

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
May 9, 2006

Tom Phillips called the meeting to order with the following members present: Austin, Bell, G., Bell, P., Binegar, Brown, Carter, Chaney, Cruz-Rodz, Dare, Gelfand, Giles, Hirschlein, Johannes, John, Jordan, Lamphere-Jordan, Martin, Mitchell, Moomaw, Raff, Ransom, Rouch, and Terry. Also present: Bird, L., Bosserman, D., Elliott, K., Gates, G., Goodbary, A., Hunt, D., Husley-Greene, C., Ivy, B., Krehbiel, L., Martin, D., Materer, N., Moberly, H., Monismith, D., Nolan, R., Shutt, G., Strathe, M., Verghese, P., Weaver, J., and Westhaus, P. Absent: Darcy, Goetze, Hallgren, Meinkoth, Shabazz, te Velde, and Veenstra

HIGHLIGHTS

Recommendation Based on Report of Special Committee on African Americans.....	2
O’Collegian Editorial Independence.....	5
Recommendations Concerning Confidentiality Agreement.....	6
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations.....	8
Special Report from the Chair and Vice Chair.....	9
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	
Recommendation: Transfer Student Probation Policy and Procedures.....	9
Year-end Report.....	11
Athletics	

Year-end Report.....	12
Budget	
Recommendation: Athletic Facilities Upkeep, Maintenance and Utility Expense Report.....	14
Recommendation: Annual Athletic Payment Explanation.....	14
Year-end Report.....	15
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security	
Year-end Report.....	16
Faculty.....	
Year-end Report.....	17
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology	
Year-end Report.....	17
Research	
Recommendation: Entrepreneurial Faculty Fellows Program.....	19
Year-end Report.....	19
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	
Year-end Report.....	21
Rules and Procedures	
Results of Vote on Faculty Referendums on Post-Tenure Review.....	22
Year-end Report.....	23
Student Affairs and Learning Resources	
Year-end Report.....	23
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Graduate Faculty Council.....	26
New Business.....	26

Phillips moved the May 9, 2006 Agenda be amended by moving the Recommendation Based on the Report of the Special Committee on African Americans to item number 4 and the Special Report on O'Collegian Editorial Independence to item number 5 and replacing item number 8 with a Special Report from the Chair and Vice Chair. Binegar seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended. Phillips asked for approval of the April 11, 2006, Minutes. Chaney moved acceptance of the Minutes. Ransom seconded. The Minutes were approved.

Recommendation Based on Report of Special Committee on African Americans — Earl Mitchell

Mitchell said this recommendation had been submitted on-line to all Council members for their review. This report was initiated by both Faculty Council and SGA and this document is one that singles out something special to Mitchell due to the fact that in the 39 years he has been at OSU this is the first time Faculty Council has made this kind of statement. Mitchell moved amending the original recommendation, that was Tabled at the April 11 Faculty Council meeting, per the suggestion of the Faculty Council Executive Committee as follows: under *Campus Environment*. bullet 3, delete "Make deans accountable for their success in recruiting and promoting black faculty, staff and students", leave the sentence, "Diversity accomplishments should be a component of dean evaluation", and delete "Colleges should implement mandatory diversity training". Phillips asked for discussion. Raff said he thought the special committee

had done a fine job in responding to the concerns he had when this recommendation was originally presented at the April 11 meeting and added he supported the amendment. He said the statistical data that had been added to the document was much more extensive than it was a month ago and the data on PhD's is now included as well as other data from the other Land-Grant schools in the Big 12. Johannes seconded. The vote to amend passed unanimously. Phillips asked for discussion. Mitchell made the point that the one issue he felt needed to be dealt with was that OSU, as a Land-Grant institution, needed to make a greater effort in producing more PhD's and Doctoral candidates. He added this was a separate issue from this document but he wanted to say it. He does not think the recommendation is perfect but it does make a statement. The original document, as amended, was seconded by Raff, voted on and passed unanimously.

The complete recommendations of the "Special Committee on African Americans at OSU" can be read at: <http://facultycouncil.okstate.edu/>

The recommendation to administration, as amended, is as follows:

Title: Role of African Americans at OSU

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 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.
- Diversity accomplishments should be a component of dean evaluation.
- 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

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.

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

We looked at comprehensive universities in other states. There we found OSU is behind other schools in recruitment of African American faculty although by a relatively small amount. All schools need to do better and OSU is not alone in needing to work harder.

There are many ways to look at student enrollments. In terms of absolute percents OSU is in the middle of the universities examined. When we look at the student percents as a percentage of the population percents, however, OSU is the lowest. At Iowa State University the African American percent of students is less than at OSU but is higher than the population percent that is African American. Given that these state schools recruit the vast bulk of their students instate, OSU is not doing as well as the other schools in attracting and retaining African American students.

Between 1983 and 2003 the number of doctorates awarded to African Americans has risen sharply, more dramatically than for any other racial/ethnic minority group. The low percentage increase for African Americans as a part of the OSU, or other faculties we studied, cannot be attributed to the small number of African Americans earning PhDs.

Recently OSU President David Schmidly has made progress with regard diversity and African Americans in particular his priority. Faculty support progress in this area.

Diversity is important to OSU. But the situation of African Americans transcends diversity. OSU cannot have diversity without progress for African Americans. Change requires OSU to change from the university perceived as "the efforts just aren't there" to a university where the efforts are strong, consistent, long-term and successful.

SPECIAL REPORT: O'Collegian Editorial Independence — Lenzy Krehbiel

Krehbiel, Co-Editor-in-Chief of the Daily O'Collegian, said Bob Darcy had asked her to report to Council and clarify an article that ran in an April edition of the O'Collegian regarding a recent censorship attempt made on the paper. As background information Krehbiel said last fall in light of a court case in the 7th Circuit involving Governors State University the O'Collegian Editorial Board, with the backing of the Student Publications Board and the Student Government Association, presented a statement to President Schmidly asking him to publicly reaffirm the O'Collegian Editorial independence. The statement was, "Oklahoma State University recognizes and affirms the editorial independence and press freedom of all student-edited campus media. Student editors have the authority to make all content decisions and consequently they bear the

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.

