

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES  
250 Student Union  
February 13, 2007

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

**HIGHLIGHTS**

---

Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations .....	2
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies .....	3
Athletics .....	3
Budget .....	5
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security .....	5
Faculty .....	7
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology .....	7
Research .....	8
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	
Health Insurance Request for Proposals Recommendation .....	8
Rules and Procedures	
Vice Chair Nominations .....	10
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Student Government Association .....	10
Graduate Faculty Council .....	11
Women’s Faculty Council .....	12
New Business	
Recommendation: Funding Priority for Endowed Chairs and Professorships .....	13
Vote to form a special Tenure Track Adjustment Related to Family Leave committee .....	13
Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) representative .....	13

---

Phillips asked for approval of the January 9, 2007, Minutes. Darcy moved acceptance of the Minutes. Cruz-Rodz seconded. The Minutes were approved. Phillips asked the February 13, 2007 Agenda be amended and recognized Bob Miller, Chair of the Nominating Committee.

Miller said Earl Mitchell retired last month and stepped down as Chair of the Rules & Procedures Committee. Miller said the Nominating Committee met and were nominating Ron Moomaw for appointment as Acting Chair through May 31, 2007. Darcy moved and Jordan seconded. The motion passed unanimously. Phillips asked for approval of the Agenda. Darcy moved and Jordan seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended.

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

- 06-05-01-EXEC ***Recommendations Concerning Confidentiality Agreement:*** Pending. Information Technology is working with Desire2Learn on a method which will allow open enrollment into the security classes. Topics for the security classes will range from secure internet usage to explaining policies and procedures. These classes will be available by mid March.
- 06-10-01-EXEC ***Legislative Priority:*** Input acknowledged but not accepted. The Board of Regents has approved a “Restore, Reward and Grow” approach to faculty development that will be continued as resources are available. The highest legislative priority for OSU will be for formula funding that can be used for faculty and staff salaries as well as other institutional priorities.
- 06-10-02-EXEC ***Electronic Posting of OSU Budget and Salary Documents:*** Not accepted. The information is already available in our library and on a web-site maintained by the Tulsa World. There is concern that the information could be accessed and used inappropriately by people outside of OSU.
- 06-10-03-COUNCIL ***Optional use of an Academic Mission-based Logo by Faculty and Academic Units:*** Not accepted. The OSU Marketing Office initiated a study of the logo problem a year ago. There were no less than ten logos being used by various entities across the campus. The block “O” was presented to the OSU Marketing Council. The Council recognized the word “University” was smaller than the word “Oklahoma” within the logo. It was decided to update the logo by focusing on the word “University” and the academic symbolism represented by that word. The logo and its various uses were brought before the Council and they were recommended for the President’s Office approval. After approval was given, a comprehensive university style guide was developed to direct the system, campus, colleges, and departments in their use of the logo. Exceptions to the use of the logo can be granted on a case-by-case basis by the President’s Office.
- 06-11-02-RES ***Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects in Research:*** Accepted. The proposed policy has been approved by the associate deans for research, Legal Counsel and the Council of Deans.
- 06-11-03-SALR ***Study Abroad Initiative:*** Pending. Dr. J. Hromas and Ms. Gerry Auel are developing a response to the recommendation.

- 06-12-01-ASP ***Wellness Class Recommendation:*** Accepted. The health/wellness class (HHP 2603) will remain an elective rather than become a core course for the curriculum.
- 06-12-02-FAC ***Annual Faculty Appraisal and Development Program:*** Accepted. The proposed policy was shared with the Council of Deans on December 14 and discussed during the January meeting. Provost Strathe recommended to the President that the proposed policy be accepted with minor modifications. [The Provost added the minor modification was that faculty would be appraised on the calendar year.]
- 06-12-03-COUNCIL ***Smoke-Free Campus:*** Pending. Task Force formed and meeting to review strategies, legality, and timeliness.
- 07-02-01-RFB ***Health Insurance Request for Proposals Recommendation:***  
To President Schmidly

Phillips clarified that the new A&D policy would take affect next year although there are some colleges that are doing their own within their college which is fine. However, if you have not heard anything you are still under the same system as in the past and that means there could be formals and informals going on at the present time.

