

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
April 11, 2006

Bob Darcy called the meeting to order with the following members present: Austin, Bell, G., Bell, P., Binegar, Brown, Carter, Chaney, Cruz-Rodz, Gelfand, Giles, Goetze, Hallgren, Hirschlein, Johannes, John, Jordan, Lamphere-Jordan, Martin, Meinkoth, Mitchell, Moomaw, Phillips, Raff, Ransom, Rouch, Shabazz, Terry, and Veenstra. Also present: Agnew, T., Birdine, P., Clark, G., Condit, L., Cook, K., Gates, G., Goodbary, A., Hunger, B., Janosek-Albright, J., Miller, B., Monismith, D., Nixon, T., Schmidly, D., Shutt, G., Strathe, M., Thomas, C., Thornton, J and Weaver, J. Absent: Dare and te Velde.

HIGHLIGHTS

Committee Approvals and Election Results.....	2
Gary Clark, OSU Foundation.....	3
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	4
Remarks from the President.....	4
Special Committee on African Americans.....	5
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	
Recommendation: Academic Forgiveness for Undergraduate Students.....	8
Budget	
Recommendation: Faculty International Travel.....	9

Resolution: Staff Salary and Benefit Increases.....	10
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security	
Recommendation: Compliance with the Oklahoma Statutes and OSU	
Policies and Procedures on Smoking in Public Places and Indoor Workplaces	
Smoking Prohibition within 25 Feet of Entrance to Public Buildings.....	11
Faculty.....	
Recommendation: Revision of Annual Review and	
Establishment of Cumulative Review.....	12
Research.....	18
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Graduate Faculty Council.....	18
Women's Faculty Council.....	19
Graduate and Professional Student Government Association.....	19
Staff Advisory Council.....	19
Athletic Council.....	21
New Business	
Recommendation on Dress Codes for Faculty.....	21

Darcy asked for approval of the March 14, 2006, Minutes. Lamphere-Jordan moved acceptance of the March 14, 2006 Minutes. Mitchell seconded. The Minutes were approved. There was a correction to the Faculty Committee report presented by Cathy Sleezer on the diversity issue. It should be corrected to read: "The President stated he was very interested in addressing current and future diversity issues. We agreed that the Faculty Committee would move from focusing on past diversity issues to focus on current and future issues. Specifically, we agreed to move forward collaboratively to conduct a survey that measures diversity, culture, and performance and that results in systematic, documented and public improvement. I later met with the Faculty Committee and they agreed to work with administration on this." Darcy moved the April 11, 2006 Agenda be amended by moving the Rules and Procedures Committee report to the beginning of the meeting, the addition of Gary Clark, OSU Foundation, to present a report, and Al Rouch, Research Committee Chair to present an update. Johannes seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Ron Moomaw

Moomaw reported the results of the Faculty Council election as follows:

Vice Chair – Birne Binegar; **Secretary** – Tom Jordan; **College of Agriculture** (two 3-year positions) – Glenn Brown and Leon Spicer; **College of Arts & Sciences** – three 3-year positions: Joseph Bidwell, Jean Van Delinder, and Paul Westhaus, and one 1-year position, Nicholas Materer; **College of Engineering, Architecture & Technology** (one 3-year position) – Khaled Gasem; **College of Education** (one 3-year position) – Sandra Goetze, and (one 1-year position) – Bob Nolan; **Library** (one 3-year position) – Heather Moberly; **OSU-Okmulgee** (one 3-year position) – Danna Martin. The new Councilors are invited to the May 9, Faculty Council Meeting as guests and will assume office June 1, 2006.

Moomaw moved Sandra Goetze be appointed to fill the position vacated by Cathy Sleezer and that her appointment be effective immediately so she can participate in future meetings and serve as a member of the Faculty Committee. Johannes seconded. Goetze was approved unanimously.

Moomaw moved Faculty Council appoint a Special Committee on Confidentiality consisting of Bob Darcy, Hank Welliver, Nick Materer, Mark Weiser, and Martin High. Johannes seconded. Raff spoke in favor of forming this special committee. Mitchell asked, "Why"? Darcy explained this committee was formed due to the discussion at the March Faculty Council Meeting where VP Bosserman indicated that he would be open to receiving suggestions, comments and recommendations concerning the University Confidentiality Agreement. Raff moved an amendment to the original motion to explicitly state that the committee is limited to the charge of investigating and making recommendations on the Confidentiality question and will cease to exist upon its report at the May Faculty Council Meeting. Darcy said the committee will make a series of recommendations to the Vice President and report back to Faculty Council at the May meeting and then cease to exist. Terry seconded the motion to amend. Original motion passed with 18 yes, 1 no and 7 abstentions. Motion to amend passed with 17 yes, 1 no and 8 abstentions.

SPECIAL REPORT: Recent "Letter to the Editor" in the Stillwater *NewsPress* Regarding Acquisition of Property by OSU— Gary Clark

Darcy introduced Gary Clark, former Chair of the OSU Board of Regents, former President of the Oklahoma Bar Association, and currently Vice President and General Counsel for the OSU Foundation. Darcy had asked Clark if he would like to speak to Council regarding a "Letter to the Editor" that appeared in the *NewsPress* on Monday, April 10, concerning the dealings of the Foundation with homeowners in the affected area of the Athletic Village. Clark said he was shocked to read the letter and added the basic premises of the letter were simply untrue. He wanted the opportunity to tell Council of what he knew about the situation and to give them an opportunity to ask questions. The basic premise of the letter written by a Robert Radford said that the Foundation had been making incessant demands upon a forty-year faculty member from the OSU College of Engineering while he was in the hospital, in regard to purchasing his properties north and south of McElroy. Clark said he had attempted to call a R. T. Radford listed in the phone book and email a student by the name of Robert Radford to try and find out who had written the letter. He felt he knew who this letter was written about because he personally had been working with a member of the faculty from the College of Engineering who was recently in the hospital. Clark continued that he had met on two occasions with the professor and his wife regarding properties they owned in the Athletic Village area to see if an agreement could be reached on the purchase of their property. They had disagreed on the appraisal of the property but Clark was trying to get to a number that might be agreeable to them and on the second occasion Clark suggested they meet on the following Saturday to go around and look at their properties and comparable properties as listed on the appraisal reports as well as others they thought were comparable. This was done and at the conclusion of that time Clark told them he would get back with them with a revised proposal as to two properties south of McElroy and seven properties north of McElroy. The Tuesday afternoon following the Saturday visit Clark received a call from the professor's wife who informed him that her husband was in the hospital

