. Economic Development – Income-generating licenses, invention disclosures, and companies at the OTRP.
  - 5. Financial Information – Expenses, revenues and private fundraising.

While IRIM updates and maintains the academic ledgers, data comes from various sources across campus including Budget & Asset Management, Grants & Contracts, Scholar Development & Recognition and the OSU Foundation.

- C. Ledgers are completed at the university, college and department level.

1. College ledgers are used by the provost for annual budget meetings with college deans.
  2. Department ledgers are a component of OSRHE annual academic program review.
- D. To ensure reflecting OSU goals as the strategic plan evolves, ledgers are subject to continuous process improvement. An example of current revisions include:
1. Diversity breakdowns for students and faculty. (More detail on diversity will be available on a “Diversity Ledger” that IRIM is working on for the Vice-President of Institutional Diversity).
  2. More details breakdowns of sponsored program expenditures.
  3. Degrees granted section.
- E. The most current academic ledgers are available on the OSU IRIM website:  
[http://vpaf.okstate.edu/IRIM/AcademicLedger/OSU\\_colleges.html](http://vpaf.okstate.edu/IRIM/AcademicLedger/OSU_colleges.html)

Darcy said some of the university's data is pretty corrupt, for example, he had requested a report and when he showed the record of one faculty to that faculty member, he found that the record was wrong. To what extent is there a mechanism to make sure that this data is good. Hawkins replied that when they run their files they work with Human Resources and work with HR to correct any issues that they see. She added that she could not provide a probability of how correct things are and feel like their data is correct. Darcy asked if there was a mechanism where the data is showed to an individual, department, or college, and where they have to check off on it. Joe Weaver said, "The Dean's have full access to the data. Frankly, the local units have to take ownership of the data they produce. The information in our records is only as good as the information we receive from the local units". Phillips asked how ethnic history is collected. Hawkins replied this is self-reported and if they choose not to respond it will typically get lumped into "white" and "white" is actually a "catchall" to the ethnicity question. President Schmidly pointed out that each year he has to go through this report card for the overall institution in his annual evaluation to the Regents and report downward trends. If there are inaccuracies in the data then they need to figure out ways to get it as accurate as possible. He finds where the most disagreement over accuracy of the data occurs is in counting research dollars, especially where you get grants that stretch across multiple units in difference colleges. Schmidly said this might be a challenge for the Office of Research. Raff reiterated the President's comments saying that when research dollars are reported for interdisciplinary projects it is possible that only one department is credited with the research dollars; in fact it is likely since it is much simpler to administer an interdisciplinary grant out of a single "home department". However, if decisions are to be made based on the productivity of units as determined by the ledgers, collaborative grants can actually hurt departments who participate as "non-home" departments. Dare commented that, with respect to ethnicity data, some people choose not to report their ethnicity. Hawkins replied they have worked at getting those minimized as far as student data is concerned but that is not something you can force someone to answer. Darcy suggested reporting "unknown". Hawkins replied this had been done in some things they had published but this is the first year to put in the ethnicity breakdown and the "unknown" category might be something they would want to look at. Darcy said they had been very successful over the years with student recognition like the Truman, Rhodes, etc., and he feels they are at the point now where something should be done like that with faculty awards as well. Darcy said he noticed that one of the President's categories was "faculty awards" and he suggested the President begins the process of thinking about how this university can get behind its faculty and groom them for the kind of awards that will take them to the next level. Pat Bell remarked that another reason why people do not report race or ethnicity is because they are of mixed race or ethnicity.

**SPECIAL REPORT: Smoke-Free Campus at OSU Center for Health Sciences —  
Alexander Rouch**

Rouch reported the OSU-CHS policy on smoking and tobacco use was implemented in January 1998. Dr. Tom Allen, President at that time, initiated the policy and wanted an entire smoke-free environment. Previously, smokers could smoke outside on campus grounds. Sue McKnight, Director of Human Resources at the time, developed the policy. Sandy Cooper, current Director of Human Resources, worked with Sue. Scott Fern from OSU provided legal consultation. Dr. Allen and faculty discussed the issue a few times at Senate meetings and faculty supported the policy. There was no formal faculty opposition. Some wanted to establish "smoke areas or rooms" on the campus, but no substantial support for this was obtained. Some students opposed the policy and approached the *Tulsa World*. The paper published an article which was positive and supportive of the smoke-free environment. The policy has enhanced the positive reputation of the medical college. The OSU-CHS campus was the first campus in the Tulsa area to become totally smoke free. Employees who smoke can volunteer to go into a smoking cessation program. The college pays for all expenses. The OSU Regents approved the policy. Compliance by all OSU-CHS employees and the public has been very good. No significant problems have been encountered.

