

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

250 Student Union

June 13, 2006

Tom Phillips called the meeting to order with the following members present: Bell, G., Bell, P., Binegar, Cruz-Rodz, Darcy, Gasem, Giles, Goetze, Hirschlein, Jordan, Martin, Materer, Meinkoth, Mitchell, Moomaw, Nolan, Ransom, Rouch, Spicer, Veenstra and Westhaus. Also present: Agnew, T., Bird, L., Chaney, D., Gates, G., Hunger, B., Hunt, D., Hulsey-Greene, C, Lollman, J., Masters, B., Mathiasen, A., Matoy, A., McKinley, K., Strathe, M., Webb, G., and Welliver, H. Absent: Brown, G., Brown, T., Carter, Dare, Moberly, and Van Delinder

HIGHLIGHTS

Vacant Council Positions.....	1
Special Presentations	2
Higher Learning Commission Response to the Accreditation Self-Study Report.....	2
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	3
Reports of Standing Committees	
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology	4
Research.....	4
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Graduate Faculty Council	4
Emeriti Association.....	5
Staff Advisory Council	5
Old Business	
Report from the Special Committee to review the Draft “Reporting of Unethical Conduct and Complaint Protection” policy.....	6
New Business	
Recommendation: Phone Books.....	8
Recommendation: Regular Consultation on Campus Planning.....	8
State Appropriations	10
Cumulative Review.....	10

Phillips asked for approval of the May 9, 2006, Minutes. Darcy moved acceptance of the Minutes. Ransom seconded. The Minutes were approved. Phillips moved the June 13, 2006 Agenda be amended by voting on the appointment of a faculty member to fill a vacant position for one year and two special announcements. Darcy seconded. Jordan moved acceptance of the Agenda as amended. Cruz-Rodz seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended.

Vacant Council Positions

Phillips said there were two vacant Councilor positions. One from the College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology, due to the fact that Tom Jordan was elected Council Secretary, and one from Arts & Sciences, due to the fact Scott Gelfand went on sabbatical. Phillips moved the

nomination of Bruce Russell from CEAT to be a one-year representative. Darcy seconded. Nomination passed unanimously. Phillips reported he was working on the A&S replacement.

Special Presentations

Bob Darcy presented Theodore Agnew, Professor Emeritus, with a certificate for being a stalwart of the Faculty Council for the past 40 years, a Past Chair of the Council and for attending meetings regularly. Last year Dr. Agnew agreed to be a good will ambassador of the Faculty Council to the Administration and he succeeded very well. A standing ovation with a round of applause followed.

Tom Phillips recognized Bob Darcy with a certificate for having served as Chair of the OSU Faculty Council and General Faculty during the 2005-2006 year. Phillips stated Darcy had worked tirelessly for the cause of faculty issues and to promote shared faculty governance on campus. He facilitated or oversaw Council efforts among others such as those concerning post-tenure review of faculty, under-representation of Black faculty, increased dialogue between faculty and the Board of Regents, formation of unique relationships with Administration, and development of a joint task force with faculty, students and staff to address the campus master planning efforts. Round of applause followed.

SPECIAL REPORT: Higher Learning Commission Response to the Accreditation Self-Study Report – Brenda Masters

Masters reported the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association has granted Oklahoma State University continued accreditation through 2015.

HLC Response—Two Sections

- Assurance—Five sections indicating how OSU satisfies each accreditation criterion

- Two Reports Required—Affirmative Action Office (2007) and Diversity (2011)

Assurance: http://accreditation.okstate.edu/response/20060522_HLCResponseAssurance.pdf

- Advancement—List concerns—Diversity, Information Technology, Tulsa Campus, Others.

Advancement: http://accreditation.okstate.edu/response/20060522_HLCResponseAdvancement.pdf

Gasem asked what the university should be concerned about beyond the feedback received from the external reviewers. Masters replied she was surprised how clearly the evaluation team saw the institution even though they were only here for about three days and she said she did not know of other concerns at the institution that they did not become fully aware of. She added she did not personally know of anything wrong with the university that cannot be fixed.