responsibility for the decisions they make.” Krehbiel said the President refused to sign it, citing Legal Counsel's opinion that there was not a “compelling interest.” Krehbiel continued by saying the Student Rights and Responsibilities policy states that the O'Colly, along with KOSU and Cable Channel 30, is free from university control under "current" policy. The Editorial Board, along with the Student Publications Board and SGA, feels this leaves the door open for future administrative interference. Said policy has not been revised since 1970, as evidenced by the inclusion of Cable Channel 30 in the statement (Channel 30 is now Nickelodeon in Stillwater). Rumors this semester regarding President Bush speaking at graduation were discussed at the Editorial Board monthly meeting attended by President Schmidly, Chief-of-Staff Al Goodbary, and Gary Shutt. They asked about the rumors and were told if they held off printing the story they would make sure they would be the first told after it was definite. Later that week the story broke. Before that time the O'Colly was trying to contact outside sources to get confirmation and one reporter called Gary Shutt trying to get a comment. Krehbiel asked Shutt what he told the reporter and Shutt replied, “I reminded her of the agreement that we had that you all would wait until we had word from the White House and I said, ‘to me, if you all know it’s rumors, why would you do a story about rumors?’ I told her I would call the Department Head and tell him I thought you shouldn’t run that story and it would have been his decision what he would do”. Krehbiel said, for the record, Tom Weir, Department Head, has no editorial control over what goes on at the O’Collegian and neither does the General Manager, Fritz Wirt, or the advisor, Jack Lancaster. All decisions are made by students. If something had run it would have been the responsibility of Krehbiel and co-editor, Jason Roberts, and not Dr. Weir.

Pat Bell asked what the O’Colly’s “self-policing” measures were. Krehbiel replied they check facts out between reporters and the editor and co-editor are accountable to the Student Publication Board. Bell asked if something appeared and it is completely false what her recommendation was. Krehbiel said they would run a correction.

Johannes asked if over the past ten years had there been any attempt by anyone to censor anything they do, disregarding this current incident. Krehbiel replied there had been threats made by the Student Government Association, a cut in fees they receive because of a perceived lack of publication regarding student groups, threats made in 2004 regarding the Vernon Morensy situation and she believes that is the extent of it.

Shutt said it was the intent of his office to work with the O’Colly to the best that they can and they understand the paper’s position. He added it was unfortunate about what happened but they will continue to work with the O’Colly and support them and they work with a lot of reporters and try and help get them directed to the right sources and respond to their requests. They have a role to get a paper out and he understands that.

Raff said he wanted to commend the O’Colly and thinks they do a fantastic job. He added he sometimes does not like or agree with the editorials, but that is the way it should be.

Recommendations Concerning Confidentiality Agreement — A. J. Johannes

Johannes said it had been brought to Council’s attention about the OSU Confidentiality Agreement and at its March 14, 2006 meeting the Faculty Council established a Special

Committee to make recommendations concerning the University Confidentiality Agreement (http://www.okstate.edu/osu_per/docfiles/OSU%20Confidentiality%20Agreement.pdf). The Committee consisted of Bob Darcy (Chair of the General Faculty), Hank Welliver (Chair of the Staff Advisory Council), Mark Weiser (Management Science and Information Systems), Nick Materer (Chemistry) and Marty High (School of Chemical Engineering). The Committee made the following Recommendations which are submitted in the form of a Faculty Council Recommendation to President Schmidly.

1. The Confidentiality Agreement should be immediately suspended and signed copies returned to all those who signed it. The existing confidentiality agreement emphasizes employee punishment as an enforcement mechanism. Since punishment can only follow information disclosure, we prefer a more proactive approach that includes proper classification of documents and continued employee education on the proper handling of information to prevent inadvertent disclosures in the first place.

2. The University should identify information that is confidential by statute and those individuals who have access to it. By appropriately labeling information in this way the relevant people will be educated of their responsibilities.

A training program would be more effective in furthering the goals of the University than an entirely punitive policy. If the pertinent staff and faculty know their responsibilities then they will act accordingly. A policy that employs training and education would more likely have the end result of limiting disclosure of confidential information in the first place.

Training and education of faculty and staff should be the major thrust of any confidentiality policy, not the threat of termination or lesser punitive action.

3. The University should identify all information that, by statute, is public. This should be freely and generously made available to anyone. Salary information, for example, which is publicly available by statute, should not be restricted in any way by any administrator. It should be easy to obtain.

4. Information that is neither restricted nor public by statute should be identified and a clear justification offered, after widespread consultation with faculty, staff and others, for it being treated as confidential or made public. In the case of it being public, it should be freely and easily available to anyone. In the case of it being confidential, those with access to it should be told exactly what is confidential and to whom it may be divulged. The administrator or administrators authorized to classify information as "confidential" should be clearly specified and their classification decision be reviewed by the Chair of the General Faculty along with the Provost and or the President.

5. Information regarding Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, and Gramm Leach Bliley Act should be provided in a readable format on the OSU's web site. OSU should periodically remind all employees of their responsibilities under federal statute to insure that these acts are not violated.

6. Any punishment of an employee who violates a possible confidential agreement must be

commensurate with the act. We understand that no disciplinary actions were initiated after the laptop containing confidential student information was reported missing. This lack of action on this egregious violation contrasts recent disciplinary actions taken against the staff for lesser offences.

7. A standard form should be developed to check out and return keys. In general, physical access policies should be separate from information policies.

8. A carefully crafted notice, recommended by University legal counsel, should they so recommend, be given to those with access to this information stating clearly what information is confidential and their obligations regarding this information. Once OSU develops policies and procedures with respect to classification of documents, the administration along with the Faculty Council will work to draft policies on the handling of these documents. For example, to obtain access to an electronic database, one may be furnished with a list of specific conditions and responsibilities for the use and disclosure of the information.

9. Individuals already fired or forced to resign from the University for violation of the Confidentiality Agreement should have their cases reviewed by a neutral party to ensure the dismissal was commensurate with the alleged violation. In cases where dismissal was not commensurate, the University should re-instate the employee.

Johannes moved the recommendation be voted on and Raff seconded.

The recommendation passed unanimously.

Bosserman said that because they will be addressing this issue over the summer months he would appreciate Faculty Council appointing someone to work with them. Phillips replied they would make sure someone was appointed.

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

05-11-01-RES ***OSU Conflict of Interest Policy:*** Accepted. The final document was approved by the OSU/AM Board of Regents at their meeting on April 21, 2006.

