

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
February 14, 2006

Tom Phillips called the meeting to order with the following members present: Austin, Bell, P., Binigar, Brown, Carter, Chaney, Cruz-Rodz, Dare, Gelfand, Giles, Hallgren, Hirschlein, Johannes, John, Jordan, Lamphere-Jordan, Martin, Meinkoth, Mitchell, Moomaw, Raff, Ransom, Rouch, Shabazz, te Velde, Terry, and Veenstra. Also present: Agnew, T., Beier, M., Bird, L., Bosserman, D., Chemishanova, M., Crespo, A, Elliott, K., Emslie, G., Gates, G., Goodbary, A., Matoy, A., Miller, B., Schmidly, D., Strathe, M., Swaim, R, Weaver, J., Webb, G., Welliver, H., and Woodside, C. Absent: Bell, G., Darcy, and Sleezer.

HIGHLIGHTS

Student Affairs Update on Recent Events.....	2
Master Plan Task Force.....	2
OSU Master Plan Update.....	4
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	7
Remarks and Comments from President Schmidly.....	7
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	
Recommendation: Reinstatement of Undergraduates after Academic Suspension.....	9
Athletics.....	10
Budget	
Recommendation: Equity in Merit Pay Raise Programs for all Employees of Oklahoma State University.....	11

Recommendation: Moratorium on Change to Block Tuition.....	12
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security.....	13
Faculty.....	
Recommendation: Proposed Recommendation from Faculty Committee on Faculty Review of Administrators.....	14
Update Regarding Post-Tenure Review.....	15
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology.....	17
Research.....	17
Resolution: To Recognize and Commend the University's Office of Research Compliance.....	18
Rules and Procedures	
Vice Chair Nominations.....	18
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Graduate Faculty Council.....	19
Women's Faculty Council.....	19
Graduate and Professional Student Government Association.....	19
Staff Advisory Council.....	21
New Business	
Report from Special Committee to review the Draft "Reporting of Unethical Conduct and Complaint Protection" proposed policy.....	21
Vote Regarding Master Plan Task Force Letter.....	22

Department of Zoology Statement on Evolution.....	22
---	----

Pat Lamphere-Jordan moved acceptance of the January 10, 2006 Minutes. Birne Binegar made the following correction to page 2, line 10, of Bob Darcy's Special Committee report to replace the word "severed" with "served". Armando Cruz-Rodz seconded. The Minutes were approved as corrected. Pat Lamphere-Jordan moved acceptance of the February 14, 2006, Agenda. Birne Binegar seconded. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: Student Affairs Update on Recent Events — Lee Bird

Dr. Bird discussed a recent well-publicized incident involving Alpha Phi Alpha fraternity. It did not occur on campus but a shooting did take place at the Holiday Inn that killed one and injured three other students. After that incident they met with NPHC and even though the incident did not take place in the Student Union they wanted to evaluate the security for those events to see if rules were being followed. Some specific recommendations were made to NPHC and they have been working with them and their executive committee very closely over the past three weeks and they hope to have the passage of that policy as they meet with student groups this afternoon. Those signing off on the policy will include Dr. Bird, the Director of Campus Life, the Director of the Student Union, and the Campus Police. They have worked to modify the policy and to try to find out how these social events can be made safer for everyone concerned. There have been recent incidents at the YMCA and an incident at a local burger place and so they are constantly looking to refine the policy to make sure OSU students can have a good social event in an environment that is as safe as possible. The OSU student that was shot in the face at the Holiday Inn is doing quite well and is back in school on a part-time basis. Raff said in addition to the student just mentioned, one student was treated and released and he then asked about the third student. Bird replied that student was a Langston student and was treated with a gun shot wound to the back. She said she would check with Dr. Jones at Langston to get an update. Mitchell asked if there was anything about the new policy that would have prevented this incident. Bird replied she did not think so but the concern to them was that the students checked in and had their ID's scanned but their names did not appear on the sign-up list and they are now trying to use a different method. From now on the social events will focus on current Oklahoma students from Langston, UCO, etc., and not just the total community. Bird ended by saying students are anxious to have events in the Student Union again and they will be happy to facilitate that request and hope the new procedures will make these events safer.

SPECIAL REPORT: Master Plan Task Force — Matt Beier

Beier introduced himself as a member of SGA and the SGA Senate. Last Fall SGA along with Faculty Council, GPSGA and SAC formed a Task Force to create a consolidated list of specific recommendations regarding the Master Plan. Beier then presented the following letter to President Schmidly that will be in Thursday's O'Colly.

Dear President Schmidly,

Last fall the SGA Senate passed Resolution 72 and Faculty Council passed similar legislation, Resolution 05-12-02-EXEC. These asked that the Master Plan approval be postponed for further review by the OSU community and that the campus leadership's input be included. You heeded our request, and the four representative bodies of the university community - the Student Government Association, the Graduate and Professional Student Government Association, the Staff Advisory Council, and the Faculty Council - together formed a Task Force to obtain feedback from our representative constituencies and create a consolidated list of specific recommendations regarding the Master Plan.

The Task Force has completed its work, and we submit this letter to you asking that you publicly reply to our recommendations. Together we can develop a Campus Master Plan that will be enthusiastically supported by the University and Stillwater communities.

Sincerely,

Matthew Beier
Chemical Engineering Junior
OSU Master Plan Task Force Chair

Lauren Detten SGA President	Kara Cook SGA Senate Chair	Shirley Vincent GPSGA President
--------------------------------	-------------------------------	------------------------------------

Hank Welliver SAC Chair	Bob Darcy FC Chair
----------------------------	-----------------------

Our recommendations are as follows (Please note that the recommendations are numbered for clarity, not for priority):

1. Clearly demonstrate how the Campus Master Plan supports the goals and objectives outlined in the OSU Stillwater Strategic Plan.
2. Clearly demonstrate how each of the eleven original Guiding Principles has been incorporated into the Campus Master Plan.
3. Develop alternatives to the current planned northward expansion of campus that will displace Stillwater residents and reduce affordable student housing within walking distance to campus.
4. Conduct necessary land acquisitions in an open, transparent, and just process that respects the rights and needs of affected individuals, businesses and municipalities.
5. Include realistic construction costs and project the future operation and maintenance costs as part of the proposed budgets for the Campus Master Plan. To the best of your ability, identify the sources of funds for construction and operation.
6. Demonstrate how the future facility needs of all Academic units, including colleges, departments, and administrative support offices, are being met.
7. Include a designated home for the Social Sciences that includes Geography, History, Political Science and Sociology and for the Humanities that includes Philosophy and Foreign Languages.