Binegar asked the Provost what administration's response to the report would be and would new initiatives come out based on the report. Strathe said that the university will certainly address the issues and she felt it was important to know that even in the "Advancement" section; this is a consultation section in which they make suggestions on things that might be considered.

Data Warehouse Update

Masters updated Council on this issue she had reported on at an earlier Council meeting. The faculty segment of the Data Warehouse is advancing with currently held data from institutional

transactional databases. The variables from the Human Resources System are associated with identification, employment, tenure status, assignment, and education.

Darcy asked why public information would be highly secure. Masters replied it is not the objective of this specific project to try and realign the social norm about what data are public data and what data are easily available public data to the general public on-line. She said she recognized these are societal norms. Darcy said they were not societal norms but rules of the university and they are State law. Masters said she agreed that if public variables are public they should be public on the website; but as a society we are not there yet.

Academic Program Reviews

State regents mandate that each academic program be reviewed. The university reviews each academic program every five years. The required review documents are being aligned with the academic ledgers and the assessment reports. If you have reactions to the current process or suggestions for improvement of the process contact Brenda Masters at brenda.masters@okstate.edu.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Schmidly, Provost, and Vice Presidents

- | | |
|---------------|--|
| 06-01-03-FAC | <i>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:</i> Pending. Wording modifications suggested by the administration are under review by members of the Faculty Committee. |
| 06-02-04-FAC | <i>Proposed Recommendation from Faculty Committee on Faculty Review of Administrators:</i> Not accepted. Provost has informed Faculty Council leadership. |
| 06-04-01-SCAA | <i>Role of African Americans at OSU:</i> Pending. Responses are being prepared. |
| 06-04-05-FAC | <i>Revision of Annual Review and Establishment of Cumulative Review:</i> Accepted. Proposed policy was approved by majority vote by the faculty, and the document has been forwarded to the Board office for review. |
| 06-05-01-EXEC | <i>Recommendations Concerning Confidentiality Agreement:</i> Pending. Discussions are underway. |
| 06-05-02-ASP | <i>Transfer Student Probation Policy and Procedures:</i> Accepted. The proposed policy has been reviewed and approved by Instruction Council and by the Council of Deans. |
| 06-05-03-BUDG | <i>Athletic Facilities Upkeep, Maintenance and Utility Expense Report:</i> Pending. Discussions are underway. |
| 06-05-04-BUDG | <i>Annual Athletic Payment Explanation:</i> Pending. To be discussed in the fall. |
| 06-05-05-RES | <i>Entrepreneurial Faculty Fellows Program:</i> Accepted. A task force has been formed to begin developing policies and procedures for the Fellows program. |
| 06-06-01-EXEC | <i>Phone Books:</i> To President Schmidly. |
| 06-06-02-EXEC | <i>Regular Consultation on Campus Planning:</i> To President Schmidly. |

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Nick Materer**

Materer reported from the committee's perspective, there are two critical projects that faculty need to be aware of for next year. One is the device subscription project. This project will allow the network to grow, integrate wireless and help optimize bandwidth. Hopefully, we will see more proactive problem resolution and better support. However this project is part of a set of tools that can improve the network and academic expression but can potentially hinder our "freedom to tinker". The LRP&IT committee will be involved early in the policy discussions. The other project relates to the course management system. Blackboard and WebCT will no longer function as of January 2007. This change will eliminate some duplication of services at OSU. For more information, see <http://itle.okstate.edu/CMSsearch/index.htm> on the Institute for Teaching and Learning Excellence website. Faculty that use these services should plan their transition/training in the Fall 2006. Training will be provided and faculty will be able to import older Blackboard and WebCT Data. Many issues with IT and technology integration and change are caused by uncertainty, quick changes and unforeseen consequences. In the LRP&IT committee, Materer would like to start a process which broadly outlines where technology at OSU is going. This includes structural aspects (mail, databases, networks) and supports (Multimedia, Desktops). Materer talked to Darlene Hightower, Information Technology Chief Information Officer. She is supportive of this process and also believes that it will be helpful for future planning.