- 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.
- 06-02-04-FAC **Proposed Recommendation from Faculty Committee on Faculty Review of Administrators:** Pending. Under discussion.
- 06-03-01-RFB **Education Incentive Recommendation:** Not approved. Due to financial constraints, this administration cannot consider a new fringe benefit program, especially one that does not target all employees. Human Resources has been asked to look at revising the University's entire fringe benefit structure to determine if an employee-election cafeteria plan can be implemented to provide employees control of their benefits.
- 06-04-02-ASP **Academic Forgiveness for Undergraduate Students:** Accepted. The proposed policy has been reviewed and approved by Instruction Council and by the Council of Deans.
- 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:** Accepted. Physical Plant is in the process of moving receptacles away from buildings. This task should be completed over the summer. It is the administration's understanding that Faculty Council is considering a smoke-free campus and this administration would support that recommendation.
[Note: Bosserman added that when someone gets cited for smoking within 25 feet of a building he did not want to hear from Council that they are being unreasonable. They will do all the publication but everyone should know they should not be smoking within 25 feet of a building. Binigar asked about "shelters" for smokers. Bosserman asked him if that was where he wanted the resources to go. Raff asked if this was enforced what were the enforcement procedures. Bosserman replied State Law defined what the fines would be and they are \$200 per incident. Ransom added as a smoker he did not think it was a wise use of resources to build shelters. Johannes said the concept of a smoke-free campus was absurd and feels students or staff should not have such restrictions placed on them.]
- 06-04-05-FAC **Revision of Annual Review and Establishment of Cumulative Review:** Pending outcome of the faculty vote. Proposed policy has been distributed to faculty for a ballot vote. Recommended wording has been discussed with the Council of Deans.

06-04-06-FC	<i>Recommendation on Dress Codes for Faculty:</i> Accepted.
06-04-01-SCAA	<i>Role of African Americans at OSU:</i> To President Schmidly
06-05-01-EXEC	<i>Recommendations Concerning Confidentiality Agreement:</i> To President Schmidly
06-05-02-ASP	<i>Transfer Student Probation Policy and Procedures:</i> To President Schmidly
06-05-03-BUDG	<i>Athletic Facilities Upkeep, Maintenance and Utility Expense Report:</i> To President Schmidly
06-05-04-BUDG	<i>Annual Athletic Payment Explanation:</i> To President Schmidly
06-05-05-RES	<i>Entrepreneurial Faculty Fellows Program:</i> To President Schmidly

Special Report from the Chair and Vice Chair – Tom Phillips

Due to the fact that Bob Darcy was out-of-the-country he wanted to make sure special recognition was given to the out-going Councilors, to those who have served as Chairs of Committees, out-going officers, and other special people to Faculty Council. Binegar helped Phillips distribute certificates to those mentioned above and Darcy had provided a script for Phillips to read thanking each person individually. Those recognized were: Amilcar Shabazz, Robert Terry, John te Velde, Bill Martin, Pat Lamphere-Jordan, Gilbert John, Stephen Hallgren, Dan Chaney, Linda Austin, Beulah Hirschlein, Ron Moomaw, Greg Bell, Al Rouch, A. J. Johannes, Tom Jordan, Scott Gelfand, Earl Mitchell, Tony Brown, Birne Binegar and Lionel Raff. Diane LaFollette, Assistant to Faculty Council, was presented two dozen red roses.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Tony Brown

Brown presented the following recommendation titled: Transfer Student Probation Policy and Procedures:

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: The University administration approves the policy and procedures document titled “Transfer Student Probation”.

Rationale:

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education (OSRHE) set minimum standards for admission to public colleges and universities, including students who are transferring from other higher education institutions. Students wishing to be admitted as transfer students must earn a grade point average equal to or above the required retention grade point average to be eligible for transfer (i.e., 1.70 for fewer than 30 hours attempted and 2.00 for 30 or more hours).

OSRHE policy further stipulates that transfer students who have not been formally suspended may be admitted as “transfer probation” students. *Institutions may develop policies and procedures, subject to State Regents approval, to guide the admission of transfer students who do not meet the requirements.* Such policies should include that these students are admitted on probation and must maintain a 2.0 GPA each semester while on probation or raise their retention GPA to the designated level, as detailed in Part II Retention Standards. Any “transfer probation”

student with curricular deficiencies must remove the deficiencies within the first 12 hours of enrollment. Additionally, it is expected that institutions provide the appropriate academic support services to assist such students in achieving academic success.

Beginning with the 2005 fall semester, Oklahoma State University instituted an OSRHE approved higher GPA standard for transfer admission, requiring that all students with fewer than 60 hours attempted present a 2.25 graduation/retention GPA at the time of admission. Nevertheless, the University recognizes that some students who have the potential to succeed in this environment may not, for a variety of reasons, have the required minimum GPA at the time they seek transfer admission to OSU. Therefore, the following institutional Transfer Probation Policy is proposed for OSRHE approval.

Proposed Policy and Procedures

Transfer Probation Policy

OSU may admit a limited number of transfer students each year who do not meet established criteria for transfer admission.

The number of students admitted in this category will not exceed four percent of new transfers in an academic year.⁴

In order for a student to be admitted on transfer probation, he or she must present documented evidence of the academic ability to succeed, extraordinary circumstances that contributed to past academic difficulties, or specific academic program needs that cannot be met at a different institution.

Students' admission classification will be "Transfer Probation," and they will be under advisement by University Academic Services, where special programs and services are available for at risk students, through at least one semester. University Academic Services will coordinate efforts with OSU-Tulsa Enrollment Services to ensure delivery of appropriate services to OSU-Tulsa students.

Procedure

Students who apply for transfer admission and present a transfer graduation/retention GPA below 2.25 will be denied admission, but apprised of the opportunity to petition for admission on transfer probation.

Petitions for transfer probation will be reviewed on a weekly basis by a committee comprised of one representative each from Undergraduate Admissions, Academic Affairs, and the Director of Student Academic Services from the College the student wishes to enter.

⁴ Percentage derived by examining the six-year graduation rate for transfers who began at OSU in the 1997, 1998 or 1999 fall semesters. The percentage of admitted transfers with GPAs below 2.25 in those years was 10.7. Thirty-nine percent of that group graduated, which then equals 4.2 percent of all admitted transfers.

After completing at least one semester in University Academic Services, students who have achieved or maintained good standing (i.e., graduation/retention GPA equal to or greater than 2.0) will transfer to a college provided they meet admissions standards for their specific program of intent.

Brown presented the Academic Standards and Policies committee year-end report as follows: Committee Members included: Tony Brown, Chair & Faculty Council Member; Chuck Ransom, Faculty Council Member; Brian Carter, Faculty Council Member; Carl Latino, General Faculty Member; Teresa Bear, General Faculty Member; Neil Luebke, Emeritus Faculty Member; Amanda Nichols, Graduate Student Member; (Vacant), Undergraduate Student Member. Twelve (12) Committee meetings were held during the Faculty Council meeting year.