8. Place a priority on expansion of the library by including renovation and space additions in the five-year Campus Master Plan.
9. In accordance with the Guiding Principle to “*embrace sustainable principles*,” all new and renovated buildings should comply with United States Green Building Council Certifications for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design. In addition, landscaping should include the use of native flora (xeriscaping) and recycled wastewater (gray water) for irrigation.
10. Demonstrate how the Campus Master Plan provides room for expansion of classrooms sufficient to meet the needs of future growth of the student population.
11. Demonstrate how the planned parking and transportation components of the Campus Master Plan will support safety (emergency access), accessibility for disabled persons, and promote traffic flow around the campus. Limited on-campus parking should be maintained, especially close to the library.
12. Explain why the Biosystems Lab, Journalism Building, Health Services Building, Cordell Hall, and the Wrestling Hall of Fame are being removed, and indicate where the programs currently located in these buildings and other buildings that are slated for removal will be housed.
13. Explain the purpose of the planned water features currently included in the Master Plan.
14. Develop alternatives that allow Hall of Fame and McElroy streets to stay open.
15. In accordance with the Guiding Principles to “*prioritize interdisciplinary interaction on campus and incorporate aesthetics and art throughout the campus*,” place a priority on centralizing student support centers and provide many aesthetically pleasing indoor and outdoor spaces conducive to faculty and student interaction and study.
16. Provide a three dimensional model of the Campus Master Plan at a centralized location for the University and Stillwater communities.
17. Involve university and community stakeholders in periodic (2-5 year) reviews and revisions of the Campus Master Plan. The process should be conducted in an open and transparent manner and include representatives of all key constituencies.

Beier added that most of the press regarding the Master Plan was about the Athletic Village and although that is mentioned in a few points they obviously focused more on the academic side.

Johannes asked if all the volume of work required above was reasonable. Beier said their “charge” was to make recommendations regarding the Master Plan and come up with a list of issues or recommendations that their constituents had regarding the Plan. Raff quoted from the statement above, “Our recommendations are as follows (Please note that the recommendations are numbered for clarity, not for priority)”, and asked what Beier considered the number one priority of the Task Force. Beier replied he thought the number one complaint was the transparency of the process, i.e., to receive more information and evaluate the Master Plan fairly and the constituents had enough information to do so. Shabazz asked about item #7 in regard to whether it was referring to two different buildings, one for the Social Sciences and one for the Humanities or one. Beier replied Darcy thought that in the next 30 years these should be two different locations.

SPECIAL REPORT: OSU Master Plan Update — President Schmidly

President Schmidly said he thought there would be no problem in responding to the issues that were raised in the above mentioned letter. The President showed colored maps and charts that had been presented at a series of meetings held recently where all of the issues were summarized and all the questions that have been raised and their responses to as many of them that can be made up to this point. Before the Christmas holidays the plan was frozen and produced the maps and charts about what was in the plan after the discussions at the Board meeting in November. The plan is divided into two separate components. An initial development period which is 1-5 years and include projects they feel will begin during this time. The longer term is up to 20 years. An example he gave was that in the initial development period there is approximately \$750 million worth of projects ranging across academics, student life, infrastructure, and athletics. One thing to remember about the charts, they were made prior to the gift from Boone Pickens and that gift changes the dynamics, particularly the timing, of the athletic project. Schmidly discussed some major issues that have come out of the discussions that continue to drive the community. One is the land acquisition particularly north of McElroy. There have been suggestions made to stop the land acquisition and move the facilities that were planned elsewhere around campus. Schmidly said they are looking at that. The University now owns fifty percent of the land south of McElroy and about twenty percent of the land north of McElroy. A second aspect is the timing of the projects. When do they start, when is their anticipated completion, etc. They are now in the process of producing a new set of charts that will include another column which will have the timing of the projects. The new charts will also reflect many of the suggestions and conversations that have taken place. The third area discussed has been infrastructure, particularly what will happen to Hall of Fame, Hester, Athletic Avenue, McElroy and parking. The frozen maps have major underground parking around the stadium and the President thinks this will be removed from the list of projects because of the projected \$88 million expense and feel the parking issue can be resolved in a much more cost-effective way. A highway engineer has been hired, working with the University and the City, to look at options for Hall of Fame. Schmidly stated, "Hall of Fame will reopen and it will reopen as soon as it can be safely reopened given the construction issues around the stadium". It is anticipated the north side of the stadium will be finished in the summer and it is also anticipated the construction of the west end zone part of the stadium will begin over the summer. The west end zone part will stretch almost to Cordell and is a two-year project. One of the questions for the highway engineer is can Hall of Fame be reopened while the west end zone construction is going on. The highway engineer is also looking at the rerouting of Hester because of this construction. The Provost, Vice Presidents and College Deans have meet and discussed these issues with their faculty. The consultants will take the feedback from each of the meetings and the letter presented above, review it, and make sure all of the issues have been adequately considered. The President said there were many unresolved issues in the 20-year plan such as concerns regarding the fate of Cordell and if Cordell comes down where will the offices there be relocated. In the one-to-five-year plan there will be considerable construction along Monroe beginning with the multi-modal transportation facility which will begin sometime this summer. Also, the Classroom Building, the renovation of the Print Shop, the starting of the new Science Building, and the renovation of South Murray. Included in this plan are two projects for Vet Med, the new Business Building, and the renovation and expansion of the Architecture Building. Eventually Athletic Avenue will be eliminated and a quadrangle will be established which is the last of the quadrangles in the old Bennett Plan. There is also discussion of a building that would eventually be built to replace some of the activity that is now in Cordell. Schmidly ended by

saying they would probably go to the Board in March requesting approval of the initial development plan of the one-to-five-year period. This needs to be approved because so many of these projects, particularly the academic projects, are tied to the State Bond Issue. Discussions might be continued until a later Board meeting about the twenty-year plan because of the long lengthy list of items in the above letter. Schmidly said he thought they will proceed with the entire Athletic Village concept as drawn on the current maps but they will evaluate the other options and see what the implications are.

Raff said he had heard that the University is seeking to get the interest from the bond monies released to OSU and OU, was this true? The President replied "Yes", he and President Boren signed a letter. When the bond issue was presented it was \$500 million. It was reduced to \$475 million with the \$25 million coming out of the OSU and OU segments with the remainder of the institutions held harmless. They have requested for that reason that OSU and OU receive the interest money and have been working with the State Regents and the Chancellor toward that end. This might result in an additional \$10 to \$12 million. If this does happen they are looking at investing the money in the new Classroom Building so the size and capability can be increased.

Lionel Raff asked about development north of McElroy Street and that he understood the University was still purchasing property in that area and, if so, why if other options are being considered. The President replied that most of the purchases are coming from volunteers stepping forward wanting to sell. The 20-year plan is the most difficult aspect of the Master Plan and is also the piece that is most likely to change because it is hard to predict over a 20-year period what areas will be the most important. The plan will not be "in stone". There will be a process and a group of people that will regularly review the plan and there could be many changes in the 20-year plan.