Cruz-Rodz, OSU-OKC representative, asked about the relationship between branch campus IT's and the main campus IT. He said it seemed like there was a disparity between the two. Materer said he thought IT realized there needed to be collaboration between the branch campuses and he feels Hightower is very reasonable and is concerned about doing it right and it is just a matter of giving her the ability to do it which will require working with the different faculty and staff councils.

RESEARCH — Al Rouch

Rouch announced the committee to select the Regents Distinguished Research Rewards met last week and those people have been selected. An official announcement will follow. They were all excellent applicants. Rouch urged those that did not win to submit again next year.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:**Graduate Faculty Council — Bob Hunger**

Hunger reported on the following three items: 1) Following minor changes, a draft of a resolution/appeals process for use by graduate students for items not related to course grades or academic integrity was approved at the May meeting of the Graduate Council. Input from others will now be sought. 2) The contributions made by a student when a published manuscript with multiple authors is used as part of a thesis/dissertation will now be included in the thesis/dissertation. This includes obtaining permission from a journal to include a published manuscript in a thesis/dissertation if that journal holds the copyright. 3) Graduate Council is

beginning to consider possible changes in policy related to R-grades. This is still in the formative stages.

Emeriti Association — Kenneth McKinley

Emeriti Membership: 527 (April 2006)

Emeriti Dues: Annual: \$15/person; \$25/couple; Life: \$150/person; \$200/couple

Emeriti Programs:

First Friday Dinners: Dinner is served on the first Friday of each month, at 6:00 PM, followed by a program of interest to all in attendance; \$7/person at Kerr-Drummond (unless announced to be elsewhere);

Stillwater Academy for Life Long Learners (SALL): A program begun, commensurate with the 2005-06 academic year, which provides for short-duration, high-interest presentations in a lecture/discussion format, led by OSU faculty and staff (current and former); and, business, industry and government leaders in Oklahoma. Programs are 1 ½ hours in length, 6 times in frequency (9 hours total) and are limited to persons of AARP age (50) and older. Eight “classes” were held in the fall and spring, 2005-06 (eight total) and two are currently being offered in summer 2006. Nearly 100 persons enrolled in some or all of the initial year’s offerings. The SALL is administered and guided by a volunteer board of Emeriti members.

OSU-Osher Life-long Learning Institute (OLLI): The SALL board has just been informed of the award of a grant from the Osher Foundation, Los Angeles, to support the continuation, development and expansion of the SALL concept, beginning in fall 2006 in Stillwater, Oklahoma City and Tulsa. The grant is for three years at \$100,000 per year. If the proposed goals and objectives are met, an award of a \$1M endowment for perpetuation of the program will be awarded. The grant will be administered as a joint venture with the OSU College of Education, with program staff being housed in Willard Hall.

White Woods Retirement Campus (WWRC): The WWRC Board of Directors, begun by the Emeriti Association, in the late 1990s, has entered into a “letter of engagement” with the Greystone Corporation of Dallas, TX for the development of a business plan for the construction of a comprehensive, full service (cottages, apartments, assisted living, nursing care) retirement center on donated land at the corner of Range Road and 19th Street in SW Stillwater. This plan, several years and some false starts in the making, will be ready for discussion and action by fall 2006. It is anticipated that a public announcement regarding the status of the future of the facility will be made before the end of this calendar year.

International Retired Scholarship Fund: The Emeriti Association, through a committee of members formed in 2004, has begun an endowed scholarship fund drive to assist current and future international students with the costs of their education at OSU. Scholarships for students from Thailand and Ethiopia have been endowed to date. Brochures and publicity supporting fundraising efforts for scholarships for students from Japan, South Korea, and the United Arab Emirates are being developed for immediate distribution.

Staff Advisory Council — Hank Welliver

Welliver said new SAC officers would be elected on June 14. He said Duane Hunt had crafted a recommendation on the Confidentiality Agreement similar to Faculty Council’s and he thought at

the next SAC meeting a recommendation would be presented regarding the OSU grievance policies. Welliver thanked Faculty Council for all the help they provided to SAC this past year.