Committee Recommendations

The following recommendations were made to the Faculty Council during the 2005-06 academic year:

1. Role of Faculty in Curriculum Development (05-10-01)
2. Oklahoma State University-Tulsa Community College Dual Admissions Program (05-10-02)
3. International Education Scholarship Fee (05-12-01)
4. Academic Integrity Policy (06-01-02)
5. Academic Forgiveness for Undergraduate Students (06-04-02)
6. Reinstatement of Undergraduates after Academic Suspension (06-02-01)
7. Transfer Student Probation Policy and Procedures (recommended 5-9-2006)

Faculty Council Action on Recommendations

All recommendations were approved by the Faculty Council with the exception of the Transfer Probation Policy which will be presented to the Council at its May 9, 2006 meeting.

Administration Action on Recommendations

All recommendations were approved by the Administration with the exception of the Transfer Probation Policy which will be presented to the Council at its May 9, 2006 meeting.

Additional Committee Activities

The following issues were reviewed and discussed by the Committee without a recommendation to the Faculty Council:

1. Hours required in undergraduate engineering degree programs at OSU were compared with similar programs at other Big 12 Universities.
2. New By-Laws of the Graduate Faculty Council were reviewed.
3. Inquired into the status of a proposed Graduate College policy on appeal of non-grade graduate student projects.
4. Proposed changes in the incomplete course policy were discussed.
5. A recommendation from the Student Government Association regarding a test overload policy was considered.

Pending Committee Actions

1. Dropping and Adding Courses, Withdrawing from the University, and Tuition Refund Policies.

The Committee is working in cooperation with the Administration in the development of a policies and procedures document governing dropping and adding courses, withdrawing, and tuition refunds.

The recommendation passed unanimously.

ATHLETICS — Earl Mitchell

Mitchell presented the Athletics Committee year-end report as follows:

The Athletic Committee of the Faculty Council began a study of sports clubs. The objective was to determine the impact of sports activities on student academic life and learn more about the relationship between students who participated in these competitive sports but not sanctioned by the NCAA. While Campus Recreation assists clubs in securing needed funds, facilities and equipment the emphasis is on student leadership and involvement.

There are 22-23 Sports Clubs. There is only information on the OSU Webpage on the following: Crew, Cowboy Cricket Club, Cycling, Karate, Paintball, Men's Rugby, Sailing, Ultimate Frisbee, Men's Lacrosse, Sport Club Council, Sport Club Council Handbook, Sport Clubs Forms and Examples, Dressage Club, Women's Lacrosse.

They are chartered through the SGA as an activity group. They have a constitution and an advisor (Faculty or A&P Employees). Some clubs are more active than others. There are 12-15 very active clubs. They operate under the Campus Recreation division of Student Affairs. 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.

Ice Hockey – OSU 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 travels with their horses and play matches at other institutions. They have to seek stables for their horses. The cost is borne by the individual. The Polo Team had its season cut short because of an accident that injured a few horses.

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 (Mer cruiser) provides a motor boat (\$40,000-\$50,000).

These were the few clubs that we were able to gather some information.

RECOMMENDATION

The Athletic Committee did not complete the study and recommends that this study be completed next year as one of its priorities. Each of the club leaders and advisor should be invited to meet with the Faculty Council Athletic Committee.

The central concerns are:

1. How much institutional support is provided to the sports clubs? (We were told by Kent Bunker that other institutions like Texas A&M provide support for many of their sports clubs.)
2. Should there be more institutional support?
3. How does the travel impact on student academic performance? How much class is missed and how are faculty notified about absences?
4. What are the opportunities for more participation by other students?
5. What are the difficulties for each of the Club Sports to maintain competitiveness and fiscal soundness?

BUDGET — Scott Gelfand

Gelfand brought the Faculty International Travel recommendation, presented at the April 11 Council meeting, off the Table and amended it. Johannes seconded. Passed unanimously. Provost Strathe said OSU is under Board policy and in 1977 the Board of Regents delegated his or her designee the approval authority for travel outside of the 48 contiguous states but they are required to report, on a weekly basis (which her office does), and all International travel is processed through her office within 24 hours after it is received. The only difference between it and domestic travel is her signature is required and in her absence her associate signs the travel requests. Provost Strathe reported notices had been emailed to all the academic Deans notifying them that it had been brought to her attention that some areas believe that the past practice of submitting travel requests for formal approval at monthly Board meetings is still in place and be assured that is not the case and it will be processed quickly. She added there is no reason for any department to delay the purchase of tickets for international travel. Due to this fact, Gelfand decided the recommendation was “moot” and moved it be withdrawn. Binagar seconded. Raff said the Budget Committee should be consulted. Several members were present and had no objection. Vote to withdraw the recommendation passed unanimously.

Gelfand then presented the following two Recommendations from the Budget Committee:

Title: Athletic Facilities Upkeep, Maintenance and Utility Expense Report

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: the Administration inform the Faculty Council Budget Committee of (1) the University’s plans and policies concerning funding mechanisms for future potential deficits incurred by Athletics, and (2) the plans developed by Athletics to ensure that it can pay for all upkeep, maintenance, utility, and related expenses associated with all athletic buildings and facilities, both present and future.

Rationale:

Athletics plans to significantly expand its facilities in the near future. As this expansion takes place, the costs associated with upkeep, maintenance, and utilities for these facilities will increase proportionately. Good business practices require that plans be in place to ensure that funds are available to cover upkeep, maintenance, utilities, and other expenses associated with its facilities. Also, it is likely that the University's budget will be tight for the indefinite future, and that acquiring defaulted debts would significantly reduce the University's ability to fulfill its primary missions of instruction, research, and outreach to the state. Accordingly, it is prudent for the University to ensure that all University funds are spent on its academic mission, and that no University funds will have to be diverted to cover the upkeep, maintenance, utilities, and other expenses related to athletic facilities.

Recommendation was voted on and passed unanimously

Second recommendation is as follows:

Title: Annual Athletic Payment Explanation

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: the Administration provide the Faculty Council Budget Committee a detailed explanation and justification of the \$1,362,104.00 annual payment by the University to Athletics for its use of athletic facilities. (This explanation should include, but not be limited to, an explanation of how the payment meets cost accounting standards.)