Binegar asked how far someone had to walk to get off-campus. Rouch replied, "About 30 seconds". Meinkoth asked if any student housing was involved in the policy. Rouch replied not with the CHS and the only issue was private cars in the parking lot on campus. He added he would have to check with Legal but what he understood was you still could not smoke in private cars on campus. Dare asked about prohibiting the use of smokeless tobacco. Rouch said smokeless tobacco did not fit in with the "clean air environment"; however, it was in the policy. Rouch ended by saying, "CHS is in the business of promoting health in order to prevent disease and they will maintain a smoke-free environment".

**SPECIAL REPORT: Status of Efforts to Place Print Shop Employees — David Bosserman**

Bosserman provided an update on the Print Shop lay-off at the request of Faculty Council Vice-Chair, Tom Phillips. There are six categories and 15 employees involved – one has a current OSU application, has interviewed, but has had no job offer; four employees have accepted other positions at OSU; one employee accepted a position at OU; two resigned; one has a current OSU application on file but has not asked that their application be sent to any job that is open to date; six have filed no application at all. The lay-off status went into affect on January 4, 2006 and they will be in a “leave without pay” status for one year where they still have all the opportunities to apply for jobs at OSU in that lay-off category. Raff asked Bosserman if he had any data on the ratio of people that have found new positions as to what their new salary is relative to what there salary was before they were laid off. Bosserman replied, “he did not”. Darcy asked if any decision had been made about the custodial employees. Bosserman replied, “No decision has been made and we are still looking at the data and the data is flawed and I want the data right. When you’re working with about 200 peoples lives you need to be sure that everything is right before you make that decision and when that’s done then I will come forward with a recommendation one way or the other”. Phillips asked if the recommendation was for “outsourcing”. Bosserman replied, “no” and that the recommendation is to go the full gamut. It could be as simple as identifying areas where training and management would help the university do a better job and stay the way we are all the way up to a possible outsourcing. He continued that a full bid process would have to be undertaken before they would consider any outsourcing option because all this firm is doing is saying that if we took your employees and your square feet and knowing that we’re in the business, what would we put in there to do the same job. They are looking at gross square footage and people to do the job. Binegar said last October a group came to campus to study the situation. Binegar asked, “were they consultants or were they a custodial firm”. Bosserman replied they were a firm in the business of providing custodial service and are in several higher education institutions who he asked to come, pro bono, free of charge, to the university, and look to see if there was something that should be pursued and he did not have the answer to that.

### **Recommendation from Faculty Council Executive Committee — Beulah Hirschlein**

**Title:** University Printing Service Employees

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that:** Even though University Printing Services employees were terminated, the University efforts to find employment for them within the University or outside the University should not cease until each has found a satisfactory situation.