Old Business

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

Bell distributed copies of the report from the Ad Hoc Committee on the Reporting of Unethical Behavior. The committee report with responses from Anne Matoy, Assistant Vice President, Human Resources, is below. The actual policy can be found on the Human Resource’s website at: http://www.okstate.edu/osu_per/

June 13, 2006

Ad Hoc Committee on the Reporting of Unethical Behavior Members: Pat Lamphere-Jordan, and Kris Giles, Patricia Bell Final Report to the Faculty Council

The Ad Hoc Committee solicited input on this policy from the Faculty as a whole and the Faculty Council. The concerns reported to the Committee were summarized, reviewed by all members of the Committee, and sent to Asst. VP Anne Matoy. Her responses are in Italics. This report contains an itemized list of the concerns submitted along with the response to that particular concern. The Committee reviewed these responses and had no further comment or suggestion. The Ad Hoc Committee on the Reporting of Unethical Behavior makes no objection to the policy as clarified and amended in this document.

**From: Anne Matoy,
Assistant VP, Human Resources**

Date: March 29, 2006

TO: Bob Darcy, Pat Lamphere-Jordan, and Kris Giles

Summary of Comments forwarded by Faculty

My response and thoughts are in blue¹. The policy is not a significant change from current practices. In fact, some have questioned why we need a policy at all since many of these provisions are covered in other policies. However, Staff Advisory Council thought it important for employees to have a single source of information for anyone concerned about the reporting of misconduct.

1. There is considerable concern regarding the following issues raised by the policy:

A. Telling the faculty and staff not to spread rumors. How can such a rule be enforced?

¹ Now also in Italic.

We agree it would be difficult, if not impossible, to enforce. The item was added to the policy to make individuals more aware that a means exists to check or verify rumors before repeating. We sometimes have rampant rumors that are untrue and harmful to individuals and/or the University. If individuals would check them out before spreading, we would have a more congenial place to work.

This section is not critical. We would appreciate any suggestions.

B. Punishing people if they do not meet a “good faith” standard. What is the purpose of this rule?

There should be some deterrent to individuals who maliciously make false allegations.

C. There is an assumption that the individual(s) reviewing the filed complaint is beyond reproach. What safeguards are available?

Anytime an individual is not satisfied with the response, s/he is able to seek other resolution through other University offices, police, courts, etc.

- 2. Who will review complaints? Will it be the ombudsperson, Affirmative Action Officer, or someone else? More than one person wants to know who the “compliance Officer” will be. If the administration is the sole compliance and review officer, this is a big problem.**

Complaints are reviewed by the appropriate compliance office, just as they are now. For example, discrimination and sexual harassment complaints go to Carolyn Hernandez; NCAA rules violations go to Rick Allen; research concerns go to Steve O’Geary; financial problems go to Kathy Elliott, etc. If the OSU Confidential Reporting System is used, Ethics Point prevents the report from being sent to any person named in the incident.

- 3. Sections 3.10, 3.06 and 3.3 do not present a consistent picture. On the surface, it appears that the employee passing on a substantiated rumor to a supervisor is protected by 3.3 as long as it is done in “good faith”. Is this the intent? It is suggested that rumors be identified as “concerns” as opposed to “allegations” (3.3). This allows employees to check on rumors so that said rumors can be confronted and put to rest.**

A rumor by definition has no discernible source or known authority for its truth. The policy would request that the truth of such statements be verified by the supervisor or the appropriate compliance office before further communications to others. Improvements in wording will be appreciated.

Also, there is no provision for things that happened before the policy came into being. Can a report of an event that happened in the past now be filed under the provisions of 3.12?

Any report can be filed through the OSU Confidential Reporting System without regard to any time limit. The potential for review of the concern may, however, be hampered by the length of time that may have passed.