Phillips asked Bosserman if he wanted to comment on the “*Electronic Posting of OSU Budget and Salary Documents*” recommendation. Bosserman said when the issue was originally brought up he was asked if electronic posting could be done and he answered, “Yes, it can be done”. However, after input from Faculty Council and Staff Advisory Council, the Executive Team met and decided for the reasons given above it should not be done. He added it was not a question of can be done but that a decision was made not to do it. Phillips added it was not a unanimous vote in favor in Faculty Council or SAC but both were in favor of posting electronically and administration objected to that.

Phillips commented regarding the “*Optional use of an Academic Mission-based Logo by Faculty and Academic Units*” recommendation. He had spoken to Chief of Staff, Al Goodbary and he wanted relayed the thought of the President, who Phillips had already heard from in person, saying there is certainly flexibility in this issue and the President is very willing to hear any requests for waivers or variances on a case-by-case basis.

## **REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**

### **ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Jean Van Delinder**

Van Delinder commented on a GPSGA recommendation similar to the one the ASP committee brought before Council last November regarding the Incomplete Policy. The main concern of GPSGA is the integrity of student grades and the committees last meeting was spent mainly discussing that issue.

### **ATHLETICS — Kris Giles**

Giles reported that OSU faculty and staff supported their student athletes in 2005-06 with \$1,391,409 in season ticket sales and donations. Football was most popular with faculty and

staff; 103 club seats and 1,251 season tickets were purchased, with a total of \$285,694. Men's Basketball's 7565 season tickets brought in an additional \$275,940. Wrestling had 160 faculty and staff season tickets (\$9,600); and baseball 79 (\$9,322). Women's basketball had 157 faculty and staff season tickets (\$10,205). Softball and soccer had only eight faculty and staff season tickets for \$336 and \$312. An additional \$800,000 was donated through the Posse. Faculty and staff purchase a significant number of game-day tickets and make donations to the athletic department as well. The \$1,391,409 represents only dollars received from season tickets and associated donations, and does not include the significant contributions associated with individual game-day ticket purchases or donations independent of season tickets. These additional contributions would significantly increase the total annual contributions by faculty and staff at OSU.

Employees at the OSU ticket office and the POSSE summarized 2005-2006 data on season ticket purchases and donations to Athletics at the request of the Athletics Committee of the Faculty Council.

Contributions to OSU sports during the 05/06 year by faculty and staff

	2005-06			Total \$
	# of Accts	Ticket Price	# of Season Tix	
Baseball	42	\$118	79	\$9,322
Football	562	\$211	1,251	\$263,961
Football Club Seats	36	\$211	103	\$21,733
Softball	6	\$42	8	\$336
Men's Basketball	380	\$365	756	\$275,940
Soccer	6	\$39	8	\$312
Wrestling	81	\$60	160	\$9,600
Women's Basketball	83	\$65	157	\$10,205
			<b>2,522</b>	<b>\$591,409</b>
Donations made to the posse associated with tickets				<b>\$800,000</b>
Minimum annual contributions				<b>\$1,391,409</b>

\*These figures do not include non-season ticket purchases: ex. individual game-day tickets.

\*These figures do not include donations to the posse independent of season tickets.

While faculty and staff also spend their money on interests other than OSU athletics, it is clear by the number of tickets sold and annual donations that many faculty and staff consider athletics an important component of their OSU experience.

**BUDGET — John Veenstra**

The committee had requested information from Joe Weaver's office regarding the University organizational charts. The committee has also requested information on the energy savings issue. A third item the committee is looking into is the textbook resale and non-resale issue.

**CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Khaled Gasem**

The Ad Hoc committee to review the Master Plan provided their findings and recommendations and they were distributed to those in attendance at the Council meeting as follows:

**Background**

After careful study of campus planning at OSU and a number of universities throughout the United States, the Campus Facilities, Safety and Security Committee recommended to the Faculty Council in 2004 that the OSU Administration first establishes a Campus Planning Office outside of Physical Plant, and then develop a Master Plan for the Stillwater campus. The Faculty Council approved the Committee's recommendation and forwarded it to the OSU Administration. The OSU Administration accepted the recommendation "in concept."

The OSU Administration followed the Faculty Council recommendation but not in the proposed order. The Administration hired a consulting firm (Benham) to prepare the master plan before the planning office was established. In retrospect, the master planning effort would have been more effective if the Faculty Council's recommendations to first establish a Campus Planning Office was implemented. The planning office could have been involved in selecting an experienced campus planning consulting firm and facilitating the planning process.

Following a review of the master plan developed by the Benham, a new Facilities Planning Office (FPO) was established to oversee (a) a revision of the master plan, and (b) the construction projects on campus. During the summer of 2006, the newly-established FPO, relaying on three faculty members from the School of Architecture at OSU, revised the Benham draft master plan into a preliminary master plan. Currently, the FPO is seeking comments from all campus consistencies on the preliminary master plan. As part of this effort, the Campus Facilities, Safety and Security Committee formed a Professional Ad Hoc Advisory Committee to review the preliminary Campus Master Plan for the Faculty Council before making its recommendations to the Faculty Council.

The findings of the Ad Hoc Committee are contained herein.

**Findings and Recommendations of the Ad Hoc Advisory Committee**

1. The OSU Administration is now to be commended for establishing a Campus Planning Office in the fall of 2006 to finalize and maintain the current Master Plan for the Stillwater campus. The campus planning office should be (a) modeled after similar campus planning offices of peer universities with a capital programming function, and (b) broadened to include professionals experienced in campus planning such as a certified AICP planner to better coordinate campus facilities, and a registered CLARB professional landscape architect to enhance the site amenities of the campus.
2. When the master plan is revised, it should reflect a shorter planning period. Current theory and practice in planning is to have a Planning Period of 10 years not 20 years as indicated by the preliminary master plan. This is because master planning now takes place in a world of rapid change in technology and socioeconomics.

3. The master plan should be thought of as a living document and should be developed in a digital format that can be reviewed annual and updated at the end of each academic year and kept current. Current copies of the master plan can be reproduced with the supporting data as needed. The master plan should not be produced as a static document in the form of a final report or models. Further, a professional advisory group, like the Ad Hoc Committee, should be used to review the proposed changes annually.
4. When the contents of the master plan are updated, it is recommended that an overlay methodology of each planning element (landscape amenities, utility distribution systems, circulation systems for motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians, maintenance access to all buildings, historic features, public art, etc.) be developed along with a composite analysis map showing opportunities and constraints on which planning proposals can be analyzed.
5. The principle of adaptive use in planning (i.e., consideration of alternative uses for existing buildings) should be considered during the planning process before the demolition of any structure occurs.
6. Since the Facilities Planning Office will use the OSU Master Plan to develop a Capital Improvement Program, it is important to use more accurate projections of facility needs. Further, the impact of OSU expansions in Tulsa and OKC should be considered carefully.
7. It is recommended that the athletic portion of the campus be included in the campus master planning process.
8. It is recommended the master plan addresses transportation needs of motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians. It will be very helpful if the master plan includes short-term (5-year) and intermediate-term (10-year) components that show the planned improvements, if any, to enhance access to campus and traffic circulation within campus.
9. It is recommended that reports and opinions provided by consultants regarding traffic and parking be evaluated by an independent professional body to critique their analysis and the underlying assumptions.
10. It is recommended that right-of-way be secured for future expansion of key traffic corridors in land-locked areas – Hall of Fame Avenue is an example.
11. It is recommended that the findings of the “Stillwater Transportation Enhancement Study,” sponsored by OSU and the City of Stillwater, be evaluated for inclusion in the master plan.
12. It is recommended that buildings and land use be labeled on the Master Plan drawings to improve its comprehension and to identify important uses of space that may not be apparent without that labeling.

