

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES

250 Student Union

October 10, 2006

Tom Phillips called the meeting to order with the following members present: Bell, G., Bell, P., Bidwell, Brown, A., Brown, G., Cruz-Rodz, Darcy, Giles, Goetze, Hirschlein, Jordan, Leavell, Martin, Materer, Meinkoth, Mitchell, Moomaw, Nolan, Ransom, Rouch, Russell, Spicer, Van Delinder, Veenstra and Westhaus. Also present: Agnew, T., Bosserman, D. Chaney, D. Crespo, A., Elliott, K., Gates, G., Hightower, D., Hunger, R., Miller, L. Miller, R. Milliken, C., Monismith, D., Shutt, G. Strathe, M., Swaim, R., and Weaver, J. Absent: Carter, Dare, Gasem, and Moberly

HIGHLIGHTS

| | |
|--|----|
| Campus Planning | 2 |
| Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations | 4 |
| Reports of Standing Committees | |
| Academic Standards and Policies | 5 |
| Athletics | 5 |
| Budget | 5 |
| Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security | 6 |
| Faculty..... | 6 |
| Long-Range Planning and Information Technology | 7 |
| Research..... | 7 |
| Retirement and Fringe Benefits | 7 |
| Rules and Procedures..... | 9 |
| Student Affairs and Learning Resources | 9 |
| Reports of Liaison Representatives | |
| Graduate and Professional Student Government Association | 9 |
| Student Senate..... | 10 |
| Graduate Faculty Council | 10 |
| Emeriti Association..... | 10 |
| New Business | |
| Recommendation: Legislative Priority | 10 |
| Recommendation: Electronic Posting of OSU Budget and Salary Documents..... | 11 |
| Recommendation: Optional use of an Academic Mission-based Logo by Faculty and Academic Units..... | 12 |

Phillips asked for approval of the September 12, 2006, Minutes. Darcy moved acceptance of the Minutes. Jordan seconded. The Minutes were approved. Phillips asked for approval of the October 10, 2006 Agenda. Darcy moved acceptance of the Agenda. Jordan seconded. The Agenda was approved.

SPECIAL REPORT: Campus Planning – Joe Weaver

Joe Weaver presented a brief overview of the Campus Master Plan. A model was provided by the School of Architecture and shown to those in attendance. Their fifth-year design class took this on as a class project and they took the colored drawing provided to those in attendance and constructed small and large model versions of the plan. The smaller model will be on display in Whitehurst so it can be referred to as needed. The larger model will be on display in the Physical Plant so that architects and construction people can view it when turning in bids. The colored drawing distributed entitled “Draft Master Plan 2025” was taken to the Board of Regents on July 24 to brief the Board, not for approval, but to get a sense from them if we were going in the right direction or not. The Board liked the plan and they told the Board their intentions were to come back to campus this fall and regenerate the original Stakeholders group and have a series of meetings with them to make sure the plan is consistent with the original guidelines that the Stakeholders set up a year ago. They had their first meeting last week and Weaver thanked Council member Tom Jordan for being very helpful throughout the entire process. Weaver added they are also working with the Faculty Council Campus Facilities committee that Dr. Gasem Chairs. They have had one meeting with him and will be having a series of meetings with his group as well. After all comments have been assembled and modified they hope to take the plan to the Board in a January/February time frame. Weaver said they would speak at the General Faculty Meeting in November and give a brief presentation.

Phillips asked where drawings of the Athletic Village could be viewed because it was provided on the model shown but not on the drawing. Weaver said the Provost had directed them to focus attention on the academic core and the rest of the campus and Weaver said he made the decision to carve that piece off of the plan given the controversy around it. It has not been “written off” and it will be integrated back in, when their plan is finalized and firmed up it will be brought back into the document that will be presented to the Board so they can approve those changes as well.

Darcy asked if there was any reason, other than aesthetic, that Cordell Hall must be demolished. Weaver replied that in the drawing the building is silhouetted because it is his understanding at this point in time a decision has not been made as to whether Cordell stays or goes. It is obvious that the West End Zone and Cordell do crowd each other but Cordell cannot be taken down until there is at least similar space in that part of the campus. The question is can this happen within the 20-year time frame so the programs can be accommodated.