with pneumonia. Clark expressed concern about the illness and told her they could take whatever time they needed and his health was the most important thing. She asked if he would call her at their home that evening after 8 p.m. He agreed and called at 8:15 and 8:45 but there was no answer. The following morning the wife called and said her husband was still in the hospital and asked if they could wait a few days. Clark said "of course". The next Friday the professor called Clark and said he was home and had called to find out what numbers Clark had come up with. He gave the numbers to him and the professor said he would talk them over with his wife and get back with him. Clark said he had no further communication with the professor after that. After seeing the letter he called the professor's home and talked to his wife to say he hoped they did not feel like they had been pressured by the situation and she said no they had not and she did not feel the letter was an accurate reflection of what had happened and what could they do to get this twisted story straightened out. Clark had attempted to reach her before the Council meeting but had been unable to do so. He then asked if anyone had questions. Raff asked if the offer, as stated in the newspaper, was 65% relative to the appraised value and Clark replied that was not true. Clark said it was above the appraised value of Cinnabar and he said he did not think he could say what it was in relation to what the County Assessor's new Fair Cash Value number was because he does not have any confidence in those numbers based on his looking at other properties in the Athletic Village area. He gave an example of a property that sold for \$54,000. The people had put \$10,000 to \$12,000 in it to remodel, they got their own appraisal through a bank this past December for \$65,000 and that is what they wanted to sell it to OSU for. The Assessor Office has it valued at \$85,700. A property that sold for \$87,000 she has valued at \$122,000. Therefore, he does not have a lot of confidence in those numbers but he tells everyone they deal with that they will talk about the appraisal they got, if they do not think it is done fairly and they do not think the comparables are truly comparable, then show them what is and they will adjust the price based on that. Raff asked for an estimate, in terms of percentages, as to how far apart the current offer is relative to their asking price. Clark said approximately 15 to 20 percent if he were guessing. Theodore Agnew, Professor Emeritus, made a statement in regard to the fact that he and his now deceased wife had decided to make a major gift of property at Cantwell and Bellis which they had owned and had been their family home for 16 years. As of April 6 it is now the property of the Oklahoma Annual Conference of the United Methodist Church. He assured everyone that in the preliminaries to that event and in all the conversations he had with Mr. Clark, he showed the utmost courtesy and Dr. Agnew was very pleased to have worked with him. Darcy thanked Clark for attending the meeting to a round of applause.

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

- 05-11-01-RES ***OSU Conflict of Interest Policy:*** Pending. The final document has been approved by the Executive Group and is on the agenda for approval at the April meeting of the OSU Board of Regents.
- 06-01-01-EXEC ***University Printing Services Employees:*** Counsel received. OSU will continue to provide assistance to individuals as requested.
- 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. Wording modifications suggested by the administration are under review by members of the Faculty Committee.
- 06-02-03-BUDG ***Moratorium on Change to Block Tuition:*** Approved.
- 06-02-04-FAC ***Proposed Recommendation from Faculty Committee on Faculty Review of Administrators:*** Pending. Under discussion.
- 06-03-01-RFB ***Education Incentive Recommendation:*** Pending. Under discussion.
- 06-04-02-ASP ***Academic Forgiveness for Undergraduate Students:***
To President Schmidly
- 06-04-04-CFSS ***Compliance with the Oklahoma Statutes and OSU Policies and Procedures on Smoking in Public Places and Indoor Workplaces Smoking Prohibition within 25 Feet of Entrance to Public Buildings:***
To President Schmidly
- 06-04-05-FAC ***Revision of Annual Review and Establishment of Cumulative Review:***
To President Schmidly
- 06-04-06-FC ***Recommendation on Dress Codes for Faculty:*** To President Schmidly

The President – Remarks and Comments

President Schmidly spoke regarding current information about the budget and state appropriations up to this point. This topic is not very far along with many indications we might be headed toward a stalemate. There is a major attempt to substantially reduce the income tax in Oklahoma and there is also an effort under consideration to raise the salaries of public school teachers by \$3,000. If those two things happen then there is no additional money left as that uses up all the available revenue funding. As a result of that the House has essentially adopted a “bare bones budget” that includes no increased appropriations for higher education. There is approximately 2.8 percent but by the time you factor in the retirement of the Capitol Bonds and OLAP increases then that money is used up. That means the net distribution to the institutions will either be the same as it was last year or a little less. Mandatory costs to the university have increased approximately \$7.5 million and with no state increase it would take an 8.5 percent increase in tuition to recover those mandatory costs. Mandatory costs plus a 3 percent raise program would require a 14.2 percent tuition increase. If Restore and Grow is added it raises to 16.8 percent. If Reward is added it raises to 17.8 percent. The real concern the President has is that if the House version of the budget were to be adopted then just to balance the budget would require either a substantial reduction in expenditures or a fairly major increase in tuition. A Senate mark-up for higher education is much more favorable. The Governor’s budget included approximately \$86 million in higher ed appropriations and as you back that down and look at what flows through the formula, if that budget was adopted, tuition raises would depend upon what the State Regents decide with regard to base allocations for institutions. The President feels that at the current moment the picture does not look “rosy” in the Capitol. This issue could end up in Special Sessions. Schmidly said he did not want the students to go home and not have an understanding of where we are and so in the last two Friday editions of the O’Colly there will be an open letter to the students explaining the situation and they will meet with student leaders and explain the situation to them. Schmidly ended by say, “There is no reason to believe it is all doom and gloom and there is still ample opportunity for compromise but at this moment it does not look like there is a strong sense to put a lot of additional money into higher education this session which is disappointment given that the state has the ability to invest”. He is going to the Capitol tomorrow to meet with the other university presidents and they will continue to work very hard. They will meet with Todd Hiatt and all the leadership in the House and explain to them the difficulty this presents for our students. Going into the session the hope was that enough allocation would be received to cover the mandatory increases and give a nice raise to faculty and staff and to hold tuition in the 6-7 percent range, but at the present time that is looking increasingly doubtful.