Darcy asked if the system is operational, have there been items put on it and what is Matoy's sense of usefulness of the information gained. Matoy replied the Confidential Reporting System is operational. She continued the actual policy goes beyond that as it is the reporting of any type of complaints. The Confidential Reporting System does not replace any other reporting mechanisms such as the one which has been in place by Student Affairs for some time. There has always been the reporting system on harassment, etc. She added this is not replacing anything just in addition to. Matoy said since last September there have been 25 reports filed. Two have been duplicates and this could be due to the fact someone might have accidentally pushed the button twice. Matoy feels this system has been beneficial. There have been some specific cases that have been investigated but more important than that it has raised some questions on some procedures that they might not have been aware of. Darcy asked if any of them had dealt specifically with what might be considered faculty issues such as students complaining about faculty members. Matoy said she did not recall any issue of students complaining about faculty. Darcy asked if there was anything about faculty. Matoy replied there have been a couple of complaints and in one particular case there was a complete investigation and the faculty member was given an opportunity to respond, the faculty member was fully vindicated and the full report was made a part of the permanent record so any question of this coming up in the future was put to rest. Matoy said she thought the majority of complaints she has seen have been cases of sexual harassment and discrimination and she feels Carolyn Hernandez has been the busiest of any of the compliance officers. Some of the other complaints had to do with research and records.

Phillips said at this time the charge of the committee had been met and thanked Bell for the report.

New Business

Darcy presented the following recommendation to Council:

Title: Phone Books

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: The University contract with a publisher similar to that which provided the former campus phone book so as to make available phone books for Fall, 2006. The net proceeds to the University are to be used for cash awards for staff in a manner the Staff Advisory Council may choose.

Rationale:

1. The phone books are used by a number of staff, students, faculty, administrators and others.
2. Offices with adequate budgets are downloading and printing copies at relatively large expense.
3. The Vice President for Administration and Finance told the Faculty Council that the University realizes a net profit of \$8,000 from the phone books in addition to free copies.
4. Whereas Faculty and Students have a number of monetary awards available each year there are only 6-8 Staff Appreciation Awards of \$750 each available for staff. This small increase in funds will more than double the amount available to staff.

Pat Bell asked when during the year is it being recommended the phone book be printed. Darcy replied it is recommended once in the fall as before and just like the ones printed in past years. The printed version would be in addition to the on-line version. Goetze asked if it would be possible for IT to take the on-line version and put it into a palm database because she is not always at her computer when she needs a phone number. Jordan pointed out he has the on-line version on his palm. You go to the directory where they have a place to download the entire directory into a PDF file. Darcy said one argument administration has made against printing a phone book is that there are inaccuracies in it. The on-line phone book was downloaded and it was noticed that entire departments were missing. In the printed version, from the past, each department had to go through and hand-certify their information. The on-line version is not being corrected or updated except by individuals editing their own information. Binegar pointed out that in the printed version you could see the structure of the university via organizational units in the front part of the phone book which is vital to anyone who has an idea as to what they are looking for but does not have a name. He also gave of example of going to the first day of class and the room had been changed but there was nothing to notify him about the change except the wrong class was in the classroom he was assigned. He went to the nearest office and they had computers but no one knew the passwords. If there had been a regular phone book he could have looked up a number and used the telephone and he feels there are certainly situations where a hard copy of the phone book is necessary.

Recommendation passed unanimously and will be forwarded to administration.

Tom Jordan presented the following recommendation to Council:

Title: Regular Consultation on Campus Planning

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: The various individuals planning and implementing the Athletic Village and the Master Plan brief one another regularly as to their progress and plans. Further, one person be designated to coordinate all this interactive planning.

Rationale: It appears that campus development is moving in at least two different streams, independent of one another. The result will be a transformed campus. It is essential that the several groups doing this planning and implementation communicate. Further, it is essential that someone be responsible for such coordination. Hundreds of millions of dollars of private and public funds are at stake here, and the University should act responsibly in the coordinated planning of these efforts.

Gasem brought up a recommendation passed by Council in April 2004 when he was Chair of the Campus Facilities, Safety and Security Committee. It was titled "An Improved Process for Campus Planning" and was "accepted in concept" by administration in October 2004. They stated, "The Facilities Planning and Space Utilization Committee met on September 24, 2004, and unanimously approved the appointment of John Houck, Assistant Vice President for Physical Plant Services, as the Principal Planning Officer to carry out the development of a campus master plan incorporating all facets of a campus master plan. The Committee charged John Houck with proposing a committee structure that incorporated all campus constituencies in the development of the campus

master plan". Jordan added that since that time John Houck now works for the Athletic Department and is the person in charge of the Athletic Village.