Darcy asked why would Cordell be torn down. Weaver said he thought it was common knowledge that the Athletic Department has requested that real estate be assigned to them and Cordell would be in the way. He added the President had committed, that before Cordell be torn down, assuming it is decided to go that way, that there is space for the programs in it elsewhere and that determination has not been made. Darcy asked who would pay for that additional space. Weaver replied that would be a point that would have to be resolved before any final decisions could be made.

Tony Brown said the legend indicates a five-year IDP and ask Weaver to explain. Weaver said the Board in the March/April timeframe approved an Initial Development Plan which basically is the Athletic Village as it was presented to them plus all the construction that was in the Bond Issue plus the Business Building and the ATS Building which was pretty far down the road in terms of

conceptual design. The IDP included was the construction already on the table plus the Athletic Village. There was funding already in place for those projects. Brown asked for a brief highlight of the projects in the 5-year IDP. Weaver said at the northern end of Monroe Street there is the Multimodal facility that, hopefully, will hold a 1500 space parking garage, a transportation hub for the bus terminal. It will also have office space to accommodate the parking and transit office, a satellite police office and some retail venues. South of that there is a small building which will be the Classroom Building in cooperation with NOC. Directly south of that is the new Research Building and in some configuration be attached to PS I and II basically for the hard sciences. This is the largest single bond project in the State Bond Program. Just off of that area on the other side of the road is the ATS expansion. That has not been funded as of yet but it is one that is being actively discussed and fundraising proposals are being developed for it. At the end of the street is the Murray Hall renovation project to house many of the Social Sciences and some of the Humanities Departments. Directly east is Old Central and that is intended to be a complete restoration of that facilities. The Honors Program will be housed there. There is a large auditorium on the top floor they hope to put back in service. If possible there might be some classrooms and study halls as well in that area. It will be a complete restoration on the inside as well as the out. Darcy asked if it would be a restoration back to a particular point in time. Weaver replied they are working with the Oklahoma Historical Society to determine what is the best point in time to go back to because if you go back to the very beginning restrooms were not in the building and they would not go back that far. The large facility north of Old Central is the new Business Building. Funding has not been developed for that project either. The last academic project would be the Architecture Building which was funded by the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation at \$15 million to expand that facility. It is something like Old Central in an attempt to bring that building back. There are a couple of smaller projects at the Veterinary School, the L-3 lab as well as some classroom space.

Brown asked about potential projects. Weaver replied the money is not identified for HES and Business but proposals are out trying to raise the money.

Weaver said parking “would get real exciting” about this time next year along Monroe Street as we get into the construction phase of some of the projects.

Bruce Russell asked if a traffic study had been commissioned as to whether Hall of Fame should be the main artery or if it should be McElroy. Weaver said a Traffic Engineer had been hired last year to study Hall of Fame, Hester, and traffic around the stadium for our own purposes. They are participating with the City of Stillwater on a transportation enhancement study that the City is conducting and OSU funded about one-third of the cost. Some initial information has been provided as to where they see things going. Russell asked if it was the plan to keep the four lanes on Hall of Fame. Weaver replied, “Yes”. Russell asked if it would be shut down during games. Weaver replied, “Yes, they reached an agreement with the City this past summer that during game day that section of road in front of the stadium would be closed”. Russell asked what the fate of McElroy would be. Weaver said the transportation study the City is doing is considering that very thing. He feels they are inclined to think no farther north for any additional four lanes and added the Residential Life people are concerned about four lanes around Married Student Housing and farther east there are a lot of property easements that would have to be acquired which would make it very expensive.