Special Committee on African Americans – Bob Darcy

Darcy presented a report and recommendation entitled “Role of African Americans at OSU” to Council. He said Faculty Council created this committee at the September 2005 meeting and included members Kara Cook, Chair, SGA Senate; Bob Darcy, Chair, General Faculty; Shirley Vincent, President, GPSGA; and Hank Welliver, Chair, SAC. Its purpose was to look into the situation of African American students and faculty at OSU, identify reasons for why their numbers are so low and make recommendations for bringing those numbers into conformity with those of similar Oklahoma universities. The committee has now completed its work and their 26-page report was mailed to all Councilors before the April 11 Council meeting for their review. The recommendation is as follows:

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that OSU do the following:*Outreach*

- Increase money funneled into marketing and recruitment and target it more effectively so as to attract black faculty and students. This is particularly needed in graduate and professional programs. OSU must compete for black students with attractive scholarship packages. Standardized tests cannot be the sole criteria of a student's potential.
- Set an OSU goal to catch up with the current faculty and student success levels of other Oklahoma universities.
- Expand OSU summer programs and camps so that they attract more Oklahoman black junior high and high school students to the campus, before those students apply to college. Employ committed black staff to support these programs. The recruitment area for these programs needs to include junior high and high schools with large black student populations.
- Recruit nationally visible and prominent black senior scholars.
- Devote more resources toward recruiting in Oklahoma City. OSU must have the visibility in Oklahoma County and in its high schools as it has in Tulsa. Oklahoma County has 37.26% of Oklahoma's African American population (Tulsa County has 23.28%). Better recruitment of African-Americans from within the OSU system, OSU-OKC in particular, must be a goal. This will involve tailoring courses at OSU-OKC to prepare students for OSU-Stillwater and developing the bus service to OSU-OKC similarly to the service available to OSU-Tulsa.

Campus Environment

- Create an academic culture that respects black faculty and their research.
- Rename Murray Hall after Oklahoma Civil Rights leader Clara Luper in order to give blacks some ownership of OSU and remove the vestige of Jim Crow and segregation.
- Make deans accountable for their success in recruiting and promoting black faculty, staff and students. Diversity accomplishments should be a component of dean evaluation. Colleges should implement mandatory diversity training.
- Build a sense of community for black faculty, students, and staff. This can be done by hosting periodic, informal dinners, creating a Center for Black Studies, and by increasing awareness of on-campus black residential living. Black students, because their activities fail to overlap with those of other students, need adequate funding to sustain a vigorous presence. Black faculty, staff and students should be involved in developing plans for their own building along the lines of the Gains-Oldham Black Culture Center at the University of Missouri: <http://www.missouri.edu/%7Ebcenter/history.php>.
- Challenge the OSU Foundation to create a fund for hosting special campus events for black scholars. Nationally and internationally recognized black scholars should be invited to come speak and visit OSU.
- Conduct an internal survey to explore the reasons why black faculty are retained or why they choose to leave. The survey should also explore what determines whether or not black students enroll at OSU.
- Display and emphasize Oklahoma African-American art within the campus environment.

- Increase mentoring available for African-American students and faculty and provide recognition for those mentoring them.
- Include blacks in boards and committees that recognize students and faculty, and find ways to include black students and faculty in the nomination pools of persons to be recognized.

Rationale:

Leaders of the Faculty Council, the Graduate and Professional Student Government Association, the Staff Advisory Council and the Student Government Association Senate, were challenged by an African-American's *Daily O'Collegian* opinion article written about OSU's racial problems. The article concluded: "the efforts just aren't there"¹.

We formed a special committee² to look into problems faced by OSU's African American faculty and students and to make recommendations for improvement. The committee talked with OSU African American administrators, faculty and students. It invited both OSU administrators to visit, as well as an African American expert from the University of Oklahoma.

The committee found President David Schmidly and Vice President Cornell Thomas willing to acknowledge that OSU has a problem and committed to addressing it. African American faculty and students openly discussed their experiences.

Oklahoma State University has been an educational and research resource for the people of Oklahoma and, indeed, for the peoples of just about every nation. But it has not been the resource for Oklahoma's African Americans that it can be. That needs to change immediately.

The statistics are stark. In 2003, OSU's faculty was 1.47% African American. Twenty-one Oklahoma colleges and universities had higher percentages, including the University of Oklahoma, whose percentage doubled OSU's. In Fall 2002, 3.3% of OSU's enrolled students were African American. The state average for public colleges and universities was 8.3% -- which is the state's African Americans population proportion. Twenty-four of twenty-nine public colleges and universities in Oklahoma had higher proportions than OSU, and once again OU's was double OSU's. There was no progress between 1970 and 2000. Over those decades the gap between OSU's black student and faculty proportions and the black Oklahoma population grew larger, not smaller.³

The term "diversity" cannot be used as a substitute that ignores the fact that OSU has not been the same resource for Oklahoma African Americans that it has for other Oklahomans. Change requires OSU to change from the university where "the efforts just aren't there" to a university where the efforts are strong, consistent, long-term and successful.

¹ Dawn Scales. "Diversity is key to education." *Daily O'Collegian* Wednesday March 30, 2005, page 4.

² Faculty Council Minutes September 13, 2005 page 10. The Council vote to form the Special Committee was unanimous.

³ In 1970 the gap between black faculty and the black population proportion was 6.10%, 6.89% in 2000; in 1970 the student gap was 4.69%, 4.81% in 2000.

After a lengthy discussion Darcy moved the recommendation be "Tabled" until the May Council meeting. Mitchell seconded the motion. Vote to Table passed unanimously.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Tony Brown

Brown presented a recommendation entitled, "Academic Forgiveness for Undergraduate Students" as follows:

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: The University administration approve the policy and procedures document entitled "Academic Forgiveness for Undergraduate Students" (see attached).

Rationale:

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE), under its "Policy Statement on Grading," provides a policy on academic forgiveness which includes repeated courses, academic reprieve, and academic renewal. The purpose of the proposed document is to establish University policies and procedures necessary to implement the general OSRHE policy.

The proposed policy and procedures document specifies (1) the different forms of academic forgiveness, (2) the procedures that must be followed in implementing each form, (3) the conditions students must meet in order to be eligible to petition for academic forgiveness, (4) a review panel for ruling on student petitions, (5) the transcription of academically forgiven coursework, and (6) the method to be used in calculating a student's retention and graduation GPA after being granted academic forgiveness.