Recommendation passed unanimously and will be forwarded to administration.

State Appropriations

Earl Mitchell brought up the appropriations in the State Budget because he had seen no outrage on anyone's part because for the first time in the years he has been here there is around one billion dollars in extra money to spend and the three groups that seem to be held hostage to this whole process are the teachers, the state employees and higher education and these groups are a large part of the budget. He cannot understand fighting over money we have. In past year's it has been difficult because we did not have the money. Another concept is that across the country tuition is increasing and so we are pricing out education for a large number of people in addition to the number of students that graduate that have loans and that puts them in a different bracket. When he was President of Habitat for Humanity here in Stillwater there were a number of college graduates who were working but qualified for Habitat for Humanity because the amount of student loans they had prevented them from obtaining bank loans for home mortgages. It is reported that the average student loan per year is approximately \$19,000. If \$19,000 is the average, he thinks that some students are leaving college with \$40,000 to \$50,000 in loans. For the first time in Oklahoma there is enough money to set some aside to take care of some unfunded liability in terms of Oklahoma Teacher Retirement and yet no one seems to be outraged about it. Let your feelings be known to a large number of people. In the political process the politician only recognizes people who vote and people who give them money.

Cumulative Review

Binegar reported there was a situation similar to what happened last January. Last year faculty voted on a recommendation on Appendix D and then the wording was modified by the Regents prior to their acceptance. The statement on Post-Tenure Review which is now called Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty was voted on by the faculty and overwhelmingly approved and now it is in the Regent's hands and they have suggested some revisions. The Council officers are in the process of trying to renegotiate the final version. The Officers are also in a situation where they do not want to negotiate publicly. However, they do want to assure the faculty that they are committed to representing faculty interests and ideals and feel that, at this point, this can best be accomplished by direct dialog with the Regents.

Pat Bell asked what the proposed changes were. Binegar replied there is one section that reads "any disciplinary action that may follow the cumulative review must adhere to all prescribed procedures currently in force within this policy document". Their suggestion is to drop the word "currently". Binegar said he felt that was an ambiguity that would exist anyway due to when the document was written, printed or read and he personally did not have any strong objections to that modification. Another phrase was, "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". That has been changed to "shall be based upon" those grounds and Binegar's view is that it makes the intent a little

clearer; as their concern was the criteria or “list of offenses” by which someone could be accused for not doing their job, would not be broadened or changed on the fly; rather these would be stipulated to correspond to the criteria that are already in place. He thinks the new language makes that somewhat clearer as “implemented in accordance with the grounds” sounds more like “procedures and processes” rather than the actual criteria by which people could be judged.

Binegar said the more troublesome change is a specific reference, a citation, in fact, to AAUP guidelines for development plans. Most of what is in that citation is already in it but there is one key thing lacking. The current statement reads, “Any formal development plan should respect academic freedom and professional self-direction, and it should be flexible enough to allow for subsequent alteration”. Those words are also in the AAUP statement. What is missing that appears in the cited paragraph in the AAUP statement is “No formal development plan can be imposed on the faculty member unilaterally” and that is probably the key issue. Is the removal of that citation the removal of that protection? Phillips said they had heard the Board did not want to make a literature citation in their policy and did not want to cite some other authority and give up authority to some document published by somebody else.

The Officers propose to put back some words that essentially state what AAUP says; that a development plan should not be imposed unilaterally on a tenured faculty member, rather it should be the result of the negotiations.

Darcy added that all the officers are optimistic that something will get worked out as they have a very good relationship with the Regents on this issue. The Board meets in Okmulgee on June 24 and this is a task force that has made this recommendation to the general Board and the standing committee on Academic Affairs will meet that morning. This is definitely on their agenda. Phillips has been assured by Doug Wilson, Board Executive Secretary, that they will listen to Faculty Council.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is September 12, 2006. No meetings are held in July and August.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas Jordan, Secretary