Darcy asked about the functioning laboratories in the ATRC Building given the stadium construction and he said he understands the President's top Legislative priority is \$25 million to construct another building to house those laboratories. Darcy asked where and when would that building be constructed. He added he understood the ATRC is currently one-half to one-third empty although it is not yet paid for and what will moving functions out of the ATRC accomplish. Weaver said he thought the first assumption was incorrect because there had not been a definitive determination that research will not be able to be conducted in the basement of the ATRC. Some concerns have been expressed and experts on vibration have been brought in to give advice in the process of sorting that out. The President has made a commitment to the College of Engineering and Dean Reid that should that be the case and a determination is made that some of the labs are affected by that that they would be relocated and he even committed to the concept of a new building. Where it would go would be a function of discussions with Dean Reid and the faculty involved. A number of sites were discussed including the Tech Park. Weaver said whether that is the President's highest priority you would have to ask him. He thought faculty pay raises, the Restore, Reward and Grow Program, and keeping the utilities and benefits covered would also be right up there.

Materer asked how the Tech Park fit into this 20-year plan. Weaver said the Tech Park is managed by a Board that is a partnership of the City, the Vo Tech system and OSU and they have their own Master Plan as to how that real estate will be used and is not really a part of this campus per se. Materer asked about cost overruns such as with the money allotted for the new Research Building and Physical Sciences I and II. He said they had heard the ventilation system would cost \$10 million plus. Weaver said they had a day-and-a-half meeting on the Research Building last week and some amount of money will have to be spent in that building in order to get the Botany Department moved out of Life Sciences East into that building. He added the idea of building a new Research Building and totally renovating PS I and II seems to be beyond reach given the money that we have. But the H-Vac system can be fixed and get the negative pressure under control and get some renovated labs for Botany. Having a construction manager paired up with an architect early in a project is to manage those kinds of problems down to the point where you are working within your budget and managing your expectations and you are keeping your scope in check with the money that you have. Weaver said at this point all projects are within budget and added a construction company has to sign a contract that they can do a project for a certain amount of money and they are at risk if they run over budget.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

President Schmidly, Provost, and Vice Presidents

- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 06-04-01-SCAA | <i>Role of African Americans at OSU:</i> Received. Distributed with September update. |
| 06-05-01-EXEC | <i>Recommendations Concerning Confidentiality Agreement:</i> Pending. No Change. |
| 06-05-03-BUDG | <i>Athletic Facilities Upkeep, Maintenance and Utility Expense Report:</i> Complete. Explained at the September Faculty Council meeting. |
| 06-05-04-BUDG | <i>Annual Athletic Payment Explanation:</i> Complete. The amount is \$944,000. This was explained at the September Faculty Council meeting. |

- 06-06-01-EXEC **Phone Books:** Complete. Administration supports technology-based services. Phone books will not be printed and distributed. Worked with SU Bookstore. They will keep hard copies for sale.
- 06-09-01-ASP **Add/Drop Policy Changes:** Accepted. Provost Strathe presented the policy to the Council of Deans in September and the modifications were approved as written.
- 06-10-01-EXEC **Legislative Priority:** To President Schmidly.
- 06-10-02-EXEC **Electronic Posting of OSU Budget and Salary Documents:**
To President Schmidly.
- 06-10-03-Council **Optional use of an Academic Mission-based Logo by Faculty and Academic Units:** To President Schmidly.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Jean Van Delinder

The committee is working on a wellness addition to the curriculum and it will be discussed next month. Phillips asked if this would be part of the General Education requirement and how many credits. Van Delinder replied it would be part of the requirement and would be three credits.

ATHLETICS — Kris Giles

The committee will continue to look at and develop a report on the financial independence of the Athletic Department including the report on the allocation by the Board of Regents. They will also be documenting faculty and staff financial contributions to the Athletic Department and other student-related athletic activities.

BUDGET — John Veenstra

At their last meeting on September 27 Joe Weaver spoke to the committee about how the latest money to the OSU budget was allocated. Prior to that part of the committee met with Dr. Bosserman and Joe Weaver to talk about the two Council recommendations; one related to facilities upkeep and maintenance costs and the second related to the annual athletic payment explanation. Out of that discussion a letter was drafted to Athletic Director, Mike Holder, by Tom Phillips and John Veenstra as follows:

October 10, 2006

Mr. Mike Holder
Vice President for Athletic Programs
202 Athletics Center
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078

Dear Mr. Holder:

On behalf of the OSU Faculty Council we thank you for your candid remarks on the financial situation of the Athletic Department that you made at our March 14, 2006 meeting. Specifically, we appreciate your commitments to balancing the budget of the Athletic Department, and not accepting

subsidies for it from the general university funds, referred to as E&G funds, that are allocated each year.