Gary Webb asked about satellite parking areas. Schmidly replied that could happen. Parking areas could be provided on the outskirts of campus or space might be leased out in the community and have buses transport employees in or there might be a combination of both.

Matt Beier said, as a student, he was wondering about classroom space and what did the President estimate the student population being on the Stillwater campus in twenty years and would there be a two-campus school. The President replied that the development of OSU-Tulsa had been part of OSU strategy long before he came and the numbers he had heard was 20,000 in 2020 which, in his opinion, is an unrealistic number and he asked for a revised number. The number he got back was substantially less. There is an enrollment management study that was completed last year and that study does have enrollment projections for over the next 20 years and those are in the range of 25,000 to 26,000. He added that from the demographics in the state the number of high school graduates that are academically prepared to go to college in Oklahoma is currently flat lined and not projected to go up in any appreciable manner. Some growth will come from out of state. He gave an example of Texas growth and said, "They're growing so much that their universities can't service their student populations and that is why OSU now has an office in the Dallas-Ft. Worth area and there will soon be one in the Houston area". Over a twenty-year period Texas A&M grew from 20,000 students to 45,000 and that will not happen here.

Gilbert John asked about the incorporation of aesthetics and art on campus such as providing an atmosphere that represents the people in the state and are there any plans in that regard. The President replied campus beautification has to be part of the plan and there will be landscaping, irrigation, art and sculptures. Most universities set aside a small percentage of the total cost of the building for landscaping and art work. OSU does not currently have such policies but this does need to be discussed at some point.

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.
- 05-12-01-ASP ***International Education Scholarship Fee:*** Accepted. A joint Student Affairs/Academic Affairs meeting was held with several constituent groups. The Study Abroad office was tasked with developing applicable policies on the use of this fee. The administration is pleased with the students' support. The fee request will be submitted to the Regents for approval.
- 06-01-01-EXEC ***University Printing Services Employees:*** Counsel received. OSU will continue to provide assistance to individuals as requested.
- 06-01-02-ASP ***Academic Integrity Policy:*** Accepted. Minor modifications to clarify the policy were recommended by members of the Instruction Council and by Legal Counsel. The proposed policy was approved by the Council of Deans on January 26, 2006.
- 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:*** Pending. Review continues on the proposed changes.
- 06-02-01-ASP To President Schmidly
- 06-02-03-BUDG To President Schmidly
- 06-02-04-FAC To President Schmidly

REMARKS AND COMMENTS – President Schmidly

The President reported regarding the budget. There is clearly money on the table. There is a willingness to spend some of it on education on the Senate side. There is a more conservative philosophy on the House side and it remains to be seen how those will balance. They are trying to get at least, at the very minimum, \$90 million of new money flowing into higher ed through the formulas. Our ability to get money there directly relates to our Grow, Reward and Restore Program. The number one priority for him going into this is to do everything possible to get every dollar back into the formulas. The Governor's budget included \$65 million and they would like to see it higher. Schmidly said, "This also impacts our students because the more we get through the formulas the less we have to impact tuition and fees". The Governor's budget included \$180 million of new capitol projects to infuse research and economic development - \$60 million going to OU, \$60 million to OSU and \$60 million to other state entities. Schmidly said, "Where that will go who knows. Governor's budgets sometime see the light of day and many times do not and so that will be open for a lot of discussion". He added OU had two major thrusts, one to get some enhanced additional funding for their cancer center and the second to start a diabetes center. Schmidly said the medical school in Tulsa must be fixed and they will work very hard to bring this to a resolution so that there will be a permanent site and practice which is very important to the long-term stability of the medical school. The President said a very nice gift was received from ConocoPhillips recently and he suggested inviting Steve McKeever to a future Council meeting to discuss the National Sensor Testing Facility which will be located in Ponca City and they would like to build a parallel component of it at the Oklahoma Technology and Research Park maybe in conjunction with an accelerated building that was planned there a few years ago. Also, the plans for biotechnology are built in the area of biomedical activity and primarily located around Oklahoma City. There is very little in the plan to do with agri-biotechnology which they think is a real weakness in the plan. One thing discussed is to strengthen what is done on this campus and money where the Experiment Station could include a station at Ardmore on the Noble campus where work could be conducted in conjunction with the growing biotechnology/agri-biotechnology enterprise there. He is not certain that can happen. There are many competing interests for that money. It is an election year. He believes something will be done with teacher's salaries and he thinks that is a good idea. Something will be done with corrections and on a personal note he would much rather see more invested in kids and not have to incarcerate them. He thinks something will be done with highways and transportation. He thinks there will be a hard look at giving everyone a small tax rebate or permanent tax cuts. The good news is there is a lot of money on the table.

Barbara Miller asked about TABOR (Taxpayer's Bill of Rights) and if it does get the required number of signatures to be placed on the ballot and passes what impact did the President think it would have. The President replied they are very general in the way they want TABOR to look in Oklahoma and he has heard general statements such as it will not be like it was in Colorado and not to worry about it. He added he was not aware of any TABOR kind of amendment that has proven friendly to investing in public higher education. He views that with skepticism because he personally believes public higher education is a great value to a state and ought to be invested in and the taxpayers are better investing in it than they are in receiving a small amount of money back. If TABOR does get on the ballot they will have to be extremely careful how they engage in it because of some of the state policies about what state officials can and cannot do with regard to speaking out on these issues. They will do all they can but they will have to be done within the guidelines of those policies. Miller asked if he thought it would have an adverse effect. He does not see any way for TABOR to have a positive outcome for higher education and if it is adopted his prediction is tuition rates will continue to rise dramatically in Oklahoma and that we will lose our ability to make up substantial ground with growing, rewarding, and restoring faculty. Binegar asked if administration could not speak out against TABOR for legal reasons will the faculty be so constrained. Schmidly responded he did not think as individual faculty members would be and he added they could certainly speak about the impact the policy has on higher education but he does not think they could take money and invest it in an ad campaign to try and sway public opinion. Raff said he thought there were the required number of signatures for the issue to be placed on the ballot. The President said there is a challenge to the manner in which the signatures for the petition were collected and to the veracity of the list and if that challenge is not successful it will probably be on the November ballot.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Tony Brown

Brown presented the following recommendation to Council:

Title: Reinstatement of Undergraduates after Academic Suspension

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: The University administration approves the policy and procedures document titled "Reinstatement of Undergraduates after Academic Suspension".

Rationale:

Oklahoma State University is authorized under the policies of The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) to establish an academic suspension appeals process. The purpose of the proposed policy is to establish such an appeals policy and procedures necessary to implement it.

The proposed policy and procedures statement provides an appeals process for suspended students. Under current policy, students who are academically suspended are ineligible to enroll for a minimum of one regular semester (fall and spring). An exception is made for seniors (see 2.02 of attached document). Under the proposed policy, a suspended student will be allowed to enroll in the semester following their suspension if their petition is approved by a faculty review board.