Darcy asked for discussion. Bosserman asked, "What if they don't want us to help them"? Hirschlein replied that would be part of the "satisfactory situation" because you can choose to be reemployed somewhere. Bosserman clarified that those people who have not filed an application for employment that would be "satisfactory" because they are making that decision. Hirschlein replied they may come forth and make an application because they had one year on leave without pay. Bosserman replied, "correct". Brown asked if there was a process whereby they request assistance to relocate to find another job, not just restricted to the university, but outside the university, i.e., a job placement process. Bosserman replied this was discussed with the employees at the time the layoff was announced and one of the employees did go to Meridian Technology and received additional training to find a job. Bosserman then stated the recommendation was in conflict with the current layoff policy. He said it specifies in the current policy that during that year of leave without pay they can apply for jobs. Hirschlein replied that the recommendation makes it clear that they understand that they have an opportunity to stay with the university if they choose and stay within the salary structure they had and nurturing them. Darcy added what Council was asking the university to do was to "show some love". He felt this recommendation is saying "We want something positive from the university, positive from you. We would like to hear, in your voice, a real concern for these people who served OSU so loyally". Bosserman asked the question, "Where was this love when we made the business decision to look at eliminating Printing. We have a policy on this campus that printing would go through our Printing Services. Printing Services only did 44 percent of the printing on this campus. The units voted with their dollars to put over \$900,000 off-campus. We have five colleges who have set up their own printing and duplicating to compete with Printing and so I would ask where does this come into this mix". Bosserman added, "You're pointing to this as a one-way issue when, in fact, it was driven by the campus determining that Printing Services was possibly not providing the service they needed to do their job". Darcy said he did not think they were debating the issue of the business decision for Printing but, if the debate was invited he would point out that if 40 percent was \$900,000 then over a million, or 60 percent of the printing, was voted for by people going to Printing. Bosserman said 44 percent was done by on-campus Printing. The other 56 percent was done off-campus or in other units on campus. This fell below the 50 percent. Bosserman recommended the reading of the book "Who Moved My Cheese".

Joe Weaver said he was charged with talking to the employees regarding the lay-off and said that more than one attempt was made to visit with them as a group and individually. As an example, one employee called to tell them that he has chosen to get additional training in another line of work and Weaver felt if there was no relationship with the individual he would not have bothered to call. They felt like they had a good rapport with the employees as they were working through the process and he felt what Council was looking for they were doing, doing according to policy, and although he appreciated the spirit of the recommendation it probably would not change the way they do anything because he felt they were already doing it. Darcy said, "that's what we want". Phillips asked if in the rules of Leave Without Pay are they given a preference over other applicants for jobs like in the Federal Government such as Veteran's preference, etc. Bosserman replied that he did not think they received a preference and if they wanted to be considered for a job and they met the standard qualifications they would be placed into the pool of applicants.

Darcy called for a vote. Motion passed with one abstention.

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

- 05-11-01-RES      ***OSU Conflict of Interest Policy:*** Pending. The draft policy has been reviewed by the Council of Deans and by Legal Counsel. The Research Office is modifying a few inconsistencies found and then the final document will be shared with the Executive Team for approval.
- [Detailed maps have been provided to Faculty Council, student groups, etc. Maps can also be found in the Library, City of Stillwater and on the OSU web page.]
- 05-12-02-EXEC      ***Inclusion of the OSU Community Leadership in the OSU Campus Master Plan Process:*** No action required. Discussions on the master planning process have never closed. Thus, there is no need to reopen.
- 05-12-01-ASP      ***International Education Scholarship Fee:*** To President Schmidly
- 06-01-01-EXEC      ***University Printing Services Employees:*** To President Schmidly
- 06-01-02-ASP      ***Academic Integrity Policy:*** To President Schmidly
- 06-01-03-FAC      ***Recommended Revisions to The Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, etc. of the Faculty of OSU Approved by the Faculty Council and General Faculty in Spring 2005:*** To President Schmidly

**REMARKS AND COMMENTS – President Schmidly**

President Schmidly commented on the announcement made earlier in the day in regard to Boone Pickens donation of the largest single donation for athletics to an institution of higher education in U.S. history in the amount of \$165 million. The President said Mr. Pickens has now gifted to the University almost \$300 million and has said he is not through with that process. Other needs on campus have been discussed and he understands those needs and agrees with them. The Master Plan was reviewed with him including all of the projects planned for the academic side of the campus, the infrastructure projects, campus life projects, and he felt at this point and time he wanted this particular gift to be devoted to athletics. It is entirely for facilities. The gift was made on Dec. 30 and that money was reinvested into Boone Pickens's Energy Equity Fund and he waived all of the charges associated with that fund. There is normally a charge of 20 percent of the profits made and a 2 percent management fee. He not only gave the money but he is devoting, at no cost, the time of his investment team to manage that fund and, hopefully, grow it. The performance of his fund in the past has been short of phenomenal. The money will remain there until it is needed and then it will be drawn down so that these projects are paid for without debt. If the money grows as hoped, there is a possibility there will be enough money remaining to pay off all of the debt that Athletics has. If that happens, with these kinds of facilities, that the Athletic program will be totally self-sufficient and that is the goal of VP Holder and if anyone deserves accolades for this gift it is Mike Holder. The President ended by saying Boone Pickens does not like to have all of his generosity shared but he may be among one of the top five philanthropists in the United States. He gives to children's hospitals, libraries, was one of the largest donors to Hurricane Katrina, and is a very generous individual. He loves Oklahoma State and takes a lot of pride in what OSU accomplishes and his message is very simple as he wants to see Oklahoma State be more competitive in academics, athletics, and everything it does. A round of applause followed.