You expressed your hopes for operating the Department with a surplus and, in due time, ending the subsidies.

From the spirit of your comments, and following discussions with Vice President Bosserman, we are prompted to inquire about the timetable you have developed, as part of your business plan for athletics, for reducing and eliminating the subsidy the Department receives from the general university. Last year this subsidy was approximately \$944,000. Retaining those dollars within the general university budget would significantly benefit the University's academic mission.

We look forward to receiving your timetable for reducing and eliminating the current subsidy to the Athletic Department from E&G funds.

Sincerely,

Tom Phillips
Chair, OSU Faculty Council

John Veenstra
Chair, Budget Committee

cc: David Schmidly, System CEO, President
David Bosserman, Vice President, Administration & Finance

Phillips said that following up on statements made by VP Holder, publicly and on numerous occasions, that he wanted to give up the E&G money, they would be very happy for them to do that.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Jim Meinkoth

Meinkoth gave the committee report in the absence of Chair Gasem. The committee has had meetings with Joe Weaver and Professor Nigel Jones, who is a member of the Planning Committee, on the Campus Master Plan as well as with Hugh Kierig, on parking. Dr. Gasem organized an Ad Hoc committee of experts from various fields on campus trying to make use of the expertise here. Joe Weaver and the Planning Committee will present the preliminary plan to the Ad Hoc committee which will review the plan and will serve in an advisory role to help the CFSS make recommendations to Joe Weaver's office. Phase 1 will handle everything above ground, including things such as landscaping, signage, historical preservation, recreation facilities, art and public spaces, safety and traffic flow. The goal is to have that completed by December 15 of this year. Phase 2 will include things below ground including the water and sewer systems, power, chilled water, etc., and they hope to have a separate set of meetings and recommendations completed by March 15 of next year.

FACULTY — Tony Brown

The committee is meeting every two weeks to begin its consideration of the draft of the Policy and Procedure Letter (2-0112) on annual faculty A&D. The second P&P letter they will address will be the Cumulative Review which is the newer. In the process they have been soliciting information and so far have met with one Dean and one Department Head and plan on having additional meetings as well as soliciting information and comments from faculty

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Nick Materer

The committee continues to have discussions with Information Technology and as problems and/or developments arise Materer feels they will be handled smoothly. They followed through regarding a privacy concern involving faculty who utilize the email destination option under O-Key. A warning was placed on the O-Key web page where the email destination option is configured. After upgrades, planned at the end of this year, the privacy issue will be permanently fixed.

Materer would also appreciate any ideas and/or comments regarding what type of technology faculty should have on their desktops and replacement policies.

Mitchell asked Materer if he knew anything about the level of computer technology faculty have because he feels sometime faculty have computer problems because the equipment is old and has not kept up with technology. Materer replied they might send out a survey. Mitchell thought IT could tell you the level of everyone's computer. Hightower said central IT could not but perhaps IT areas within each college could. Tony Brown said in his department there is a regular rotation on when computers are replaced. Email any input in this area to Materer.

RESEARCH — Al Rouch

The draft of the "*Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research*" is complete and ready for faculty review. The draft will soon be on the Faculty Council web page for review. While developing the policy, Dr. O'Geary, OSU Director of Compliance, actively sought out and obtained faculty input and discussed aspects of the entire policy with the Research Committee.

A sound policy on human subject research for the university is very much needed. Our current document is simply inadequate and gives the impression that OSU is not serious about protecting human subjects in research. This policy corrects that impression and provides important guidelines and definitions for those who conduct this type of research.

Faculty who submit IRB protocols are encouraged to critique the policy and send comments to Dr. Rouch or Dr. O'Geary.