Rationale:

In June of 2005, the A&M Board of Regents authorized a payment to Athletics in the amount of \$944,188 for use of athletic facilities for fiscal year 2005 – 6. A payment in this same amount has been authorized each year for a number of years in exchange for the right to use athletic facilities for graduation and other events. No detailed explanation of the components of this fee or how this fee was arrived at has been provided to the Budget Committee. Many current and past Faculty Council members were told that an (unwritten) agreement between the University and Athletics stipulated that the payment would not increase. Significantly, in September of 2005 – three months after the aforementioned authorization – the Board of Regents authorized a payment for use of athletic facilities for this fiscal year in the amount of \$1,362,104. This is a large sum, especially given the state of the University budget. If the University did not pay this fee to Athletics, it could pay for fifteen new professors at a cost of \$90,000 each per year, expand library or research facilities, or accomplish other academic goals. Accordingly, it is important that a detailed accounting of the expenditures associated with recent fee payments be made so that the role of the fee in the athletics' budget can be assessed.

Raff asked why the amount was increased. Bosserman replied the authority was increased but the amount never was. He added that when Mike Holder was hired as a Vice President it was not known if he would take the business office with him or not. He did not. The Board had given their approval that if he did make that decision the amount would be increased. Therefore, it has not been increased. Bosserman said it was a good recommendation and administration would

respond.

Recommendation was voted on and passed unanimously

Gelfand presented the following year-end report.

The Budget Committee spent most of this year examining university policies related to a variety of budget issues, including staff salaries, block tuition and athletic funding. In addition, the Budget Comm. passed a resolution in opposition to petitions supporting the placing of TABOR legislation on the Oklahoma Ballot for a referendum vote.

A synopsis of the significant recommendations/resolutions passed follows.

The first recommendation concerned block tuition. The Tuition and Fees Committee is working on a block tuition plan -- a plan which dictates that tuition and fees for all full-time students will be the same, regardless of the number of credits for which students register. The recommendation related to this issue merely requested the administration to give the Faculty Council at least one month to review any block tuition program before it is implemented. The primary reason this recommendation was passed was to ensure that Faculty Council and the Budget Committee have adequate time to evaluate and respond to any significant changes in tuition/fee structure. This is important given that a switch to block tuition will likely affect tuition revenue, the number of credits for which students enroll and the number of classes that students drop after attending for a week or two.

After presenting, tabling and letting die a recommendation asking the Administration to ensure that any future merit pay raise programs be structured such that the average percentage raise is the same for both staff and faculty, the Budget Committee supported a resolution asking the admin. to do whatever it could to increase staff salaries. This resolution was passed by the Faculty Council.

Throughout the year, the Budget Committee discussed a number of issues related to Athletic funding. The Budget Committee recently passed two recommendations (which will be brought to the May 2006 Faculty Council meeting). The first asks the administration to provide the Faculty Council Budget Committee a detailed explanation and justification of the \$1,362,104.00 annual payment from the University to Athletics for use of athletic facilities. (This explanation should include but not be limited to an explanation of how the payment meets cost accounting standards.)

The second recommendation (which will be brought to the May meeting) asks the Administration to inform the Faculty Council Budget Committee of (1) the University's plans and policies concerning funding mechanisms for future potential deficits incurred by Athletics, and (2) the plans developed by Athletics to ensure that it can pay for all upkeep, maintenance, utility, and related expenses associated with all athletic buildings and facilities, both present and future.

The Budget Committee is currently attempting to find out how indebted Athletics is to the University and at what rate this debt is being paid off.

The primary thrust of all these athletics-related activities is to determine the level and propriety of subsidies provided to athletics.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Tom Jordan

Jordan presented the following year-end report:

Thomas D. Jordan, Chair. Members: Steve Bolin, Katherine L. Bost, James D. Brown, Daniel W. Chaney, Sarah Kimball, James H. Meinkoth, Jeff Stewart, Robert Swaim.

The committee met six times and considered/discussed the following topics: 1. Campus Master Planning; 2. Campus Recycling; 3. Parking; 4. Skateboarding on campus; 5. Handicap access at football games; 6. A tobacco-free campus; 7. Tablet monitors in high-tech classrooms; 8. Monroe Street Safety; 9. Renaming Murray Hall; 10. Tailgating problems at football games (underage drinking, etc.); 11. Parking rules regarding ticketing; 12. Stand-by policy on shuttle buses; and 13. University Avenue Safety and the Colvin Center.

The following Recommendations were submitted to and approved by University Faculty Council:

1. Restriction and/or Closing of Monroe Street from Hall of Fame Ave. to University Ave.

In the interest of human life and welfare, the University should take all reasonable and necessary steps to enhance pedestrian and bicycle safety along Monroe Street from Hall of Fame Avenue to University Avenue with all deliberate speed. We further recommend that Monroe Street continue its recognition as a principal life/safety corridor for the central campus and remain open for these critical human service needs in perpetuity. Finally, we recommend that any future administrative regulations concerning the restrictions placed upon Monroe Street be viewed in light of the continuing comprehensive campus master planning process and that they be subject to open review by both the University and Stillwater communities.

2. 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.

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.

FACULTY — Linda Austin

Austin presented the Faculty Committee year-end report as follows:

The academic year 2005-06 was a turbulent one for the Faculty Committee, with leadership changing twice within months. Nonetheless, and largely owing to the work of a special subcommittee on post-tenure review comprised of Tony Brown and Tom Phillips, it managed to

formulate both a Resolution regarding the institution of PTR (written by Lionel Raff), which set forth the limits of any policy the faculty would accept, and an actual policy based on this resolution . Both the Resolution and the policy, which included revisions to the Appraisal and Development process with the establishment of a new "cumulative review," were put to a vote of the general faculty simultaneously. If passed, this broadly outlined policy will be included in the Policy Statement.

The Faculty Committee also proposed a review policy for administrators. In addition, it suggested some changes to the current Policy Statement (1.14.4) concerning termination, mainly for the purposes of clarification. One change omitted a paragraph regarding a misplaced paragraph under "Terminal Notice or Salary"; another changed the appropriate procedure for appeal in the case of termination as a result of program discontinuance to the entire process described in Appendix C (rather than just the Termination Hearing Committee). These were not accepted by the administration. Recently, the Committee has helped write the Policies and Procedures Letters to accompany the new research and clinical tracks. The Committee's last business will be the review of reappointment/tenure/promotion files forwarded to it by the Provost.

One item on the table for next year is consideration of tenure time lines. Austin said she had understood the Provost has asked the committee to look at this issue.

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

Johannes presented the following year-end report:

AJ Johannes, Chair. Members: Pat Bell; Bill Martin; Gil John; Anne Prestamo; Nicholas Materer; Mark Weiser; Lionel Raff; Tom Phillips.