Earl Mitchell moved the following resolution be approved by Faculty Council:

*Resolution in Appreciation of Boone Pickens from  
The Oklahoma State University Faculty Council  
January 10, 2006*

*Whereas* Oklahoma State University is committed to the excellence in intercollegiate athletics,

*Whereas* Oklahoma State University Division of Athletics is committed to the education and athletic training of student athletes,

*Whereas* Boone Pickens is committed to supporting Oklahoma State University with his generous gifts to the institution,

*Whereas* Boone Pickens has made a generous gift of \$165 million to the construction of athletic facilities,

*Whereas* this gift is an historical gift to the support of intercollegiate athletics to a single institution from a single individual,

*Be it Resolved* that the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council thanks Boone Pickens for his generous gift to Oklahoma State University.

Tom Jordan seconded. The resolution passed with one “no” vote.

Darcy asked if the President would convey the resolution on to Boone Pickens and he replied he would.

**REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**

**ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Tony Brown**

Brown said the following recommendation was Tabled at the December 13, 2005, Faculty Council Meeting at the request of GPSGA President, Shirley Vincent for further discussion. Darcy reported Vincent had reported to him that all issues have been completely resolved to everyone’s satisfaction.

Brown made the motion to remove from the Table and Hallgren seconded.

**Title:** International Education Scholarship Fee

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that:** The University Administration support a recommendation from the Student Government Association to the Board of Regents for Higher Education for Oklahoma A&M Colleges to enact an international scholarship fee (SGA Bill F05RC71).

**Rationale:**

On 9 October 2005, the Student Government Association passed Bill F05RC71 recommending that “an International Education Scholarship fee of 8 cents per credit hour be enacted for the purpose (of) aiding in the global education of Oklahoma State University students. The International Education Scholarship will be available to all students regardless of college and administered by the OSU Study Abroad Office.

The Faculty Council applauds the efforts of the Student Government Association to improve the international educational opportunities for students at Oklahoma State University. Furthermore, the Faculty Council commends the Student Government Association for its efforts to increase financial support and incentives for students to obtain an international educational experience while attending Oklahoma State University.

The motion passed with one “no” vote.

Brown reported the following recommendation was discussed at the December Faculty Council Meeting for information purposes and was also posted on the Council website for review during the month. Matt Beier said SGA had not acted on this policy but would submit legislation later in the week and act on it.

**Title:** Academic Integrity Policy

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that:** The University Administration approve the Academic Integrity Policy and Academic Integrity Program as proposed by the OSU Academic Integrity Committee.

**Rationale:**

In 2003-04, the Academic Standards and Policies Committee initiated an evaluation of the University Policy on Academic Dishonesty and Misconduct. The Committee was responding to complaints that the Policy was too adversarial, confusing because it used the same board (Academic Appeals Board) to hear both grade appeal cases and cases of academic dishonesty, frequently ignored by faculty because of overly cumbersome procedures, and reliance on rules of evidence that made it almost impossible to prove a case of academic dishonesty. After a study of academic dishonesty policies at other universities and review of materials from the Center for Academic Integrity located at Duke and Rutgers, the ASAP Committee concluded that a major reformulation of the policy was needed.