If no major revisions are recommended by the faculty, Dr. Rouch will submit a recommendation on behalf of the Research Committee for Council approval of the policy at the November meeting.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Greg Bell

Bell distributed copies of two graphs. One entitled, "Average Total Compensation for all Faculty Combined – Big Twelve Universities" and the other was "Employer (OSU) Benefit Costs". OSU salaries are at the bottom of the Big 12; however, the benefits are substantial. Bell feels like OSU has an excellent retirement program and compares extremely well with other Big 12 universities.

A task force is in the process of being formed among colleges and universities within Oklahoma and Anne Matoy will be in charge of this particular task force. The purpose of the task force is to form a coalition that helps to distribute risk and then make a request for proposals (RFP). Bell feels this should give us a better opportunity to improve our plan. Moomaw asked about a high-savings deductible. Bell said the committee is talking about that now, but the problem with that is

everybody needs to be together on one plan and it is very unlikely we would get good rates if plans are split and one person is on a \$5,000 deductible plan and others on a \$500 plan. However, this can be done. Moomaw said many of his colleagues are leaving the OSU plan. Bruce Russell said many faculty are weighing the health care plan the university offers, as a benefit, and saying they cannot afford to insure their families for medical care. They can go to another provider much cheaper. He added that faculty, when considering positions at OSU, look at the \$1,000 plus per month it will cost for a spouse and two or more children to be covered and do not view the health care plan favorably. He feels in his case a high deductible would be a good alternative.

A health savings plan along with catastrophic insurance was discussed. Bell said very few people purchase the insurance due to the high cost. In a health savings plan, the money will carry over from year to year, unlike the current flex benefit plan. Oklahoma State Educational and Employees Group Insurance Board (OSEEGIB) does not offer a health savings plan, so if someone wanted it they would have to get one on their own or it would have to go through someone besides OSEEGIB. Health savings plans accrue interest like a savings account. If you picked up HealthChoice Basic at the lower premium you would get the difference back in pay but then you have to pay taxes on it unless you put it into flex or a health savings account. If administration picked up catastrophic insurance for employees with dependents single employees might consider that unfair unless it was a cafeteria plan where you get an allowance and choose your benefits. Bell said some do not agree that the university should be covering dependents because it is unfair to those without dependents. If it came to a vote, a lot of people would vote to have more dependent coverage simply because the majority of employees have dependents. If a university employee moved to an employer that covers dependent healthcare, it would essentially be a \$1000/month raise for anyone covering their spouse and children. Phillips asked what the difference was in our plan and the State plan because he thought we were all State employees. Bell said the State Plan is better than what university employees receive because although the health insurance itself is the same, the allowance that state employees get to cover the cost of insurance is much greater and covers the entire premium for employees with dependents. This allows state employees to get health, dental, vision and dependent coverage under its allowance.

Dr. Bosserman said they were waiting on a final report from one of the fiscal officers in the state who conducted a survey including all institutions in Oklahoma regarding what is paid for in this area. All institutions in the state are included in the state insurance plan and what people have or currently want will not be dictated by us or our committee and will be a statewide consortium. Some schools pay some percentage of dependent care, normally smaller schools. When the final report is received he will be happy to share it.

Dr. Bosserman has tasked the RFB committee to prepare a business plan to reinstate the tuition benefit program recommendation that was rejected by the administration last year. The committee is 100 percent in favor of asking for that tuition benefit plan again providing Joe Weaver is willing to help with the numbers to try and determine how to pay for the plan, put the plan together, try to determine how best to limit the university's liabilities, etc. Phillips asked Bell to repeat what the plan was so all Councilors would know what it was. Bell said what was recommended last year was not approved. Administration declined the tuition plan because it mostly affected employees with dependents, and just as the health plan reflects, the administration takes care of the employees, but not their dependents. Smaller universities have used tuition plans to attract faculty, and it has been

very effective but OSU has not followed suit. Phillips said he thought it was a great employee benefit and tuition benefits should be offered to employees and their dependents considering that other benefits are not as good as they could be.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Earl Mitchell

The Vice Chair ballots are in the mail and voting closes October 20. Ballots will be counted the following week.