Academic forgiveness can be granted for a single course (see "Policy on Repeated Courses" in attachment), for courses in a single semester or two consecutive semesters (see "Policy on Academic Reprieve" in attachment), or for all college work prior to a specified date (see "Policy on Academic Renewal" in attachment).

The policy provides for restrictions on the use of academic forgiveness and the use of forgiven courses in fulfilling degree requirements. Courses repeated cannot exceed 18 hours and a student may not receive more than one academic reprieve or renewal during the student's academic career. Courses forgiven under the academic reprieve or academic forgiveness policies cannot be used to fulfill the total number of credits required for a degree. All forgiven coursework will remain on the student's transcript, but grades for the forgiven coursework will not be used in computing the student's retention or graduation GPA.

Students must petition for approval of academic reprieve or academic renewal. A petition can be filed only after a significant period of time has elapsed since taking the forgiven courses (3 years for academic reprieves and 5 years for academic renewals). In addition, the student must be currently enrolled and have completed and passed a minimum number of credit hours at OSU (12 hours with a 2.0 GPA) to be eligible to petition.

The Office of Academic Affairs is the administrative unit responsible for administering the academic forgiveness policy. Student petitions will be granted or denied by a review panel whose members are the Chairman of the Academic Standards and Policies Committee of the Faculty Council (or a faculty member designated by the Chair of the Faculty Council), the Associate Vice President for Undergraduate Education, and the Academic Services Director from the petitioning student's College.

Raff said he understood the university had been operating under this policy for a number of years and Gail Gates replied, "Yes, however the new part to the policy, 'Academic Renewal', was approved by the State Regents last year". Darcy asked for a vote. The Recommendation passed unanimously.

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

Gelfand presented a recommendation entitled, "Faculty International Travel.

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: Faculty international travel, with a cost of less than \$10,000, will not require the approval of the Board of Regents and will be processed in the same manner as domestic travel.

Rationale:

Regent approval delays planning for international travel and increases administrative steps in what is now a common faculty activity.

The Regents have given authorization for University purchases without specific approval for much larger amounts.

Gelfand said he and many of his colleagues were under the impression that international travel had to be approved by the Board of Regents because on the form for international travel there is a signature line for the Board of Regents. Gelfand continued he had been informed just before the Council meeting that although that line is on the form, there is no such requirement. Provost Strathe stated that the only difference between domestic travel and international travel is that the latter requires her signature and requires that she report it to the Board Office. Darcy said in the 1990s OSU had an "Out-of-State Travel Request" and he thinks that what Oklahoma State needs to do is to recognize that in 2006 international travel is no different for faculty than domestic travel and a recommendation to eliminate that requirement would recognize that issue. Strathe said she believed it is a Board requirement by virtue of State requirement. Gelfand recommended "Tabling" this recommendation until the May meeting. Johannes thought this recommendation should be voted on at this meeting, pass it on to administration, if it is moot they will respond back if there is no problem. If it is not, they will let Council know what the problem is. Hallgren said he would like to be clear on the specifics because in AG they are still told they have to wait until the Board of Regents meet and approve the travel until they can buy their airline tickets. Gelfand recommended the Provost could issue a disclaimer at the Dean's level and his committee will look at this issue again in regard to State law. Darcy asked Strathe if she would clarify this with the Dean's and she replied she would. Gelfand moved to "Table".

Tom Jordan seconded. Motion to Table passed with 2 nays and 1 abstention.

In another matter Gelfand discussed the recommendation brought by the committee at the March Council meeting regarding staff salaries which was Tabled. He had requested input from the General Faculty and it was discussed at the April 4 Faculty Council Executive Committee meeting. The essence of the proposal was that staff should receive the same percentage of merit pay as tenure-track faculty. One of the concerns that many of the faculty members had was that the recommendation would “tie the hands” of administration in terms of Restore, Reward and Grow since there is a limited amount of funds. Gelfand recommended to his committee this recommendation be left on the Table where it will then “die” and instead introduce a resolution which has the intent of 1) not tying the universities hands; 2) taking seriously the concerns of staff raises; and 3) again reiterating that any sort of resolution or recommendation that he is putting forth is in no way, shape or form critical of Restore, Reward and Grow but just to point out that staff salaries are of some concern. The resolution reads as follows:

Resolution: Staff Salary and Benefit Increases

The Faculty Council hereby resolves that Oklahoma State University recognize that staff are important and valued members of the OSU Community and ought to be remunerated accordingly. Therefore, Oklahoma State University should seriously address the issue of staff salaries and benefits and attempt to allocate funds in order to increase said salary and benefits.

Rationale:

In discussions with faculty, there is overwhelming agreement that staff are underpaid at OSU. This belief is backed up by the 2003 Annual Compensation Report, which states that staff pay is 5.3% below the Stillwater market for similar positions.

Recent salary increases for tenure-track faculty in light of Restore, Reward and Grow (especially the salary raise for the 2005-2006 academic year, which amounted to an average of 6 percent) are welcomed by tenure-track faculty. However, and this is not in any way meant to be a criticism of faculty salary increases, staff have not received increases of the same amount. Although the CPI has not increased significantly over the past few years, some expenses, like health care and the cost of fuel, have increased dramatically. These increases affect staff to a greater degree than they do tenure-track faculty, because staff's salaries are, on average, much lower than those of tenure-track faculty.