Dr. Marlene Strathe appointed a university-wide Academic Integrity Committee to develop a University policy on academic integrity and rules and procedures for its implementation. The Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) began meeting during the Spring 2004 semester. As its first action, the AIC conducted a campus survey to assess academic integrity issues. Assistance was given by the Center for Academic Integrity in the development and scoring of the survey instrument. As a result of the survey, the AIC proceeded to develop an academic integrity policy. The Committee organized itself into two subcommittees—Policy and Procedures, and Education. Dr. Gail Gates coordinated the AIC and chaired both subcommittees. The Committee sponsored a campus visit by the Director of the Center for Academic Integrity at Rutgers. Dr. Gates and several Committee members attended two national conferences on academic integrity to gather information.

The proposed Academic Integrity Policy is one of five policies and procedures that deal with the broad issue of “misconduct” on campus:

1. The Academic Integrity Program deals with charges of **student academic misconduct** by students (e.g. plagiarism) while they are engaged in an OSU academic activity;
2. **Scientific misconduct** deals with integrity violations by faculty and staff while engaged in academic activities;
3. **Non-academic student misconduct** is concerned with misconduct not directly related to academic activities (theft, harassment, disorderly conduct, etc.);
4. **Student grade appeals** in which a student charges unfairness by faculty in a course grade assignment; and
5. **Grievance procedures** in which students, staff, or faculty can challenge the fairness of decisions made by other University employees that adversely affect them.

This recommendation passed unanimously.

#### **CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Tom Jordan**

Jordan distributed to all in attendance a sheet dealing with OSU Capital Projects for the next one to five years. This included 22 projects, the amount of each, source of funds and funding available.

#### **FACULTY — Cathy Sleezer**

Sleezer presented the following recommendation:

**Title:** [Recommended Revisions to The Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, etc. of the Faculty of OSU Approved by the Faculty Council and General Faculty in Spring 2005](#)

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that:**

**Revision 1:** In Section 1.14.3.2, which deals with procedures for termination due to departmental or program discontinuance not mandated by financial exigency, change the phrase “by a Termination Hearing Committee (see Section 1.15)” to “using the procedures in Appendix C”.

**Rationale:** The procedures in Appendix C provide due process provisions in addition to a hearing before a Termination Hearing Committee. These procedures include informing the faculty member of the reasons termination is being considered with an opportunity for the faculty member to respond to the proposed reasons. This change should make it clear that all relevant due process procedures in Appendix C are to be utilized before a decision is made by the appropriate administrators to formally recommend termination of a faculty member.

**Revision 2:** In Section 1.14.4, which deals with Terminal Salary and Notice associated with termination of faculty members, delete the first two sentences.

**Rationale:** These sentences are unnecessary, confusing and inconsistent with Section 2.2 of The Policy Statement ... which excludes the use of the Dispute Resolution Procedures in “terminations or actions taken as a result of financial exigency”. This exclusion is to insure that the stronger due process provisions of Appendices C and D are used when termination is being considered.

Sleezer asked Linda Austin, committee member, to discuss this recommendation. Austin said Revision 1 directs the faculty member to Appendix C which is not just the Termination Hearing Committee but the entire Termination Hearing Procedure. This changes the reference point. The second revision deletes a paragraph under Terminal Notice or Salary and the paragraph says that individuals who received notice of termination can obtain reasons for that termination in a confidential form especially if he/she believes that their academic freedom, etc., has been violated. The problem is that there were certain readers of the revised document that read that paragraph as saying that the individual would enter the Dispute Resolution Procedure after he/she had been terminated. The paragraph is not in the old Appendix D and the committee felt it best to delete the paragraph.

Darcy asked for questions or comments. He then asked Provost Strathe if she had any comments and she replied, “No”.

Darcy called for a vote. The recommendation passed with one abstention.

Sleezer asked what faculty policies were the faculty operating under at this time. Phillips replied the July 2001 *Faculty Handbook* because the Board of Regents had not yet accepted the new policies. Darcy said certain aspects of the new policy are being followed because the Regents had approved an appointment of a Clinical Professor and this title is in the new policy but not in the old policy and he felt this was what was causing the confusion. Bosserman said he thought this would be an amendment to the old policy but it is also in the new policy as a codified document. Binegar brought to the attention of Council that in the *Faculty Handbook* after the “Preface” (page V) there is a disclaimer that says the Regents reserve the right to alter the terms of official policy statements at any time, and so the implementation of a pending policy prior to official approval could be defended by that disclaimer.