The committee is looking at the current charter and by-laws to codify the rules and will be presenting a recommendation to Council probably next semester.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Beulah Hirschlein

At the last committee meeting students attended representing the undergraduate and graduate programs and they provided substantial input which will help to refine the committee's priorities for the year. They spoke from their own experiences and those of their colleagues to help the committee look at access to health services over the holidays, how their student fees are distributed, how they might be more student managers of their student fees, and management of the graduate fee waiver was a concern.

Dan Chaney, committee member, took minutes of the last meeting and they have been forwarded to the Faculty Council Secretary for posting to the Council website.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Graduate and Professional Student Government Association — David Monismith

R Grades – GPSGA has passed a recommendation in regard to R grades. GPSGA recommends that the current R grade system be changed to a satisfactory/unsatisfactory grading system whereby grades are given to graduate students in real time (i.e. at the end of each semester) for thesis/dissertation hours, and such grades will have no effect on a student's GPA. A student would not, however, receive any credit for any hours given a grade of unsatisfactory.

Appeals of Research Issues Not Related to Academic Integrity – GPSGA has also passed a recommendation regarding the Appeals Policy that Dean Emslie has pending in Graduate Council. Said policy will allow Dean Emslie to form a committee when necessary to resolve appeals for qualifying exams and grades for thesis/dissertation hours.

Graduate Resource Center – In regard to one of the requests on the GPSGA Top Ten List, the university will be hiring a grant writer and a graduate scholar development officer. The GPSGA officers believe it would be appropriate to incorporate these offices into the Graduate College to form a Graduate Resource Center. Their vision is to have one large office for graduate student services. The current location of the Graduate College, however, cannot easily accommodate such a facility. Therefore, GPSGA officers and the Graduate College are currently looking into relocating the Graduate College to facilitate the creation of a Graduate Resource Center.

Payroll Problems – Approximately two to three weeks ago, GPSGA was made aware that the Employment Action (EA) forms for a substantial number of students suffered significant delays in

processing. At that point in time, many graduate teaching and research assistants employed for the Fall 2006 had not received compensation for August or September. Several graduate assistants in the College of Engineering, Architecture, & Technology reported that this problem had occurred for several years. Moreover, students in other departments have indicated similar problems. In response to this issue, GPSGA requested that the Provost resolve this problem.

Student Senate — Christy Milliken

Milliken reported the Student Senate was working on the following:

1. A recommendation regarding the Edmon Low Library Audio Book Collection.
2. Granted registered status to several clubs: bass fishing, weight-lifting, volleyball.
3. Confirmed executives for the Speakers Board for this year.
4. Preparing for the SGA Big 12 Conference which OSU will host this year.
5. Transferred \$2,000 from unallocated to Athletic Alliance for Homecoming Spirit Rally.

Phillips made an announcement regarding an ad for the Salsa Ball from the Latin Dance Club to be held November 4. He had been told that instead of the \$10 normal charge faculty could attend for \$4.

Graduate Faculty Council — Bob Hunger

With minor modifications, the resolution/appeals process for use by graduate students for items not related to course grades or academic integrity was supported by the Graduate & Professional Student Government Association at their September meeting. Final approval by the Graduate Council will be sought at the October 20th meeting of Council.

At the September meeting Graduate Council approved a “Certificate in International Studies.”

Other issues discussed in September and still under consideration by the Graduate Council include:

1. Catalog wording related to providing graduate credit for asterisked courses.
2. Assignment of ‘I’ (incomplete) grades.
3. Guidelines for split votes of graduate committees.
4. Issues related to ‘R’-grades.

Emeriti Association — Theodore Agnew

Dr. Agnew reported in the absence of Bob Swaim who had to leave the meeting early. Agnew reported Tom Phillips made a splendid presentation on the activities and past history of Faculty Council. Various members of the study group remarked to Agnew afterwards that their enthusiasm at the time is only matched by their continued enthusiasm in the future for Tom’s presentation and they wished the Faculty Council well.