Liz Condit, Vice Chair of Staff Advisory Council, said the SAC E-Group met with Dr. Bosserman in March and he assured them that on this issue the Restore, Reward and Grow money was completely separate from staff pay. Johannes said he believed “money is finite” and if recommendations like this one are not passed to nudge the administration to increase staff salaries then they will never really increase. Raff asked for clarification as to whether this resolution was coming from Gelfand or the committee. Gelfand replied it was drafted by him and had not been approved by the committee. He had written the committee and no one replied to him with any opposition. Darcy asked Condit how she thought this would be received by staff. Condit replied she felt this would be a very welcomed gesture because she did not know if

administration would support staff raises unless this was supported by Faculty Council. She mentioned a report from Human Resources where in Stillwater the staff making under \$25,000 per year was 1,229 and staff making over \$25,000 per year was 2,101 but that number included Deans, Directors and Department Heads. This resolution was moved by Gelfand, seconded by Johannes and passed unanimously.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Tom Jordan

Jordan said it had come to the committee's attention that there have been many State laws and policies and procedures written by the University that had to do with tobacco with the latest one being in 2004. The committee had looked around campus and the only building they could find in compliance with the University policy and State law was Whitehurst. They also checked into whether any progress was being made in meeting the laws and policies and found that what has happened is that this is the last thing on the Physical Plant's list of things to do. Jordan said State law requires no smoking shall be allowed within twenty-five (25) feet of the entrance or exit of any building and proper signage should be posted and all ash trays should be moved away from entrances and exits. Johannes said smoker's have rights too and felt some kind of shelters should be erected to protect them from the wind and bad weather.

Jordan then presented a recommendation entitled, "Compliance with the Oklahoma Statutes and OSU Policies and Procedures on Smoking in Public Places and Indoor Workplaces Smoking Prohibition within 25 Feet of Entrance to Public Buildings".

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly:

Whereas the Oklahoma Statutes on Smoking in Public Places and Indoor Workplaces (Title 21 - Section 1247) States in Subsection A. "The possession of lighted tobacco in any form is a public nuisance and dangerous to public health and is hereby prohibited when such possession is in any indoor place used by or open to the public, public transportation, or any indoor workplace, except where specifically allowed by law"; and

Whereas Subsection E. states that "No smoking shall be allowed within twenty-five (25) feet of the entrance or exit of any building specified in subsection B or C of this section"; and

Whereas Subsection B. states "All buildings, or portions thereof, owned or operated by this state shall be designated as nonsmoking"; and

Whereas as the Oklahoma "Smoking in Public Places and Indoor Workplaces Act" (Title 62) states in Section 1-1522 that "As used in this act 'Educational facility' means a building owned, leased or under the control of a public or private school system, college or university"; and

Whereas Section 1-1525 states that "The state or local governmental agency or the person who owns or operates a public place shall, at a minimum, do the following in order to prevent smoking in public places:

1. Post signs at entrances to places where smoking is prohibited which state that smoking is prohibited or that the indoor environment is free to tobacco smoke; and

2. Ask smokers to refrain from smoking upon observation of anyone violating the provisions of this act”; and

Whereas the act was effective September 1, 2003; and

Whereas Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures (OSU P&P), General University (adopted February 1985 and revised May 1989, February 1997 and March 2004) 1-0530.2, “Smoking and Use of Tobacco in University Buildings”, Section 1.06 states that “No smoking shall be allowed within twenty-five (25) feet of the entrance or exit of any building”; and

Whereas Section 3.01 of the OSU P&P stated previously states that “Appropriate signage will be posted by the OSU Physical Plant as necessary to inform employees, students and visitors of policy provisions”; and

Whereas it is incumbent upon the University and its administration to comply with these above stated laws; and

Whereas the present signage concerning the notification of the smoking prohibition within 25 feet of the entrance to buildings at Oklahoma State University Stillwater campus is non existent in some areas, inconsistent and/or incomplete in other areas and not adequate in most areas;

Therefore be it resolved that to protect the health of all students, employees, and visitors the above stated Oklahoma state laws and the OSU P&P regulations be immediately implemented and enforced.

Motion passed with one abstention.

FACULTY — Linda Austin

At the March 14, 2006 Faculty Council meeting a motion was passed to submit the **Resolution of the General Faculty on Post Tenure Review** to a vote of the Faculty. This document is intended as the Faculty’s official response to the Policy Directive issued by the Regents and received by the Faculty Committee on March 3, 2006. The Faculty Committee brought forth the recommendation below, **Revision of Annual Review and Establishment of Cumulative Review**, concerning a proposed revision of Section 1.1.5 of the *Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University* (the document that supersedes Appendix D) that had been negotiated between the Faculty Committee, the Faculty Council Officers, the Provost, and the Regents.

Below is the original recommendation. At the end of the recommendation is a proposed Amendment. Following that is the recommendation as amended and that will be sent to administration.

Below is the **original** recommendation:

Title: Revision of Annual Review and Establishment of Cumulative Review

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: Section 1.1.5 of the Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University be revised to read as follows:

1.1.5. Annual Review of Faculty

Review of faculty activities and accomplishments shall be conducted by the unit administrator every year for every faculty member, regardless of rank or tenure status. A written report of activities and accomplishments shall be submitted by the faculty member. This report shall include a work and professional development plan. Unit administrators are expected to encourage the professional development of each faculty member. Unit administrators shall familiarize each faculty member with the performance standards established by the faculty members of the unit. The unit administrator shall endeavor to provide an environment conducive to the achievement of expected performance. The unit administrator shall submit a written evaluation that gives detailed descriptions of the faculty member's accomplishments or deficiencies. The faculty member's written report, together with the unit administrator's evaluation, shall serve as the supporting documentation for any merit pay raise or other salary adjustment. The completed annual review documentation shall be placed into the permanent record for the faculty member and shall be added to an accumulation of performance documents that shall be used in any further review. A complete set of annual review documents shall be available for any peer committee evaluation, particularly evaluations at the times of reappointment, tenure and promotion. If a major element of performance is judged to be unsatisfactory by the unit administrator, the following steps shall be taken:

- (a) A detailed written plan for corrective action shall be specified by the unit administrator.
- (b) If requested by the faculty member, the unit administrator shall obtain appropriate faculty counsel to determine whether the appraisal is justified, and if so, what measures to improve performance are warranted. If the judgment of unsatisfactory performance is not supported by the faculty group, the matter shall be forwarded to the dean for resolution.

Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

For each tenured faculty member a cumulative review shall take place every five years. A review conducted to grant promotion qualifies as a cumulative review. The review shall be based on discussion and substantive documentation provided by the faculty member. Individuals designated to conduct the review shall be faculty in the discipline or department of the faculty member under review. Faculty serving on review committee shall be selected by procedures approved by the department or unit. The review process shall include written feedback to the

faculty member as well as a provision for response. Written feedback shall be a detailed description of the faculty member's accomplishments or deficiencies. The cumulative review requires individual development plans for each faculty member. Faculty members are responsible for their own development consistent with unit, College and University goals. In this regard, the following applicable statement from the AAUP guidelines shall be followed.