The Oklahoma State University IT division had much fewer problems this year than in past years. In general IT issues were quickly solved by the appropriate IT person and very few meetings were required to monitor IT activities. Faculty, staff and student complaints about IT and the HELP Desk were significantly reduced over past years. Highlights for this year included the reinstatement of the student activity fee committee (reinstated and working the way it was originally designed to operate), committee to study course management software and device registration.

The course management software committee after much study selected Desire2Learn as the next generation of course management software. Marshall Allen, Director Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence and Darlene Hightower, CIO Information Technology Division were Co-Chairs of the CMS Committee and should be contacted for additional information.

The Device Registration project has the following objectives:

The objective of the Device Registration project is to select and implement a system that will require all network devices to complete an online registration process before initial access is granted to the OSU network. The registration process should associate devices to their owners, and prevent unauthorized devices from connecting to the network. Registration should be

available for network devices that don't have web browser capabilities, and for sponsored affiliates or guests of the OSU campus. The Device Registration project team is responsible for the following deliverables:

- Project schedule
- Business requirements
- Solicitation planning documentation
- Source selection documentation
- Product recommendation
- System implementation plan
- Communications plan
- Draft device registration amendment to network security policy

For additional information please contact Rita Gearhart Peaster, Project Manager.

Top priority for next year includes:

1. Course Management Software Implementation
2. Device Registration
3. The Implementation of VBRICK

Background on VBRICK

The VBrick Corporation and OSU's arrangements to have the ability to record events for storage and or broadcast. The idea appears to be that OSU would have a series of television-like channels to which the OSU community would have some access. There could be on-demand watching of a public lecture or musical event, for example. This would also be available for faculty to record their classes. Most of us see this as, at very worst, benign and at best, something with wonderful potential. At least one faculty member, however, walked away with the idea that all our lectures (every class anyone ever teaches) would be recorded and available. This caused wonderment about intellectual property rights and other things. Long-Range Planning and IT has been asked to visit with Marlene Strathe and get a good idea as to what is being planned and implemented, and what issues need to be resolved.

RESEARCH — Al Rouch

Rouch presented a recommendation entitled: "Entrepreneurial Faculty Fellows Program". The complete recommendation can be read at: <http://facultycouncil.okstate.edu/>.

Phillips asked if there were provisions for you or your staff to use university labs for company purposes. Rouch replied licensing agreements would be negotiated. Martin asked if the OSU System would be involved such as OSU-Okmulgee. Rouch replied "yes". Pat Bell asked if the university would be free of any liability for start-up companies. Rouch replied they had checked with several other universities and there will be legal liability and that will have to come into play. Binegar asked how wide-spread this could be, i.e., new food chain franchise out of HES, or would this be purely technological research. Rouch replied that anyone could apply and then

Dr. McKeever would appoint a committee that would review the proposal and see if it qualified. Dare said having looked at other university plans was OSU more, less or average pro-business. Rouch replied “less” but added they just looked at the universities that are very good at this. Iowa State has been very successful with this program and they have an institute that is specifically for start-up companies for faculty. Raff said as someone directly concerned with this issue he thought the committee had done an excellent job and this is an excellent start in reversing a rather poor record over the years in this area. He added he wanted to bring to the attention of the Council an item that is present now that tends to inhibit these start-up companies. Right now if a faculty member of a faculty group files a letter of disclosure there is a committee that looks at that letter and makes a recommendation as to whether or not there should be follow-up. If that recommendation is positive then it is referred to a consultant that does research, looks at the patent literature to see if it has been done before, if there is a patent in this area, and makes a recommendation to administration as to whether or not this is a patentable idea. At that point it is up to Stephen McKeever and Steve Price’s office to make a decision as to whether to move forward on a patent. Assuming everything is positive, up to that point, one of the prime criteria used is whether or not the patent can be protected. If they decide “no” then they will reject moving forward on the patent and then it is up to the inventors or investigators to do whatever they want. At the present time when the decision is “no” you get a letter from the Vice President’s Office, over Steve Price’s signature, in which there is a second paragraph, after the fact, that OSU has no interest and is not going to move forward. It states that if you, the inventor, move forward then OSU may retain rights, may require you to reimburse expenses, royalties to be paid, etc. Raff believes this is totally inappropriate and the second paragraph should be removed. Steve Price agreed in principle and is going to explore this possibility. Price characterized the second paragraph as “boiler plate” and Raff believes if so, then it should be removed. Raff thinks Council and the Research Committee should follow-up on this matter next year.

Phillips called for a vote. The recommendation passed unanimously.

Rouch then presented the committees year-end report as follows:

Dr. Al Rouch, Chair. Committee Members: Dr. Darrell Berlin; Dr. Pat Lamphere-Jordan; Dr. Denver Marlow; Dr. Earl Mitchell; Dr. Ramesh Rao; Dr. John te-Velde; Dr. Richard Whitney.

Human Subject Research: Dr. Rouch introduced Dr. Steve O’Geary, OSU Director of Compliance, to the Faculty Council (FC) at the September meeting. Dr. O’Geary reported on the efforts of his office to obtain national accreditation for OSU research using human subjects. Dr. O’Geary addressed the Research Committee (RC) on these efforts in the spring of 2005. Committee members were impressed with these efforts and agreed to support Dr. O’Geary’s plans. Obtaining accreditation will be a difficult task and involve updated training programs for faculty and other research personnel using human subjects. Dr. O’Geary and his staff implemented training and education programs for colleges and departments involved in human subjects research. This was well-received by faculty.

Conflict of Interest Policy (COI): During the previous academic year, the ad-hoc committee appointed by Dr. McKeever, developed a new COI policy for OSU. The previous policy was

out-dated and a new policy was needed. The RC spent the summer months reviewing the policy and began discussing necessary revisions in the fall. At the October FC meeting, Dr. Rouch announced that the policy would be on the FC web page for review. At the November FC meeting, Dr. Rouch presented the COI policy as a recommendation to Dr. Schmidly for approval. Council members approved the recommendation. The policy then proceeded through proper channels with some minor revisions. In May, the policy then went the Regents for final approval.

Resolution: At the February FC meeting, the RC presented a Resolution commending Dr. O'Geary and the Office of Research Compliance for their work related to educating faculty (noted above) and presenting related material at the annual Research Week in February. Dr. Gordon Emslie, Dean of OSU Graduate College, also noted the effective communication initiated by Dr. O'Geary with graduate students. The RC looks forward to working with Dr. O'Geary and his staff in the future efforts (see below).