New Business

Tony Brown introduced a recommendation from the Faculty Council Executive Committee entitled, “Legislative Priority”. The recommendation, as amended and approved by Council, follows:

Title: Legislative Priority

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: The top legislative priority for the 2007 session be funding to bring, as soon as possible, faculty salaries to the Big 12 average and continue to restore faculty positions.

Rationale:

With our five year list of infrastructure projects, it is now time to make Faculty salary the number one priority of the Administration. To date faculty raise programs under Reward, Restore and Grow have made only minimal gains compared to other Big 12 raise programs, moving OSU only slightly closer to the Big 12 salary average. The Faculty Salary Report 2005-06, prepared by Bob Darcy, reported that the amount “Needed to Bring to Rest of Big 12 Average per Faculty Member in Group Below Rest of Big 12” decreased from the 2002-03 year of \$9,900 to the 2005-06 year of \$9,403, a mere 5%.

After a lengthy discussion, Darcy called the question. Phillips asked for a vote and the recommendation passed unanimously.

Bob Darcy introduced a second recommendation from the Faculty Council Executive Committee entitled, “Electronic Posting of OSU Budget and Salary Documents”. The recommendation, as amended and passed by Council, follows:

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: The administration post all OSU Budget and Salary Documents electronically on the internet. Electronic access would be restricted to OSU faculty and staff with O-Key accounts.

Rationale:

1. This public information should be easily accessible to all individuals that this information may affect (Administration, Faculty & Staff).
2. Having the information posted by the Administration rather than the Faculty Council would provide the appropriate control of this information.

Darcy said one of the arguments brought up in the Executive Committee Meeting against this recommendation was that this would destroy morale. Against that is we as faculty and part of a university should not be advocating blissful ignorance and that the first step to addressing problems is to have people informed and everyone having the same information.

Russell asked if this was not already public knowledge. Phillips said it was at the OSU Library. Darcy said, by statute, it was public information and there is one copy in the OSU Library and one copy in the Stillwater Public Library. However, the difference is, as Dr. Bosserman has pointed out and made clear, that those who want to work with the data will find it much easier if it comes electronically so it can be processed rather than have to sit in the library with someone looking over your shoulder.

Moomaw asked, regarding Rationale 2, if the Administration did not agree to this recommendation would Faculty Council post it on the Internet. Darcy said that was the original discussion but they felt Administration could exercise control over it where Council could not. Phillips said he has all the files on disk and is willing to send a ListServ message electronically. Bosserman said he would be glad to put it out there “in a heartbeat” and just let him know him exactly what you want and how you want it addressed but he wanted to clarify that it was the Budget Book and the Salary Book and not EA’s and other information. He suggested this recommendation be “tabled” until Faculty

Council gets Staff Advisory Council's input. Phillips said he had sent it to Carey Pullins, SAC Chair, and he had not heard back from her yet. Darcy said, should this recommendation pass, it would be a Faculty Council recommendation and then Council would expect that Bosserman ask the staff before administration comes back with their response. Leslie Miller, the SAC representative present at the meeting, said she thought SAC would follow in what Faculty Council was recommending.

Several Councilors expressed concern with regard to possible jealousy issues, some being uncomfortable for themselves and their colleagues to have their names and salaries posted on the internet. Darcy said the *Tulsa World* used "Freedom of Information" last semester and got the entire State budget and published his picture on the front page with his salary next to a picture of President Schmidly and his salary. Russell said he was still concerned about it being published on the Internet.

Tony Brown introduced a friendly amendment to add "Electronic access would be restricted to OSU faculty and staff with O-Key accounts" at the end of the first sentence of the recommendation. The friendly amendment was voted on and passed.

After a lengthy discussion, Nolan called the question. Phillips asked for a vote and the recommendation passed with 14 for and 9 opposed.

Bob Darcy introduced a recommendation entitled, "Optional use of an Academic Mission-based Logo by Faculty and Academic Units" as follows:

The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that: academic units and the faculty of the University may use, at their discretion, the traditional triangle-based logo for business cards, letterhead and other printing and publications in lieu of the athletics-derived 'tilt O' logo.