Gasem said now that there is a facilities planning office, under Joe Weaver, the committee is supportive of the effort with one caveat in that Weaver will make sure all the recommendations given by the CFSS and Ad Hoc committees are considered seriously and not just “glossed over” because Gasem feels it is substantive material. Weaver said he had received a copy of the report and it would be taken seriously and given full consideration. He added that in the long-range planning, even though the Ad Hoc committee’s work was completed, his group would like to continue to interact with them and the CFSS committee so there would be continued discussions.

Russell asked about what level of investigation, in regard to transportation and traffic movement around campus, was considered. Gasem said the committee made several recommendations in the report. Weaver added that the City of Stillwater decides what happens to Hall of Fame and McElroy; however, OSU is working with the City on the traffic enhancement study they are

doing. The big idea of an east/west thoroughfare is to four-lane Western Street all the way from Sixth Street to Lakeview and to promote Lakeview as the by-pass around the campus.

Darcy said he had been told that John Houck was preparing to recommend to the City that they four-lane McElroy. Weaver said he was not aware of that. Robert Swaim, Emeriti President, said Houck had spoke to the Kiwanis Club and that is where the comment came from. He added Houck said, because of the Athletic Village, they were going to try and four-lane McElroy between Duck and Washington because of all the traffic in that particular section. Phillips said he had invited Houck to address the General Faculty Meeting this spring on April 17 about the Athletic Master Plan and he had agreed.

Darcy asked to what extent the Campus Master Plan and the Athletic Master Plan people were working together because there seemed to be two different ideas with regard to McElroy, for example. Weaver replied he met with John Houck on a regular basis, at least every other week, and the idea to four-lane McElroy was presented to the City long ago and was rejected and he feels it is something that is not currently being considered. Weaver said he supposed it could be revisited at a future date; however, as he understands from the City's plan provided to OSU that there is no real estate on McElroy to give up on either side of the street to allow them to four-lane. Also, there is the issue of who would pay for a four-lane. Weaver added, by direction of the President, he attends any meetings Houck has with the City of Stillwater and feels like they communicate and coordinate together.

#### **FACULTY — Tony Brown**

The committee is meeting every other week to develop the Policies and Procedures Letter for the Cumulative Review Policy.

#### **LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Nick Materer**

Materer reported the committee met and discussed email and SPAM. According to Darlene Hightower, Information Technology, about 85 percent of all email coming in to OSU is SPAM. Materer had sent an email to all faculty and staff about possible solutions to this problem and he received approximately 130 replies. Backing-up these emails each night takes an enormous amount of time. Dare asked why couldn't all SPAM be deleted. Materer replied it is the choice of the person (we are an academic institution) receiving the messages whether they want to delete it or not. If you disregard the SPAM messages they will automatically "go away" after ten days. He added you do have an option of not getting a report of the digest, the mail that contains the list of SPAM emails sent to your account. You can also set options that allows anything coming in to the system that Spamblocker recognizes as SPAM be sent to you. You can also set "white lists" (safe senders) and "black lists" (blocked senders). Materer said they will try and get information out about the safe and blocked sender's lists out to everyone. The committee will also talk to IT about having an additional option to allow only probable SPAM to be quarantined and 100% SPAM deleted. The web site <http://spamblockerhelp.okstate.edu> contains information on how to modify your spam settings, including options about receiving the digest or not receiving it.