Students may appeal their suspension based upon extraordinary personal circumstances (see 3.02 of attached document). Students may also petition to have the suspension removed if they provide official academic transcripts from other institutions that raise their cumulative retention graduation GPA to OSU retention standards.

Student petitions for reinstatement following suspension will be reviewed by a Reinstatement Appeals Review Board. The Board is made up of one faculty member from each of the academic colleges and a representative from the Faculty Council Committee on Academic Standards and Policies. The Board will meet with the Director of Student Academic Services for the student's college when considering the petition.

If a student petition for reinstatement is granted, the student will be placed on academic probation. Students reinstated by the Review Board will retain the academic suspension notation on their transcript. Students suspended for a second time cannot petition again for reinstatement (unless they are seniors who have not used their one-time senior exception—see 2.02 in the attached document).

Finally, the document provides for a “Summer Reinstatement Program”. The Program offers an alternative to the reinstatement petition process. A suspended student is allowed to enroll in a minimum six semester hours of required courses. Continued enrollment in the fall semester is allowed if the student earns a minimum summer GPA of 2.0 or raises their graduation retention GPA to minimum standard.

Raff asked if OSU was operating under this policy at the present time. Brown replied that the State Regents authorized the University to operate under this policy. Gail Gates added this had been in effect since at least 1992 but was not an official Policy and Procedures Letter. This recommendation would finalize the policy.

Phillips called the question. The recommendation past unanimously.

ATHLETICS — Earl Mitchell

Mitchell reported Kent Bunker was invited to provide some information on OSU Sports Clubs. Summary of his presentation is as follows:

There are 22-23 Sports Clubs. They are chartered through the SGA as an activity group. They have a constitution and an advisor (Faculty of A&P Employees). Some clubs are more active than others. There are 12-15 very active clubs. They operate under the Campus Recreation direction. All receive some Activity fee but usually not enough to cover much of the expenses.

The Oklahoma Attorney General issues a legal opinion that the Sports Clubs cannot use University vehicles because they are not a primary function of the university. Thus, they provide their own transportation when they have competitive events at other institutions. Students usually seek private donations. The rodeo club is somewhat independent. While the Wheel Chair basketball team in an intercollegiate league, they are not under NCAA regulation. There is a salaried person with them. However no other club has a salaried institutional person responsible for the group. All advisors are volunteers.

Kent usually writes letters for some of the students when they will be missing class but most of the students make their own arrangements. There is no method of accounting on the impact of the sports clubs on Student academic life.

The majority of the activities are weekends but a few have weekday activities that take them away from the campus.

Ice Hockey – SU Ice hockey team practices in Edmond, Oklahoma and have their games there also. They play in a league that includes teams in Texas. They play one home game and alternate with games away. They usually leave, drive to a location, play a game and drive back to be in class the next day. Most students do not know that we are competitive in hockey as a club sport and play other clubs in a Texas league. They own all of their individual equipment and uniforms.

Polo Team – The polo Team travel with their horses and play matches at other institutions. They have to seek stables for their horses. The cost is borne by the individual.

Sailing Club – The Sailing Club has sailboats that are worth over \$250,000. They keep them at Lake Carl Blackwell.

Water Skiing Club – (Weight Boarding). Mercury Marine (MerCruiser) provides a motor boat (\$40, 000-\$50,000).

Texas A&M provides funding of six-seven figures for their Sports Clubs.

Some of the problems mentioned by Bunker included travel liability and funding through the institution.

Mitchell said the committee intended to look at each one of the clubs individually and find out more about their travel and to look at the impact of these activities on student life in academic performance. Mitchell added Bunker said some of these students come to OSU and are retained because of the activities.

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

Gelfand presented two recommendations to Council:

Title: Equity in Merit Pay Raise Programs for all Employees of Oklahoma State University

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: any future merit pay raise programs be structured such that the average percentage raise is the same for both staff and faculty. Merit pay raise programs should be considered distinct from other salary increase programs, such as those intended to correct salary compression and/or inversion.

Rationale:

A merit pay raise program for the 2005/2006 faculty was recently enacted at OSU. Tenure-track faculty received an average total of a 6% salary increase, to be dispersed as an average 3% in October 2005 and another average 3% in January 2006, while staff received only the 3% average in October. This recommendation is not intended as a criticism of the faculty portion of the raise program; rather, it arises out of concern for the financial hardships faced by staff and non-tenure track faculty, as well as the damaging effect of the raise program on their morale.

This recommendation is not intended to suggest that “Reward, Restore & Grow” be pared back. Rather, additional funds should be allocated to allow future pay raise programs to cover pay raises for staff and non-tenure track faculty. For example, if the recent pay raise program had followed the format recommended here, funds would have been allocated and all employees would have received an average raise of 6 %.

Overview:

No set policy exists at OSU for executing salary increases. Pay raises have occurred when funds are available and the level of salaries at the time warrants an increase. Invariably these increases are awarded differentially to employees based on merit of their performance, but usually with a recommended average pay increase per administrative unit. Merit is usually assessed by unit heads and the raises are granted by Deans or other appropriate administrators. The recent two-tiered raise program for tenure track faculty was based on merit, but also was given in the spirit of the administration’s “Reward, Restore and Grow” campaign that has the intention of raising faculty salaries to levels closer to the Big-12 average. Despite the best intentions of administration, the extra faculty raises left staff members and non-tenure track faculty, which represent the majority of OSU employees, in a position of low favor. Pay raise programs structured in the way spelled out in this recommendation will, in the future, address the financial concerns of *all* OSU employees and help demonstrate that the university values *all* OSU employees.

Gelfand said there was a consensus among the committee that this recommendation should be brought forward to Council for discussion and one committee member said they supported bringing the recommendation forward but did not support the recommendation. Gelfand suggested “tabling” this recommendation until he received feedback from Faculty Council, the general faculty, as well as administration. Johannes said he felt administration went out of their way to try and put together a raise program for the faculty and he is irritated that now they start to “slap down” the administration for doing what they have asked them to do. He added he realizes the staff members are terribly underpaid and need pay raises which they have not been getting. If the administration decided to give a 5% pay raise to the staff members and a 3% raise to the faculty this policy would not allow them to do that and their hands are tied if this is done. He said this recommendation did not make good business sense and he was totally against it. Gelfand responded administration was not being slapped at all and he went out of his way to state, “This recommendation is not intended to suggest that ‘Reward, Restore & Grow’ be pared back” and “This recommendation is not intended as a criticism of the faculty portion of the raise program.” In the Overview Gelfand said he stated the same thing. Gelfand added the 6% faculty raise group did not include non-tenure track faculty. Binegar said the graduate students received raises because a comparative study had been done with their counterparts at other schools and what he felt was missing in regard to staff was the same kind of comparative study of what would be equitable for staff and compare them with other universities such as OU and feels there needs to be a base-line figure for comparison. Phillips added, “Corrected for cost of living between Stillwater and Norman”. Raff said this issue had been discussed with the Provost and he wanted to focus on the first sentence of the second paragraph in the Rationale which stated, “This recommendation is not intended to suggest that ‘Reward, Restore & Grow’ be pared back”. Raff said this was an easy sentence to write but is not executable. He added that the Provost’s view is if this recommendation is passed and implemented it will slow Reward, Restore & Grow. After much discussion Johannes moved to Table, Ransom seconded. Move to Table passed.