"No formal development plan can be imposed on the faculty member unilaterally, but must be a product of mutual negotiation. It should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it should be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration or even its own abandonment."...(AAUP, 2001, pp. 50-56.)

Any result that may follow the cumulative review shall adhere to all prescribed procedures currently in force within this policy document. Changes to this policy document related to results from cumulative faculty review can not be applied retroactively to current faculty.

If a faculty member believes that the results from a cumulative review are based on unlawful discrimination, inadequate consideration, or legitimate exercise of academic freedom, he/she may request a review of the matter utilizing the Dispute Resolution Procedure in Appendix E of this policy document.

Phillips moved to amend the following two paragraphs

from:

.... Faculty members are responsible for their own development consistent with unit, College and University goals. In this regard, the following applicable statement from the AAUP guidelines shall be followed.

"No formal development plan can be imposed on the faculty member unilaterally, but must be a product of mutual negotiation. It should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it should be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration or even its own abandonment."...(AAUP, 2001, pp. 50-56.)

Any result that may follow the cumulative review shall adhere to all prescribed procedures currently in force within this policy document. Changes to this policy document related to results from cumulative faculty review can not be applied retroactively to current faculty.

to: Proposed Amendment to wording (in bold):

Faculty members are responsible for their own development consistent with unit, College and University goals. In this regard, **the applicable statement from the AAUP guidelines shall be followed (AAUP Policy Documents and Reports. 2001. p. 55, item 7. American Association of University Professors. Washington, D.C. 9th Ed.). Any formal development plan should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it should be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration.**

Any disciplinary action that may follow the cumulative review must adhere to all prescribed procedures currently in force within this policy document. In the event that unsatisfactory performance has not improved within the timelines set in the individual development plan, any dismissal action shall be implemented in accordance with the criteria specified in the January, 2006 Board Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University.

John Thornton, Professor Emeritus and Emeriti representative on the Faculty Committee, distributed a handout that contained two suggested changes regarding the proposed amendment. The first was to begin the second paragraph of the proposed amendment with a new sentence which states, **“The results of Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty should be used by appropriate administrators as a basis for making equity salary adjustment, modifying work assignments and load, nominating faculty for special recognition and awards, and providing other support which will assist faculty members in carrying out their professional goals and responsibilities”**. In his opinion the proposed policy makes no mention of the possibility that a cumulative review of tenured faculty could produce positive results for faculty. Without some such provision, it is likely that cumulative review of tenured faculty will be perceived as nothing more than a time-consuming, useless exercise for the vast majority of faculty who are performing at a satisfactory level. Such a policy is not fair nor is it likely to be a cost-effective administrative tool. Darcy asked if anyone wanted to move those words. Tom Jordan moved and Tony Brown seconded. Moomaw recommended “should be used” be changed to “could be used”. Tom Jordan accepted this as a friendly amendment. Brown seconded. Raff asked the Provost if this is passed would the Regents accept it. Strathe said the Regents have indicated they are committed to some sort of a reward structure for the cumulative review but she does not know what format it would take as it is really a performance review by peers. She is not sure that it serves as a basis for equity adjustments, market adjustments, etc., and she does not know what the Regents mean in the way of a financial reward as to whether that is a stipend, base adjustment, etc. It would be her opinion that they would be troubled with this language. Brown said if the only result is a cumulative result, without specification that there is a positive result or benefit, he sees no faculty support for it. He thinks it is very important that it be balanced in the same way that the merits of the annual review were revised which were linked to merit pay very explicitly and those annual review documents be used as a basis for conducting the cumulative review. Darcy said in visiting with the Regents they appeared to be very enthusiastic about this having a positive possibility. He continued that he does not think Thornton’s suggestion recommends that any faculty committee mandate any reward. It is totally recommendations to the proper administration. Barbara Miller, Faculty Committee member, recommended leaving out the specific examples of rewards that Thornton had suggested and include a statement about positive incentives. Thornton said he thought the wording would make the faculty aware that this potentially can become a positive management tool for the administration and not simply an attempt to “prune the dead wood”. Darcy said every discussion held with the Deans, Regents, administration was that they wanted this to be a positive management tool and he believes them. Strathe recommended using the words “providing support” instead of “making equity salary adjustment, modifying work assignments and load, nominating faculty for special recognition and awards, and providing other support”. Raff asked the Provost if the specifics were removed did she think the Regents would accept it and she replied she did. Brown suggested “could be used” changed to “may be used”. Raff moved that the sentence be modified in that fashion. Moomaw seconded. Tom Jordan accepted this as a friendly amendment. Brown seconded. The amendment to the amendment reads, **“The results of Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty may be used by appropriate administrators as a basis for providing support which will assist faculty members in carrying out their professional goals and responsibilities”**. Darcy said to let the Minutes show that the Provost understands that support can include faculty raises. The amendment to the amendment passed with one “nay” vote.

Thornton's second suggestion was in the same paragraph, last sentence and he recommended the words "the criteria" be replaced with the words, "all provisions". Thornton said it is not clear what the phrase "the criteria" refers to in the following sentence, "...**any dismissal action shall be implemented in accordance with the criteria specified in the January, 2006 Board Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University.**" He suggested "the criteria" be replaced with "all provisions". Darcy explained the section on dismissal has two parts. The first part, Section 1.16.1 has subsections "a" and "b". There are two general justifications for dismissal and then in Section 1.16.2, "Grounds for Dismissal", there is a listing from "a" to "i" of specific grounds for dismissal and his understanding that the thrust of Thornton's suggestion was referring to both sections. Tom Jordan moved and Earl Mitchell seconded. Strathe said the reference to which the criteria is used is the Grounds for Dismissal, in "a" through "i" and she suggested using the words "grounds for dismissal". Raff moved to replace "the criteria" with "grounds for dismissal". Jordan accepted this motion as a friendly amendment. Mitchell seconded. The amendment to the amendment reads: "...**any dismissal action shall be implemented in accordance with the grounds for dismissal specified in the January, 2006 Board Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University.**" The amendment to the amendment passed unanimously.

The original amendment as amended twice passed with one "nay" and one "abstention".