Start-Up Proposal: The RC worked much of the year on developing a recommendation to aid faculty with initiating start-up companies from their research products. The RC met with faculty that have been asking for help to get start-up companies created. The RC communicated with the Research Office, Office of Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer, and OSU legal representatives. In addition, the RC reviewed related policies from other universities. In April, the RC met with interested faculty and Dr. Price, OSU Intellectual Property Director, to review the policy. A thorough discussion about the recommendation ensued and all parties were satisfied with the final product. The recommendation will be presented to the FC for approval at the May meeting.

Issues for next year:

New Policy: The RC will work with Dr. O'Geary and the Institutional Review Boards (IRB) from the Stillwater campus and the Center for Health Sciences in developing a new university policy with respect to research with human subjects. The RC met with Dr. O'Geary and IRB personnel from both Stillwater and CHS to review the initial draft of this policy. The policy will be reviewed and revised throughout the summer months and a final draft will be completed in the fall 2006. The RC will present the draft policy to the FC for approval in the fall.

Start-up Companies: The RC will develop new guidelines for faculty desiring to create start-up companies. These guidelines will provide basic and necessary information on various issues regarding faculty-initiated start-up companies. This information will be placed on the OSU Research web page.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Greg Bell

Bell presented the committees year-end report as follows:

Committee Members: Greg Bell (Chair), John Sauer, Robert Terry, Peter Shull, Armando Cruz-Rodz, Sheila Harp, Robert Emerson, William Dare, Carol Moder.

The following issues were studied and considered by the RFB committee in 2005-06:

Health care request for proposals

The RFB committee of 2004-05 was considering a recommendation for a request for proposals for a university-wide health care plan in 2005. The 2005-06 committee continued that discussion. The committee reviewed the Big 12 health care survey conducted by Human Resources for the RFB committee in 2005 and found that OSU health care premiums were not excessive compared with other universities. After considering the cost of conducting a request for proposals, the committee decided that a request for proposals would not be cost-effective at this time.

Consideration of a high deductible health care plan

The committee considered the merits of a high deductible health care plan (see IRS pub. 969, www.irs.gov) compared with our current plan. The thought was to contribute a small premium to a high deductible health care plan, subtract that premium from the premium currently paid by the university for each employee, and contribute the remainder of the current university contribution to a health savings plan. Medical expenses accrued up to the deductible would be paid by the employee from the health savings plan. Although this plan makes sense for an employee who is paying premiums for his/her family (see Lionel Raff, FC summary update #6), it does not make sense for an employee working with a monthly payment of only \$310.

Tuition benefit recommendation

The committee introduced recommendation 06-03-01-RFB, the Education Incentive Recommendation, passed by faculty council on March 14, 2006. The recommendation was also approved by the Staff Advisory Council and by the Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee. The plan calls for an increase in employee tuition benefit to a 75% waiver of tuition and a 100% waiver of fees. The plan also recommends a 50% waiver of tuition for employee dependents but no waiver of fees. This recommendation was declined by administration. Bell added he felt this was a shame because it was a relatively inexpensive way to improve OSU's benefit plan.

Recommendations for future discussion

The committee concluded the year by considering priorities among four areas of possible benefit improvement. The questions considered were:

1. Do you think a high Deductible health plan would be beneficial for you and for the faculty and staff at OSU?
2. Do you think that we should request proposals from insurance providers, and if so, are you willing to be an active part of the process?
3. Do you think that we should request more money from OSU to help provide insurance for our families?
4. Do you think that we should ask OSU to pay a portion of premiums for retirees who meet the rules of 80 or 90 before they are eligible for Medicare?

Questions 1 and 2 had already been discussed and were not considered high priority items. Although there was support for question 4, it was the general consensus of the committee that early retirement was a personal economic choice and that health care coverage should be considered as part of the retirement decision. The committee agreed that question 3, "Do you think that we should request more money from OSU to help provide insurance for our families?", was the single most critical concern for OSU recruitment and retention of quality faculty.

Other benefit news in 2006

Changes or potential changes to benefits occurred during 2005-06 that were not directly related to the RFB committee but in which the committee provided input or individual members participated.

A new carrier for the Flexible Benefits Plan was selected and assumed responsibility in January 2006. Improvements to the plan include convenient spending by debit card and internet access to current account information.

The administration is considering an increase in retirement benefit from 11.5 to 12.0% for employees participating in the Oklahoma Teachers Retirement System.

The OSU/OU request for a one-time choice between OTRS and an alternative retirement option for employees is currently stalled at the IRS. However, Human Resources and OTRS have provided a retirement calculator that will be useful for making that decision, if approved, and provides current information to employees concerning their potential retirement.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Ron Moomaw

Moomaw presented the results of the referendum ballots on two questions related to Post Tenure Review as follows:

Question 1, for approval of the Resolution of the General Faculty on Post Tenure Review:
398 Yes, 112 No, and 1 abstention.

Question 2, for approval of the Recommendation on a Revision of Annual Review and Establishment of Cumulative Review: 408 Yes, and 103 No.

Of the OSU faculty who voted in the referendum, a large majority approved the previous actions of Faculty Council on these matters.

These results have been transmitted to the OSU Administration. The Recommendation on a Revision of Annual Review and Establishment of Cumulative Review is proposed as an addition and revision to the Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University that will be considered for adoption by the Board or Regents in the near future.

Moomaw then presented the committees year-end report as follows:

Ronald L. Moomaw, Chair. Faculty Council Members: Beulah Hirschlein; A. J. Johannes ; Tom Phillips

This committee organized the FC elections and two special elections dealing with (a) the OSU Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, Promotions, and Related Matters of the Faculty of Oklahoma State University and with (b) Post-Tenure Review and Cumulative and Annual Faculty Review.

Both of the special elections generated much faculty interest and significant turnout.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Beulah Hirschlein

Hirschlein presented the committees year-end report as follows:

For the Academic Year 2005-2006, the standing committee on Student Affairs and Learning Resources (SALR) was composed of nine members: the chair, Beulah Hirschlein; three were members of the Faculty Council, Dan Chaney, Amilcar Shabazz, Steve Hallgren; two members from the general faculty, Tom Peeper, Jao-Ming Huang; one emeritus faculty, Raymond Habiby; one undergraduate, Jeff Clark, and one graduate student, Lacy Landrum.

The Committee met September 22, October 27, December 8, February 23, March 23, and April 27 at 3:30 p.m.