Gelfand presented the next recommendation brought by the Budget Committee.

Title: Moratorium on Change to Block Tuition

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: any change from the current tuition structure to a Block Tuition program be delayed until Faculty Council has at least one month to evaluate and discuss said program.

Rationale:

Although the details of Block Tuition programs vary, such programs generally set tuition at a given level for all (or most) of those who register as full-time students, without regard to the actual number of credits for which students register. State Universities generally have one block rate for in-state students and a second rate for out-of-state students.

In December 2005, Christie Hawkins, the Director of Institutional Research & Information Management, made a presentation to the Faculty Council Budget Committee outlining the generalities of Block Tuition.

In December 2006, The Budget Committee contacted the Administration and requested that a representative of the Administration make a presentation to Faculty Council outlining any contemplated or proposed Block Tuition program so that Faculty Council would have time to evaluate said program and provide feedback to the Administration before any program was approved.

In January 2006, The Budget Committee was told that no presentation would be made on Block tuition until after President Schmidly was briefed on the proposals, which will not occur until February 7, 2006. Accordingly, the second Tuesday in March is the earliest date at which an Administration representative will be able to give a presentation to the Faculty Council concerning the actual Block Tuition program being considered.

Faculty Council recognizes the legitimate desire of the Administration to brief the President before a proposal or program is publicly discussed. However, given the timing of this proposal, there is a distinct possibility that Faculty Council will have little or no time to evaluate this proposal and give the Administration its input concerning a drastic change of tuition policy.

Given the Administration's commitment to shared governance, it is not asking too much to request that the decision to implement any change to a Block Tuition program be delayed until one month after the details of said program have been presented at a meeting of the Faculty Council.

Mitchell asked why Council couldn't go ahead and look at this issue and then make some recommendations. Gelfand replied because it really depends on what Block Tuition is going to look like. The Budget Committee has looked at this issue for 18 months and looked at many different proposals, proposals that have different blocks within different colleges, proposals that set the blocks at different levels and it is a very complicated issue. Johannes said the fees, the hidden things, are what the faculty members and the colleges are worried about.

The recommendation passed unanimously.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Tom Jordan

Jordan reported the committee is working on the tobacco issue and will try and look at the full gamut of this issue. At the next committee meeting they have invited two guests with differing views on this subject to speak. Please contact Jordan via email with any thoughts and/or concerns you have regarding tobacco use such as having a Tobacco-free campus, enforcing the rules already in place, forgetting the issue, etc.

FACULTY — Lionel Raff

In the absence of Cathy Sleezer, Committee Chair, Raff presented the following recommendation to Council:

Title: Proposed Recommendation from Faculty Committee on Faculty Review of Administrators

Whereas, OSU has already established policies and procedures that provide for faculty review of administrators,

Whereas, faculty regularly review chairmen, deans, vice presidents, etc.,

Whereas, OSU Faculty have a deep and abiding concern over the performance of individuals in OSU administrative positions,

Whereas, OSU Faculty rarely, if ever, receive any feedback or response from the Administration as to the overall results of their reviews of administrators and are rarely apprised of any actions taken by the administration in response to Faculty reviews,

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: OSU adopt and implement policies that correct this situation. Specifically, it is recommended that all administrators be required to prepare and share with the appropriate faculty groups both qualitative and quantitative summary statements of the overall results of faculty appraisal of administrators under their supervision and to describe the response of the Administration to those reviews.

Rationale:

Faculty need to know the overall views of their colleagues with respect to the performance of administrators. Without such information, there exists no way for a faculty member to determine if their views of a particular administrator are out-of-line with the general perception of the Faculty. In the absence of such information, there is no effective way for a faculty member to properly assess the accuracy of their evaluations.

Sharing the results of a faculty review of administrators promotes trust. Such a procedure will encourage greater participation of faculty in the reviewing process and promote greater thought devoted to the reviews.

When the teaching competence of OSU faculty are reviewed by students using the STAs, the Administration is permitted to see those results. In a similar manner, when the research competence of OSU faculty are reviewed by the Departmental Personnel Committee and Unit Administrator, other members of the OSU Administration are permitted to see those reviews. The same should apply to members of the Administration. When Faculty submit reviews, they should be permitted to view qualitative and quantitative summary statements of those reviews and receive feedback as to actions taken by Administration in response to the reviews. Without such feedback, there exists little chance that trust between Faculty and Administration can prevail at OSU.

Binegar commented on the rationale, "When the teaching competence of OSU faculty are reviewed by students using the STAs, the Administration is permitted to see those results". In his opinion, the analogy is not quite right here; if the argument is that reviewers should be allowed to see the results of the review, then it is the students that should be given the results of teaching evaluations. Ransom said he agreed totally and when he substituted "students" for "Administra-

tors” in the above sentence he finds this disagreeable. His remark to the first sentence in the Rationale, “Faculty need to know the overall views of their colleagues with respect to the performance of administrators”, was “talk to them”.

Recommendation passed with 14 “for”, 3 “against”, and 4 “abstentions”.

Post-Tenure Review Report – Tony Brown

Brown reported in the October of 2005 the Board of Regents of Oklahoma A&M Universities contacted the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council Chair, Robert Darcy, and requested that the Faculty Council conduct a study of Post Tenure Review (PTR). As questions were raised about the Board’s interest in PTR, the Board issued the following statement regarding their position on PTR. **“The post tenure review program is actually all about ensuring OSU is progressing on its goals as outlined in the strategic plan. As a University, we are responsible to our various constituents to provide quality in everything we do in instruction, research and extension services. The evaluation of employee performance is essential if we are to improve our service to students and other constituencies. The review process would enable academic administrators to evaluate performance and seek ways to improve if necessary. Several universities have similar programs and it helps to foster a constructive atmosphere of continuous improvement and provide a reasonable level of accountability to students and other constituents.”** The Faculty Council of OSU is currently studying PTR via two formal activities. First, the Chair of Faculty Council has established a Special Committee to study PTR. This Committee consists of Tony Brown, Chair of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee, and Tom Phillips, Vice Chair of the General Faculty. This special committee is soliciting input from administration (Brown and Phillips have met with the Dean’s Council and had several meetings with the Provost), faculty and other resources. This special committee is also interacting with the Board of Regents by communicating with a special task force of the Board dealing with faculty policies. This BOR task force is chaired by Regent Claude Evans and includes Regents Douglas Burns, Edward Keller and Lou Watkins. The second group within Faculty Council that is focusing on the PTR issue is the Faculty Committee, chaired by Catherine Sleezer. Any recommendation regarding PTR or other matters closely related to faculty issues such as tenure, promotion and academic freedom are generated from this committee. They had a preliminary meeting with this committee but have not submitted a formal report. They did submit a rough outline of some of the issues that were raised from the information they received and the next step is to formalize that report and present to the Faculty Committee for action. Further information can be found on the Faculty Council website (<http://facultycouncil.okstate.edu/>) bottom right of homepage under “Past Articles, January 09, Post Tenure Review”. Please take some time to study these documents, give some thought to the issues at hand, and submit your comments and ideas to the Faculty Council for further discussion.