**RESEARCH — Al Rouch**

Rouch reported the Entrepreneurial Fellows Program is being worked on and he hope to give an official report at the April meeting. Eventually this information will be posted to the web page. Research Week will begin February 19. Some of the speakers include: Dr. Abel Gonzalez, Senior Advisor of the Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Argentine Government, former director of Radiation Safety at the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA); Dr. Ranga Komanduri, Regents Professor and A. H. Nelson, Jr. Endowed Chair in Engineering, Oklahoma State University; Dr. Frank Wilczek, 2004 Nobel Laureate in Physics and Herman Feshbach Professor of Physics, MIT; Dr. Gary A. Toranzos, Professor of Microbiology, University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras. His interests focus on the ecology of waterborne and soil-borne pathogens; and Dr. Louis Tornatzky is a Professor and Area Chair in the Orfalea College of Business, Cal Poly State University, San Luis Obispo. He has a national reputation for research and consulting on university-industry partnering in areas such as technology transfer and commercialization, cooperative research relationships and workforce development. Rouch encouraged all to attend.

Rouch said for those who work with vertebrate animals there is a new program called “The Investigator Training Program” that is on the Research web page at <http://www.vpr.okstate.edu/>. It is a program that brings OSU into compliance with the Animal Welfare Act as anyone that works with live, vertebrate animals must be trained to work with those animals. Documentation of this training is required for inspection purposes. Charlotte Ownby is the Chair of the IACUC. She and Denver Marlow have put together a program that provides quarterly training.

**RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Greg Bell**

Bell presented the following recommendation:

**Title:** Health Insurance Request for Proposals Recommendation

**The Faculty Council Recommends to President Schmidly that:** the Department of Human Resources immediately prepare and execute a request for proposals (RFP) for a new health care plan for the OSU System and that the RFP include a premium health care component such as our current plan and a high deductible plan with health savings account as an option.

**Rationale:**

The OSU President’s Office has identified the cost of health care as a major concern of this administration. The faculty share that concern. Approximately 30% of our faculty and staff purchase health care for their families on the institutional plan provided by OSEEGIB. The remaining 70% of our employees do not purchase dependent care primarily because the premiums are too expensive. It is difficult to recruit faculty with families to OSU because nearly all of our peer institutions provide better health care plans. Faculty and staff who cannot afford dependent coverage are in danger of financial ruin. These uninsured also affect the premiums paid by other employees and by the people of Oklahoma.

There are three committees, the President’s Task Force on Health Care, the Flexible Compensation Benefits Committee, and the Retirement and Fringe Benefits Committee of Faculty Council on the Stillwater campus and system-wide working toward solutions that could help relieve the high cost of dependent health care. However, these committees have no information with which to make important recommendations affecting thousands of employees. These committees need to know if there is a

possibility of reducing our premiums by employing another provider. The committees also need to know exactly what our prospective costs will be in order to make comparisons with alternative measures.

The chair of the RFB committee acquired estimates from a health care provider in Stillwater for premiums on individual high deductible health care plans (HDHP) with health savings account for individuals and families and computed the difference in health care costs between the HDHP plans and our current plan. These computations were then reviewed by OSU Human Resources and deemed accurate. According to these estimates an individual employee who does not insure dependents could save \$1,110 to \$7,910 over a 5-year period on a high deductible plan and a family of four could save \$51,500 to \$61,756 compared with Health Choice High with no additional OSU funds required. These estimates are based on five health care scenarios ranging from a healthy employee or family to employees or families with extremely high health care expenses. Premiums for a group plan are likely to be higher and we need to find out what the true costs would be. We need formal bids from providers to determine if these results can truly be achieved.

The Faculty Council is not advocating a HDHP only that all options be considered. We are recommending that research be conducted to determine what is available and that a request for proposals be conducted to provide the economic information necessary to make appropriate decisions. We recommend that a request for proposals procedure be initiated immediately so that there is sufficient time to gather information and make decisions before the end of the current plan-year. Otherwise, we will have to continue our current program until January 2009.