Darcy returned to the main motion. Moomaw asked if "(a) A detailed written plan for corrective action shall be specified by the unit administrator" and under Cumulative Review, "Any formal development plan should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction...." were consistent. Phillips moved an amendment to the original recommendation to change the numbering as follows: 1.1.5 is now called "Review of Faculty", 1.1.5.1 becomes "Annual Review of Faculty" and 1.1.5.2 is now "Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty". Brown seconded. Motion to amend passed unanimously.

Phillips wanted all to understand this will go into what was called Appendix D which is the recently approved *Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University* subject to the approval of the Regents which Council has been told they want to have something to consider at their July Board meeting. This recommendation, if passed, will be discussed at the April 18 Spring General Faculty Meeting and then would be put to a referendum vote of the General Faculty as soon as possible after the that meeting.

The main recommendation as amended passed unanimously.

Below is the recommendation, as amended, that will be sent to administration:

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: Section 1.1.5 of the Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University be revised to read as follows:

1.1.5. Review of Faculty

1.1.5.1 Annual Review of Faculty

Review of faculty activities and accomplishments shall be conducted by the unit administrator every year for every faculty member, regardless of rank or tenure status. A written report of activities and accomplishments shall be submitted by the faculty member. This report shall include a work and professional development plan. Unit administrators are expected to encourage the professional development of each faculty member. Unit administrators shall familiarize each faculty member with the performance standards established by the faculty members of the unit. The unit administrator shall endeavor to provide an environment conducive to the achievement of expected performance. The unit administrator shall submit a written evaluation that gives detailed descriptions of the faculty member's accomplishments or deficiencies. The faculty member's written report, together with the unit administrator's evaluation, shall serve as the supporting documentation for any merit pay raise or other salary adjustment. The completed annual review documentation shall be placed into the permanent record for the faculty member and shall be added to an accumulation of performance documents that shall be used in any further review. A complete set of annual review documents shall be available for any peer committee evaluation, particularly evaluations at the times of reappointment, tenure and promotion. If a major element of performance is judged to be unsatisfactory by the unit administrator, the following steps shall be taken:

- (a) A detailed written plan for corrective action shall be specified by the unit administrator.
- (b) If requested by the faculty member, the unit administrator shall obtain appropriate faculty counsel to determine whether the appraisal is justified, and if so, what measures to improve performance are warranted. If the judgment of unsatisfactory performance is not supported by the faculty group, the matter shall be forwarded to the dean for resolution.

1.1.5.2 Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

For each tenured faculty member a cumulative review shall take place every five years. A review conducted to grant promotion qualifies as a cumulative review. The review shall be based on discussion and substantive documentation provided by the faculty member. Individuals designated to conduct the review shall be faculty in the discipline or department of the faculty member under review. Faculty serving on review committee shall be selected by procedures approved by the department or unit. The review process shall include written feedback to the faculty member as well as a provision for response. Written feedback shall be a detailed description of the faculty member's accomplishments or deficiencies. The cumulative review requires individual development plans for each faculty member. Faculty members are responsible for their own development consistent with unit, College and University goals. In this regard, the applicable statement from the AAUP guidelines shall be followed (AAUP Policy

Documents and Reports. 2001. p. 55, item 7. American Association of University Professors. Washington, D.C. 9th Ed.). Any formal development plan should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it should be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration.

The results of a Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty may be used by appropriate administrators as a basis for providing support which will assist faculty members in carrying out their professional goals and responsibilities. Any disciplinary action that may follow the cumulative review must adhere to all prescribed procedures currently in force within this policy document. In the event that unsatisfactory performance has not improved within the timelines set in the individual development plan, any dismissal action shall be implemented in accordance with the grounds for dismissal specified in the January, 2006 Board Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University.

If a faculty member believes that the results from a cumulative review are based on unlawful discrimination, inadequate consideration, or legitimate exercise of academic freedom, he/she may request a review of the matter utilizing the Dispute Resolution Procedure in Appendix E of this policy document.

RESEARCH — Al Rouch

The committee is finalizing the recommendation regarding Start-Up Companies. A number of faculty are interested and Rouch has sent emails to them notifying them of an April 14 meeting, 12:00 noon, 204 Whitehurst. The committee will present their current draft and asked those faculty in attendance for their input and he hopes to have a formal recommendation to present to Council at the May meeting.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Graduate Faculty Council — Bob Hunger

All six groups of the Graduate Faculty meet during March and either initiated or completed the process of revising the bylaws of each Group to reflect changes in, and be consistent with, the approved bylaws of the Graduate Faculty.

An initial draft of a resolution/appeals process has been drafted and will be considered by the Graduate Council at its April meeting. This is a process by which graduate students can resolve and/or appeal issues unique to post-graduate degrees that are not covered by either the Grade Appeals Board or the Academic Integrity Panel. The Graduate Council will be seeking input from the Faculty Council Academic Standards & Policy Committee (Tony Brown) and the GPSGA once the initial draft has been approved by the Graduate Council.

Women's Faculty Council — Barbara Miller

Miller reported Women's Faculty Council had three winners for their Research Awards, two graduate students and one undergraduate student (\$300 each), who reported on their research projects at a reception held April 10th in the Edmon Low Library. Next year they hope to increase the number of students receiving awards and also the amount given

Graduate and Professional Student Government Association — David Monismith

NSF Fellowship Workshops – The GPSGA recently coordinated with the Graduate College and Office of Scholar Development and Recognition to co-host two workshops on the National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowships. Two sessions were held, one for faculty and one for students. The faculty session provided an overview of the fellowship, suggestions for mentoring students through the application process, and information on serving as an evaluation panelist. The session for students provided an overview of the application process with suggestions on writing a competitive application. Both sessions were well attended.

GPSGA Bookmarks – The GPSGA recently completed the design and printing of bookmarks that will be used to increase visibility of the GPSGA among OSU graduate and professional students. The bookmarks are also being included in recruiting and acceptance letters by the Graduate College.

Phoenix Awards – The GPSGA will host the 24th Annual Phoenix and Research Symposium Award reception tomorrow, April 12th at 5:00 p.m. in the Centennial Lounge. The Phoenix Award honors one outstanding Masters student, Doctoral student and Graduate Faculty Member for leadership, scholarly achievement and service. All faculty members are encouraged to attend this special event.