The Committee accepted the recommendations of the 2004-2005 SALR Committee which resulted in the selection of four topics for study during 2005-2006 to which we added two. The topics and results of our deliberations are indicated below:

1. Determine if the Student Health Center is meeting the health needs of all OSU students.

We mainly focused on the health insurance benefits provided to graduate students. The director of the Student Health Center (SHC) reported that benefits totaled \$800 per student. While, not generous, it was believed the SHC was providing well with the resources available.

Undergraduate students are covered by parents' insurance, individual plans or nothing at all.

Again it was reported that services were available and that students' needs were being met. There were no reports of dissatisfaction.

2. Investigate the possibility that tuition waivers could be increased concurrently with increases in tuition.

During the fall, a new 3-hour in-state tuition waiver was distributed to GTA/GRAs employed at least .25 FTE. Although graduate students were told this waiver would hit well before their tuition bills were due at the Bursar, the waivers did not hit accounts until 15-30 days (and even longer) after the due date. Most of the problems occurred because departments redefined regular GAs into GTA/GRA to receive the tuition waiver; however, the Graduate College was not ready for the large number of additional students receiving these waivers nor did it anticipate the larger costs of funding these students. The situation was resolved by the middle of October 2005, and students were told in the spring semester to deduct the amount of the tuition waiver (\$415.50) from their total before paying. This ensured that students did not overpay.

The administration has said it would like to increase the waivers to 6-hours of in-state tuition, but this is unlikely given the current cuts proposed by state legislators. Hopefully, graduate students will retain the 3-hour waivers. This is an issue the SALR committee may need to investigate next academic year if the budget cuts or tuition increases take effect.

3. Discuss the possibility of establishing a child care facility on campus for young children of OSU students, and pursue this issue in joint discussion with SGA, GPSGA and the NTSO.

Armed with an understanding that the availability of child care for the children of students and faculty has been studied for many years, contacts with faculty and key decision makers were

made. It was found that the need for child care in the community has been diminished by programs established in the public schools. There is, however a continuing desire for faculty and students to have child care available on site. Most favored developing a program but cited the lack of available funding.

At a meeting of the General Faculty on April 18, 2006, System CEO and President Schmidly stated that a child care center is in the Campus Master Plan.

4. Rules regarding supervision of student organizations, including Greek organizations, and with particular attention to the role and appointment of faculty advisors, should to be reviewed and well articulated.

The Committee has had lengthy discussions with the Vice President for Student Affairs. We now understand that policies have been strengthened, that parties interested in having the policies implemented in the interest of the entire university community have pledged their continuing support by signing the policy documents. Those who have shown good faith in upholding the policies have been welcomed to all the student rights and privileges the university provides.

A talking paper entitled “The Need for a Campus Wide Conversation on the Social, Civic, and Moral Responsibilities of OSU Students” was introduced at the February meeting. Time did not permit a full discussion. The paper was brought back to our attention at the April meeting and discussed briefly in the absence its author. No action was taken except to recommend that the paper be considered in the 2006-2007 academic year.

5. Reviews the progress of the university’s revised/updated academic integrity program.

Administrators and faculty who have provided leadership in the development of new academic integrity initiatives (policies and program) briefed the SALR Committee on their progress at the March meeting. We have been advised that the revised academic integrity initiative will be launched in August, 2006. Faculty are encouraged to explore the new website at <http://osu.okstate.edu/acadaffr/aa/academicintegrity.htm>. Members of the Faculty Council unanimously supported the new academic integrity policies at the council meeting on January 10, 2006.

6. Maintain an interest in how students are being served by the University Library.

The OSU Library continually assesses their collection and services to find ways to increase student access and satisfaction. The library is responsive to any input from their constituents, be it student or faculty.

In terms of library access and services for students, the Library has done many things.

- Hired a Director of Library Graduate Research Services, to serve as a liaison between graduate students and the Library, to make them aware of services and resources.
- In general, all OSU Librarians are responsible for assisting students in their research needs.
- Enhancements to Document Delivery – the Library will scan any article which is available in print but not available full-text and email it to students, faculty and staff.

- Enhanced building hours prior to Finals Week. Beginning 4/23, the Library will be open 24/7 (only closing for a few hours on Friday and Saturday mornings).
- Relocated Reference Services to the first floor of the Library, so researchers can locate librarian assistance quickly. Further, the Library's long range plans call for the first floor of the Library to become a "student success center."
- Added three group meeting rooms on the first floor of the Library to facilitate student collaboration.
- The Library is upgrading the wireless network available in the building to allow students better access.
- Installed creative software (Microsoft Office) on Library workstations, to allow students to write papers (as well as engage in other creative educational endeavors in the Library).
- Free printing on all public workstations.
- Digital Library Services serves as a contact point for students trying to access Library collections and resources remotely.
- Added many new electronic resources (databases) to assist student research needs (Classical.com, Smithsonian Folkways, AP PhotoArchive, ArtStor, to name a few). Further, the Library has moved databases over to platforms which support increased access to full-text resources. Finally, the Library has created a new "mega" search called central Search, which searches multiple databases across different platforms.
- Offers a one credit hour "information literacy" course, to help students become more competent in their research skills.
- Web forms are available for many library services, including reference assistance, book renewal, and interlibrary loan, to name a few.
- The Library has a site license for two bibliographic citation management products: EndNote and Reference Manager. Both products are freely available to students, faculty and staff.

The committee recognized the administrators who generously and patiently informed the committee and helped them study these issues and they were Lee Bird, Gail Gates, Steve Rogers, Sheila Johnson, and Gordon Emslie.

Potential agenda items for discussion and action by SALR in 2006-2007 include the items listed above and other emerging issues of critical concern.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Graduate Faculty Council — Al Rouch

Al Rouch, Graduate Faculty member, presented the following report in the absence of Bob Hunger. A draft of a resolution/appeals process for use by graduate students for items not related to course grades or academic integrity was discussed at the April meeting of the Graduate Council. Revisions based on that discussion have been made and the revised draft will be considered again at the May meeting of Graduate Council. Once the process receives approval by the Grad-

uate Council, input from other groups will be sought (e.g., the Graduate & Professional Student Government Association and the Academic Standards and Policies Committee).

New Business

Phillips welcomed new Councilor's who attended the meeting as guests and will begin their new terms on June 1.

Lee Bird reminded everyone that Special Olympics would begin May 10 with 4,000 Special Olympians on campus. She thanked those that had volunteered to help with different events and said OSU has the largest Special Olympics in the country. She also thanked all for their patience in getting around campus during this time.

The meeting adjourned at 4:25 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is June 13, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,
Birne Binegar, Secretary