Lionel Raff made the following comments: "I have not been happy with the way this post-tenure review discussion has proceeded. I have looked at the preliminary report passed out at the Faculty Committee. It deals almost entirely with revisions to the A&D process. The Regents have made it clear that they do not consider the A&D process post-tenure review. I think that the suggestions for revision of the A&D process that the Special Committee has presented are very good, but I don't think that they address the issue of post-tenure review. What is missing from the document, as it currently stands, is a clear statement of what items are not acceptable to the faculty in terms of a post-tenure review policy. We have had no vote of the faculty. There has been no motion presented at a General Faculty meeting on which a vote has been taken. I feel not much in the way of a post-tenure review policy is going to be supported by the faculty. For example, on page 3 of what used to be Appendix D that now has a different name, *Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters*, it says unequivocally, '**Appraisal and Development of Faculty Members.** Faculty are responsible for their own development consistent with unit, college, and University goals'. One idea that I've heard floated is they're going to have post-tenure review by having committees write development plans for faculty. That's totally unacceptable to me. I don't know how everybody else feels and I don't think the committee knows either because the faculty haven't been asked. So what I would like to see coming out of the Faculty Committee in the discussions that are going to be held in the next month or so is not only a recommendation for changes to the A&D policy, but a clear and unequivocal statement as to what is not acceptable to the faculty in terms of post-tenure review. I would like to see this statement take the form of a recommendation that goes to the General Faculty for discussion at the April meeting where a closed, secret ballot is taken by the faculty on these issues so that when the Regents decide what they're going to do, they will have in front of them a clear and unequivocal statement from the faculty. I hope that is what happens. If we come forward with nothing more than suggested revisions to the A&D policy, and that's our response to the Regent's desire to install post-tenure review, I think that's a little bit like saying we need to fix the sidewalk in front of the house when the house is on fire. There is nothing more important to faculty than academic freedom and tenure. That's why I came here. My son works in industry as a chemical engineer. He gave up what we call 'academic freedom'. His management decides on his development plan. They tell him what he's going to work on, when he's going to stop, when he's going to change gears. He voluntarily gave that privilege to them so it's fair. In return, he's paid a huge salary. He makes more than I make and he's 41 years old. He has 16 years of seniority and I have 42. He easily makes more than I do and that's the return he received for giving up his right to decide what he's going to do. I regard post-tenure review as a desire by administration to write a development plan for me without paying me for that right. I came here and I accepted a salary very much less than I could have made in industry so I would have academic freedom and academic freedom is supported by tenure. Academic freedom means if I want to do research, I do research; if I want to concentrate on teaching, I concentrate on teaching and while administration can like it or dislike it, I'm responsible for my own development. I hope we have a policy coming out of the Faculty Committee that not only states what we should have in A&D, but one that clearly and unequivocally states those forms of post-tenure review that are unacceptable to faculty. I don't care how often they review me. I counted up this morning how many times I've been reviewed. I count 75 times because every Regents' Professor was reviewed every four years by the department committee, the Chair, the college, the Dean, the Provost, and the Regents' Professor Committee. That's six reviews every four years, six times, that's 24, plus six reviews when I

was appointed, plus the yearly review I get. I count 75 reviews. I don't mind being reviewed. They can review me every week if they like. I couldn't care less, but I care a lot about whether I write my development plan or somebody else does. I hope something comes out of this other than what I've seen so far. That's all I have to say."

Binegar said he is also concerned about the process and added he certainly hopes it is adequately discussed and if policies are formulated they are properly vetted before the faculty, perhaps having open forums like were held for the rank-in-class proposal last year. Phillips said the Special Committee will issue a written report within the month, before the next Faculty Council meeting, and at that point it will be released to the Faculty Committee for action. Johannes said he agreed with Raff one-hundred percent but he does not get as upset because he has looked at all the universities, approximately ten, that have post-tenure review and as far as he has been able to determine that only three people have ever been dismissed. Raff responded by saying the Provost had given them similar figures and there are very, very few people that are actually dismissed under post-tenure review, but that is not the objective. What they are trying to do is grow the faculty. The last thing they want to do is decrease the faculty. The point is not the dismissal issue; the point is to intimidate you into silence. Johannes said, "You don't have to worry about growing if you put post-tenure review in because trying to get faculty members to a) to come to Stillwater, b) to work at below-average salaries, and then c) to put up with post-tenure review might be too tough". Raff said that was true because his department has two "restore" positions now and they have interviewed 11 people, offered \$650,000 worth of start-up money, and no one has been hired yet.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — A. J. Johannes

Johannes reported he is on two task force committees – 1) to evaluate course software. Blackboard and Web CT are currently being used. They have been given the charge to either keep those or change to different software. The decision is down to two programs being discussed, Angel and Desire to Learn. The latter is the system software OU has gone to and Johannes said there will need to be more faculty evaluation than what took place at the last meeting as only six faculty attended. The second committee he is on is a registration of all devices with IT. He has appointed Nick Materer to be on the committee with him and they are looking at OSU studying system-wide for all the electronic devices registrations and what that will entail for security.

RESEARCH — Al Rouch

Rouch reported the Research Committee has reviewed the Conflict of Interest Policy and find the revisions made acceptable and he communicated that with Toni Shaklee in the Research Office. Secondly, the committee is working on a recommendation they hope to bring to Council in March regarding the Faculty Entrepreneurial Fellows Program. Hopefully this will stimulate the number of start-up companies created by faculty. If there are any faculty interested in creating a start-up company from their research, contact Rouch as the committee would like to discuss this with you. At the present time there are four faculty ready to begin start-up companies.

Rouch presented the following resolution to Council:

The Research Committee recommends that the Faculty Council approve the following resolution.

This resolution is put forth to recognize and commend the university's Office of Research Compliance.