Rationale:

While we recognize the utility of 'branding' for a university, faculty and academic departments operate in a world-wide, discipline-based context, a context in which a logo suitable for an interstate billboard, a baseball cap or an OSU 24oz Pub Glass might not have the same salubrious impact when corresponding with the editor of a journal, a job applicant or when presenting one's card to visiting dignitaries. A more appropriate logo, a logo embodying the academic mission of the University, will serve academic purposes better.

Darcy showed different business cards with different OSU logos and also his which he said does not have a logo. He also does not use a logo on his letterhead. Also illustrated was the triangle logo that appears on the Faculty Council brochure, as special permission had been received from the President to not use the "tilt-O" logo, and an illustration of another seal used on the latest OSU diplomas. Darcy said according to OSU Marketing and the University the OSU logo with the triangle in the center of the "O" was no longer allowed to be used and instead everyone was to use the "tilt-O" logo. Darcy said a number of faculty had come to him and said they felt the "tilt-O" logo represented athletics and they wanted to use some variant of the triangle which they thought was more representative of the academic mission of the University. Phillips said he had contacted the President's Office about the logo and the Chief of Staff had told him that faculty had ample opportunity for input and Phillips assumed that meant in the Marketing Council. Darcy said John Mowen is the faculty representative from Faculty Council on the Marketing Council and this

issue was not discussed. Darcy said what the Marketing Council said was there was a proliferation of logos and the number must be reduced and nothing in this recommendation is opposed to that. Two logos are fine, but one should reflect the academic mission of the university. Bosserman suggested Kyle Wray, Director of University Marketing, be invited to the next Council meeting and make a presentation on why they went this way and he felt before final action was taken on the recommendation Council should hear from Wray. Glenn Brown said he felt it was all right to use the logo as a sports logo or on a T-shirt but it was not appropriate for letterhead and business cards. Bruce Russell said he would like to hear the rationale for why the “tilt-O” logo was developed. Darcy read an email from Kyle Wray which follows: “I want to be sure that we have all the facts in reference to the logo situation. The history of logos at OSU is a by-product of a lack in strategic and integrated marketing. The logos Bob mentioned, the brick letters, etc., do not incorporate the triangle. The logo with the triangle, in the middle of the ‘O’ was developed purely by accident about 12 years ago by a designer in my office. Before anyone could discuss its merit it was unofficially adopted and has been used ever since, although not exclusively; hence the challenge. The font used was weak and did not make a bold statement to the public. It had been historically confusing to a myriad of constituents. It left us unrecognizable on a state, regional and national stage. We were constantly misidentified as Ohio State and Oregon State, to name a few. The new logo has been restructured from the old one and the catalyst for the change was purely academic. It seems when the logo was created originally the word ‘University’ was a smaller font than ‘Oklahoma’ making it seem subservient. Because the main mission of the institution is to do research and provide instruction and extension of education the word ‘University’ is now bolder and in proper proportion to the word ‘Oklahoma’. This logo makes a bold statement about the institution. It’s unmistakable in the state, region and nation. It incorporates our colors and name in a way that delivers a strategic marketing advantage. It’s braced for longevity. The new style guide for logos and other valuable information is now available on the University Marketing website. You can find it on the ‘Quick Links’ portion of the main page. A hard copy is due out next week. Thanks. Kyle Wray”. Darcy said he thought if Wray we invited to speak to Faculty Council that is what he would say. He continued, this motion was not made without informing the University and obtaining that input but said it was made because faculty had come to him and said they do not like using the “tilt-O” logo. Darcy ended by saying the Faculty Council had to “jump through hoops” because Tom Phillips did not want to use that logo on the Faculty Council brochure and does not like to be forced to use it on Faculty Council letterhead; hence the motion.

Phillips asked for a vote and the recommendation passed with three abstentions.

The three recommendations will be forwarded to Administration for their consideration.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is November 14, 2006. The Fall General Faculty Meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 28 at 3:00 p.m. in the Wes Watkins Center Auditorium with a reception immediately following. An Agenda will be sent to the OSU General Faculty before the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas Jordan, Secretary