GPSGA to Celebrate National Graduate Student Appreciation Week 2006 – The GPSGA will celebrate National Graduate Student Appreciation Week for 2006 by hosting an on-campus picnic April 14th. The theme for the picnic is “Celebrating Cultural Diversity” and the GPSGA is coordinating with Multicultural Student Center, multicultural student organizations and individuals to provide a variety of ethnic foods, dance and musical performances, informational and artwork displays. The event will be held from 1-4 p.m. in the Willard Hall Living Room, patio and Theta Pond lawn. Door prizes from campus and community merchants will be awarded and games will be held on the lawn. All faculty members are welcome to attend this come-and go event.

Officer Elections – The GPSGA will elect officers for 2006-07 at its General Assembly meeting April 20th. A roster of new officers will be provided to the Faculty Council at the meeting following the elections.

Staff Advisory Council — Liz Condit

Staff Picnic – The annual picnic was held April 6, 2006. Due to inclement weather the event was moved to the student union ballroom. The council served approximately 2,000 staff members. The Picnic is a time for Staff to gather and relax with friends and the University family. SAC would like to thank the Faculty Council members that volunteered their time to serve the many hard working men and women that make up staff at OSU.

Staff Council Elections – Staff nomination forms were mailed out March 1, 2006 with a deadline to return nominations by March 24, 2006. The voting period will be from April 17-28, 2006. The upcoming elections will fill 10 seats on the council. All staff members are encouraged to vote.

Staff Council Scholarship Program – The Staff Advisory Council established this scholarship to assist staff members in continuing their higher education. The funds provide financial assistance to staff members and are generated by all Faculty and Staff through their participation in various fund raisers conducted by the Staff Council throughout the year. Annually, the money raised is combined with additional money from University Administration. Additionally, the Staff Advisory Council has an OSU Foundation Account which, when endowed, will provide monies for staff scholarships.

Applications for the 2006-2007 Staff Scholarship/Tuition Assistance will be accepted until 5:00 p.m., Friday, May 12, 2006, for Fall 2006 Tuition Assistance.

The Staff Advisory Council has created an Ad Hoc Committee and charged those on the committee with researching the numerous concerns/issues involving broadbanding (budget driven/equity), the Faculty Restore, Reward and Grow Program, and staff pay/equity issues. Results from this research will ultimately influence any and all recommendations SAC submits to Administration. After Human Resources provided the Ad Hoc Committee with the percentage of regular continuous staff employees earning less than and greater than \$25,000 annually, the committee feels that a more comprehensive report containing similar information will assist them more with their research; a report containing average staff employee pay by labor distribution account sub-codes. Their rationale for such is based on the information obtained from the Human Resources 2003 Annual Compensation Report. This Report compares salaries between OSU – Stillwater, Tulsa, Okmulgee, OKC, and the Center for Health Sciences. According to this report, the average pay for a staff employee is \$2,654 per month. Obviously, this contains all staff employees within the OSU System; i.e., Directors, Deans, Department Heads, Administrative/Professional, and Classified employees. In addition, the Ad Hoc Committee will be researching the percentage of staff employees (100% FTE – regular continuous staff) that qualify for state and/or federal assistance (i.e., Sooner Care, DHS, food stamps, etc.) based on their annual salary. Also, the Ad Hoc Committee believes that by separating the Faculty Restore, Reward and Grow Program from the Annual Raise Program that occurred in October 2005, Administration saved a significant amount of money. What happened to the savings from doing such? SAC feels that using the savings for supporting staff with even a one-time bonus would help staff members along with the Annual Raise Program in October 2005? With the cost of living increasing, most staff employees feel that a 3% annual increase is not enough. More so, most feel broadbanding of OSU–Stillwater staff positions is partial to each division's/department's budget. For example, even though a staff employee has met the criteria to move (or be promoted) to the next level, the department may not have the funds available to promote with an increase in pay as outlined in the Career Development Program (broadbanding) specifications approved by Administration. Career Development Plans according to Human Resources are “a defined path for employees that outlines what the department needs and what the department is willing to give in return.” The Ad Hoc Committee is currently reviewing existing Career Development Programs, both those proposed and those awaiting final approval. They will keep Faculty Council updated on their findings.

Raff commented when he was a Department Chair he had his Executive Secretary provide a list of promotions for the 13 support staff in the department for the previous ten year period. According to the records, for the prior ten years, there had been no promotions. Over the next year Raff attempted to promote every staff member he thought deserved it which was, in fact, every staff member and found this was extremely difficult to do. Raff asked if promotions were not an issue with staff. Condit replied it was definitely an issue and the staff have found out that the only way to be promoted at OSU is to move to a new department. She said she had been at the university for 20 years and had four different positions. Raff said he felt it did not have to be that way because he was able to promote every staff member and they did not have to move. Condit said Human Resources and the budget drive all that. Johannes replied he thought it was department heads that do not push for their staff. Condit said it may be the department heads but the deans have the ultimate say. Darcy said he thought there was an attempt to address that issue with the broadbanding. Mitchell said it did not do it very well.

Athletic Council— A. J. Johannes

Johannes reported Athletic Council is evaluating Academic Services for Student-Athletes which is Marilyn Middlebrook's area. He and Gail Gates are on that committee. Please pass any input regarding this issue to either Johannes or Gates.

New Business:

Raff said it had come to the attention of the FC Chair that there were apparently efforts, at least in one college, to institute a dress code which entailed appointing a committee to look into this issue. Raff said he felt this issue should be addressed before it happened and the following recommendation was a way of expressing the opposition of the faculty to any mandatory dress code.

Raff then presented the following recommendation entitled, "Recommendation on Dress Codes for Faculty" to Council for their approval.

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: it be the policy of Oklahoma State University that mandatory dress codes for faculty are inappropriate.

Rationale:

1. Mandatory dress codes for faculty are ill-judged because they demoralize the faculty, create an atmosphere of hostility between administration and faculty, and cannot be effectively enforced.
2. The combination of cumulative review and a mandatory dress code for faculty would likely provoke outright defiance making further cooperation between Administration, Regents, and Faculty extremely difficult.

Raff moved acceptance of this recommendation and Johannes seconded.

The recommendation passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:55 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is May 9, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,
Birne Binegar, Secretary