The Research Committee commends Dr. Steven O'Geary and the Office of University Research Compliance (URC) for their efforts in meeting with and educating faculty on new programs related to human subject research. Scheduled meetings have been held with individual colleges with faculty who conduct research involving human subjects. The majority of OSU faculty who will be impacted by new training requirements have now been contacted.

Phillips asked for approval of the resolution by Council. The resolution passed unanimously.

In addition, URC has prepared a presentation for the OSU Research Week on ethics in research. The presentation, titled *Ethics and Responsible Conduct in Research*, will focus on ethics in research, broadly covering all research that falls within the purview of URC. This presentation will also include "hot topics" (e.g., AAHRPP accreditation for the IRB, AAALAC accreditation for the IACUC, OSU training requirements, biosafety issues, and conflict of interest). Ethical research will always remain a top priority at OSU.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Ron Moomaw

Moomaw quoted from the Bylaws of The General Faculty regarding nomination of officers. "At the nominating meeting each Faculty Council member shall suggest, in writing, one candidate for each position (Vice Chair each year and Secretary every three years). Successive secret ballots shall be taken until two candidates for an office receive a combined vote of at least 75 percent of the total vote's cast. A written announcement of the names of the persons so nominated shall be distributed to the General Faculty within ten days."

Binegar said he had been advised he would be nominated for Vice Chair and therefore had decided to announce his resignation as faculty Secretary effective in June regardless. His feeling is he has served three years as a general Councilor, two years as a committee chair, three years as Secretary (two of those fulfilling an unexpired term by another faculty member) and he would consider being Chair but feels he has served his time as Secretary and he would like to move forward. Therefore, a faculty member will need to be elected to fulfill the remaining two years of Binegar's three-year term as Secretary.

After successive written ballots were taken, the results were as follows: Vice Chair nominees: Ron Moomaw and Birne Binegar. Chuck Ransom's name will be placed in the first memo for the vacant position of Secretary. One additional name will be requested from the General Faculty so at least two names will appear on the ballot. Their names will be announced, in writing, to the General Faculty within ten days of the Feb. 14 Council meeting. Moomaw also announced that additional nominations for Vice Chair and Secretary may be placed on the primary election ballot provided that a petition signed by fifteen (15) members of the General Faculty is submitted for each such nomination by March 10. Blank petitions for Vice Chair and Secretary, as well as all other vacant Councilor positions, along with voting rosters and memos, will be included in the first election mailing which will be in Campus Mail by February 15.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Graduate Faculty Council Liaison Report — Gordon Emslie

Emslie said he was very glad to report that after a national search and three candidates interviewed, effective May 1, 2006, Mark Payton from the Department of Statistics at OSU, will be the new Associate Dean in the Graduate College. He thanked Deb Jordan for the wonderful job she did in the Interim role.

In regard to the Research Committee report above, Emslie asked if they would consider adding any words to the recommendation regarding graduate students as far as curricular help from the Compliance Office and it would be much appreciated.

Emslie said the Graduate Council had been very busy the last year-and-a-half which included writing a new set of bylaws. Faculty working on these bylaws included: Bob Hunger, Steve Hallgren, Al Rouch, Timm Bliss, Edward Jones and Charles Hendrix. This is a radical revamp of the bylaws including the appointment and activities of Graduate Faculty members, how you become a Graduate Faculty member, what you do when you become one, etc. The bylaws were presented by a campus ballot in January and by a vote of 345 to 31 the bylaws will be effective March 1.

Women's Faculty Council — Barbara Miller

Women's Faculty Council Research Awards. The award flyers have been distributed to all women faculty members, to the graduate advisors, and to most bulletin boards on campus. The deadline is March 3. Three awards of \$300 each will be given: one for an undergraduate, one for a graduate student in the sciences, and one for a graduate student in the social sciences/humanities. Please contact Michele Seikel in the Library if you have any questions.

Graduate and Professional Student Government Association

Report sent by Shirley Vincent, GPSGA President, for inclusion in these Minutes.

Administration Responses to Top Ten List and Library Recommendations — President Schmidly attended the January 19th, 2006 GPSGA General Assembly meeting to provide the administration's response to the GPSGA's Top Ten List of Recommendations for Improving Graduate and Professional Education at OSU and to discuss the Campus Master Plan. President Schmidly addressed each recommendation individually and explained the details of the Master Plan, including the financial aspects of the plan. He also answered questions from the representatives on both topics. The GPSGA was somewhat disappointed with the administration's response to the Top Ten List and would have preferred more substantive answers to some of the recommendations. We will continue to encourage the administration to adopt policies and create programs that will address the recommendations. Richard Paustenbaugh, Associate Dean of Research and Instruction Services, attended the February 2nd General Assembly meeting to provide the library's response to the GPSGA's recommendations for improvement the library facilities and services.

GPSGA Input to Campus Master Plan — The GPSGA has participated in a coalition Task Force comprised of member of the GPSGA, SGA, Faculty Council and Staff Advisory Council to coordinate feedback on the Master Plan and provide the administration with a consolidated list of recommendation. The GPSGA will vote on approval of the recommendations at its February 16th Meeting.

Resolution — Resolution 2006-01 – International Education Scholarship Fee

The GPSGA passed a resolution supporting the establishment of ante International Education Scholarship Fee of 8 cents per credit hour, increasing incrementally to 20 cents per credit hour based upon participation levels.

Research Week — The GPSGA is pleased to co-sponsor Dr. Roland Fryer as the Keynote Speaker for Research Week. His public lecture titled: *Toward a Unified Theory of Black America: The Racial Achievement Gap & What to Do About It*, will be held February 22nd, at 5:30 in the Wes Watkins Center Auditorium. The lecture will be followed by a public reception in the Wes Watkins Center Atrium. Faculty and students are also encouraged to attend a Coffee Chat with Dr. Fryer from 3:30-5:00pm in the Willard Hall Living Room on February 22nd. Dr. Fryer will be available to answer questions and visit informally with those attending. The Economics Department is hosting this event. The GPSGA is coordinating Dr. Fryer's visit to OSU and co-sponsoring the lecture with the Office of the Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer. The GPSGA is also co-sponsoring the annual Research Symposium which will be the 22nd through the 24th. We encourage faculty to serve as judges, attend the poster and papers presentations and let their students know about this opportunity to learn more about the exciting graduate and undergraduate research being conducted at OSU.

Phoenix Awards Call for Nominations — The call for nominations for the annual Phoenix awards for outstanding graduating master's student, doctoral student, and graduate faculty member will be issued next week. The Phoenix Award recognizes exemplary achievement in leadership, scholarship, professional activities, university and community service and involvement with graduate and professional students. We encourage you to nominate deserving students and faculty members.

Faculty Advisor Needed — The GPSGA’s faculty advisor, Dr. Lona Robertson, recently resigned her position at OSU to take a position with another University. The GPSGA is actively seeking a new Faculty Advisor. If you are interested please contact Shirley Vincent at shirley.vincent@okstate.edu.