**RESEARCH — Al Rouch**

Rouch announced there were a number of faculty ready to open start-up companies from their research and they need help. This issue was discussed last year but nothing was done about it and the committee wants to act on it now. Dr. McKeever has given Rouch one name of a faculty member in this position and he would like to talk to others. He asked if anyone knew of faculty in this position please give him their names so they can tell the Research Committee what needs to be done in order to put forth an affective recommendation and develop a policy that will help faculty. Darcy recommended Rouch send him a paragraph regarding this issue and he would post it on the Faculty ListServ.

**RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Greg Bell**

A proposal was received from the R&FB Committee that would increase the tuition waivers for employees of both faculty and staff and their dependents. They have an estimate that was done by Institutional Research in regard to how much this would cost and also an estimate from Dr. Bosserman's office as how much it would cost the university to do this. He feels the faculty, staff and administration are all "on the same page" and would all like to do the same thing. The committee is trying to justify the cost before it is brought to Faculty Council for a vote and they hope to have a recommendation to bring to Council at the March meeting.

Another committee assignment was to look into a new RFP for health care. Both the Faculty Council Retirement and Fringe Benefits Committee and the University Flexible Benefits Committee have decided to be undecided. The main objectives for having a new RFP are to lower the costs of insurance for dependents and possibly to reduce the cost to people who have retired under the "Rule of 80" and are in between the time when they can qualify for Medicare and have to pay their own benefits. We might consider a high deductible health-care plan, but there is some opposition to that type of plan, or some other means to lower those costs.

Last February a proposal was sent to the IRS for a ruling that would allow current faculty and staff to choose between OTRS and an alternative retirement plan. To date, this ruling has not been made and may not be made until April or later.

Phillips asked if there were currently tuition waivers for employees and their families. Bell replied there were currently waivers for employees only. The proposal would be for a 50% waiver of tuition for dependents but they would pay full fees and the tuition waivers for employees would increase to 75% and all fees would be waived. The cost, according to Institutional Research, based on an estimate of the number of employees that have students going to this university or are going to the university themselves, the cost of the new tuition waiver plan would be about \$200,000 per year. The cost from the Vice President's Office included not only those students but the increase in the number of students that might take advantage of this program. That cost was \$666,000 per year. He noted the estimates did not match because they were based on two different groups. Joe Weaver added that one of the first things they noticed after the first estimate was that old tuition numbers were used instead of current rates. They also wanted to consider a different set of assumptions for who might actually take advantage of the program. He said that it would be impossible to provide a definite cost. Bell said the committee realized this and were not questioning the numbers. However, the committee thinks that they can provide more information that would justify the cost of the program. Gary Webb said that he thought this should be viewed as a benefit to faculty and staff. He added that other Big 12 universities have tuition waivers for dependents, spouses, and faculty members and he felt that this plan would provide a good opportunity to compete with their programs.

**REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:****Graduate Faculty Council Liaison Report — Robert Hunger**

- Three candidates, all currently faculty at OSU, are scheduled to interview for the position of Associate Dean of the Graduate College in January:
- 1. Dr. Frank Collins, Professor & Director of Clinical Training, Department of Psychology; scheduled for January 23, 2006.
  2. Dr. Debra Jordan, Professor, School of Applied Health & Educational Psychology (also currently Interim Associate Dean of the Graduate College); scheduled for January 24, 2006.
  3. Dr. Mark Payton, Professor of Statistics; scheduled for January 26, 2006.

Specific details of the interviews are being finalized, but each candidate will have a forum from 1:30-2:15 PM at which they will discuss their philosophy, expertise etc. Faculty are invited to attend.

From 3:00-4:00 PM there will be a meeting with the Graduate Council & interested officers from the Faculty Council.

- Ballots for voting on the proposed revisions of the Graduate Faculty bylaws are in the mail, with voting to run through February 13<sup>th</sup>.

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is February 14, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,  
Birne Binegar, Secretary