Staff Advisory Council — Hank Welliver

Welliver said he appreciated all the comments made earlier about the staff and that the staff feel like they work well with the faculty and there is no animosity because faculty received the raise program they did and staff did not. He added things right now, in general, are hard for the staff because of the economy and SAC is working on their own resolution regarding the salary issue. Staff Appreciation Day will be held in April and Welliver invited faculty to sign up to help serve at the luncheon.

New Business:

Report from Special Committee to review the Draft “Reporting of Unethical Conduct and Complaint Protection” proposed policy – Patricia Bell

Bell reported that Darcy appointed a Special Committee of three, Pat Bell, Chair, Kris Giles, and Pat Lamphere-Jordan to review the Draft “Reporting of Unethical Conduct and Complaint Protection” proposed policy. The committee members read the policy and, emailed their comments to Bell. No one was opposed to having the policy; however there were several questions raised mostly having to do with process and definition of concepts used in the policy. After the Committee summarized their concerns and questions they were sent in writing to Anne Matoy and she responded. Most of the concerns had to do with sections 3.02 and 3.03 in the policy regarding retaliation and good faith allegations. Some of the suggestions were moot points because the process is already under way. An example was a suggestion that the actual policy should precede the purchase of software, but the software had already been purchased. There were some suggestions that the policy, as stated, suggested that in regard to reprisals that the University was trying to prevent people from retaliation by going outside of the University. The question was raised, “In the event that a false allegation is made, will the University’s attempt to prevent a person from retaliating, that is outside of the University, be interfering with a person’s rights under the Civil Law”? Another question was, “What will happen to this information once a complaint is made. Is it placed and maintained in a database? If the allegation is found to be false is it then purged from the database”? There were some concerns regarding the terminology used. For example, what is the meaning of “good faith allegations”; how are some terms defined, i.e., misconduct, good-faith reporting, etc. There was a suggestion that this draft policy should be posted on a website for all to see and that all Councilors and the General Faculty should take it up as an issue before the policy is finalized. There was a concern in regard to what takes place in the event of a false report and the termination of employment if a false report is made. An earlier version of the draft policy had been reviewed by Legal Counsel and it will now be sent back to Legal Counsel for final review to determine the issue of whether or not it interferes with one’s Civil Rights under the law. As for the definitions of unethical conduct and suspected violations, once a report is made it goes to a Compliance Officer and they determine whether or not the information received warrants further action; therefore, the implication is that the Compliance Officer interprets and defines these terms. There was a suggestion to change a paragraph that refers to what would take place if someone made a reckless and false allegation and in 3.02 it states, “An employee who retaliates against someone who has reported a violation in good faith is subject to disciplinary action, including termination of employment”. Phillips asked if this policy would include the entire OSU community. In 2.01 it states, “This policy applies to all OSU campuses and any other locations where business of the University is conducted”. Binegar asked about section 3.10 – Refrain from Rumors. Matoy replied one of the advantages of the confidential reporting system is it is a way to clarify or get proper information out. Matoy added the electronic reporting system allows the complainer to be confidential. She said they are taking care that someone is not reporting frivolous information and making a report is serious and it ought to be as reasonably accurate as possible. The review will be taken seriously. Phillips asked if Bell’s committee concluded this policy was acceptable as is. Bell replied the committee would review the draft policy in regard to the changes that were suggested. Matoy said when agreement was reached on this policy it would go to Legal Counsel, to administration, and then to the Board of Regents.

View this draft policy at: <http://facultycouncil.okstate.edu/>

Master Plan Task Force Letter

Tom Jordan moved the Faculty Council endorse the letter presented earlier in the meeting by Matt Beier to President Schmidly from the Master Plan Task Force. Johannes seconded. Binegar called the question. The motion passed unanimously.

Department of Zoology Statement on Evolution – Matthew Lovern

Dr. Matt Lovern, Assistant Professor, Department of Zoology, said political attempts to weaken science education has been on the rise in this country and the ability to process the scientific theory of evolution has been a consistent target of these attempts. Lovern gave an example of a recent case from Dover, PA, where they recently made headlines with the School Board's failed attempt to force the teaching of Intelligent Design in their science classes. The Kansas State Board of Education as another example where they recently changed their K-12 science standards by actually redefining science itself which in Kansas now does not exclude supernatural explanations for natural phenomenon. The Board did this in spite of objections from State and National science research and teaching organizations. In the past two years over 40 states have faced or are currently facing challenges to the teaching of science. In Oklahoma three bills and one resolution have been introduced in this Legislative session alone to either explicitly promote Intelligent Design as a scientific theory or to more indirectly not penalize teachers who chose to do so. As of yesterday House Bill 2107, the so-called Academic Freedom Act, has passed out of the House Common Education Committee. Although these bills do not apply to colleges and universities in the state, if enacted, would make the job of teaching more difficult. The challenges hurt our ability to effectively educate our citizenry about the nature of science and what types of questions it can and cannot address. On a more practical side it would hinder the recruitment and retention of qualified science teachers to the state, of students and faculty to our higher education institutions, not to mention companies that rely on a scientific base. For those reasons the Department of Zoology voted unanimously at its February 10 Council meeting to approve the following statement on evolution:

“Evolution has nearly 150 years of empirical support from diverse disciplines of scientific inquiry, ranging from biogeography and paleontology to genetics and molecular biology. This rigorously tested and overwhelmingly supported scientific theory is the central unifying principle in biology, and understanding evolution is thus a critical component of any sound education in a scientific discipline.

In spite of the vast consensus view among trained scientists and science educators, there continue to be political attempts in numerous states including Oklahoma to force a so-called alternative to evolution – “Intelligent Design” (ID) – into the science curriculum of public schools. ID is not a scientific theory and its claims cannot be addressed by scientific means. These political actions severely undermine the accurate and thorough understanding of the nature of science. Furthermore, they threaten to put our state at a competitive disadvantage in attracting and retaining jobs in an increasingly technologically-oriented society.

Therefore, the Department of Zoology at Oklahoma State University joins with numerous other organizations devoted to science education and research in affirming the centrality of evolution to biology and in opposing attempts to introduce the teaching of ID into any science curriculum.”

Useful resources:

-
- [American Association for the Advancement of Science](#)
- [American Institute of Biological Sciences](#)
- [National Academy of Sciences](#)
- [National Association of Biology Teachers](#)
- [National Center for Science Education](#)
- [National Science Teachers Association](#)
- [Oklahomans for Excellence in Science Education](#)
- [Understanding Evolution](#)

Moomaw asked what the scientific theory of evolution was. Lovern replied, “That populations of species, specifically gene frequencies, change over time”. Phillips entertained a motion to support the Department of Zoology statement. Moved by Tom Jordan, seconded by Johannes. Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is March 14, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,
Birne Binigar, Secretary