Bell said, "This is something that we normally would have done last fall but Human Resources assured us that we were going out for a request for proposals so there was really no need for us to go forward in making a recommendation of this kind". Bell added that when the Health Care Task Force was formed things came to a stop. He added, "We have to go out for proposals now because if we don't we will be on the same plan that we have now until January 2009. That will be the first time we will be able to change over". The first thing that has to happen is to get permission from the Board of Regents at the March 2 meeting and then move forward with a request for proposals. In the meantime, the Health Care Task Force Committee is hiring a consultant that will give a recommendation sometime in April. At that point, the task force will make a recommendation and Human Resources can explain our specific needs to the providers who have said they want to be included. We can then decide which plan is most acceptable and should have a recommendation for a new plan to the Board by the June meeting or by the July meeting at the very latest. If we make that deadline, the new plan can be implemented by January 2008. Bell had received estimates from Blue Cross on a high deductible plan with a health savings account and he has put together some scenarios including a very healthy person or family all the way up to a person who spends thousands of dollars on health care every year. Before the OSEEGIB plan increased in premium and before the deductible went up it really did not make sense for an individual employee to have a high deductible plan with savings account but, depending on the premiums that we are able to obtain from a group plan, it may make sense now. The table is available and you can email him at [greg.bell@okstate.edu](mailto:greg.bell@okstate.edu) if you are interested in seeing it. In every case the individual saves from \$1,000 to \$8,000 compared with Health Choice. That does not mean that you are putting \$8,000 into your Health Savings Account but you save that much money compared with Health Choice. If you are healthy your savings account will grow and earn a small amount of interest. Families could save thousands of dollars

every year because they would no longer have to pay premiums. We may be able to get insurance for families under that plan for less money than OSU pays for individual premiums now. The university may not have to provide any more money for health care than it does now but people who insure dependents would save the money that they currently pay in premiums. Bell wanted it clarified that the premiums for an individual plan are different than those of a group plan. Group premiums are usually higher so we need to get bids from providers to find out if the plan will actually work for us. Group plan premiums are usually higher because insured individuals can transfer from one group policy to another without restriction.

Russell asked Bell if he thought the administration was “on board” with this recommendation and did he expect them to go along with it. Bell said he could not speak for the administration but he felt they were in favor of finding the least expensive health care plan that provides a quality of coverage equal to what we already have.

The recommendation passed unanimously.

#### **RULES AND PROCEDURES — Ron Moomaw**

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

After successive written ballots were taken, the results were as follows: Vice Chair nominees: Ron Moomaw (Department of Economics & Legal Studies in Business) and John Veenstra (School of Civil & Environmental Engineering). Their names will be announced, in writing, to the General Faculty within ten days of the Feb. 13 Council meeting. It was also announced that additional nominations for Vice Chair may be placed on the primary election ballot provided that a petition signed by fifteen (15) members of the General Faculty is submitted by March 9. Blank petitions for Vice Chair, as well as all other vacant Councilor positions, along with voting rosters and memos, will be included in the first election mailing which will be in Campus Mail by February 16.

#### **REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:**

##### **Student Government Association — Leah Roper**

Important guest speakers this month include: Mayor Roger McMillian talked about future directions; Dr. Lee Bird talked about how SGA bills and resolutions are progressing; Holzmann Moss Architecture Group discussing where they possibly see the Student Union being rearranged and future construction; USA Today Readership Program Representatives to talk about choices of newspapers on campus at a low cost to the students; and an IT Tech Representative on Mobile Campus. Important legislation include: Approval of recognized status to groups; approval of new justices to the Supreme Court and a recommendation of the development of a Middle East minor. Darcy recommended the bill entitled “A Recommendation to Oklahoma State University to Create a Middle East Studies Minor” be submitted to the Faculty Council Academic Standards

and Policies Committee for a recommendation to Council. Phillips said this bill will go to the ASP Committee for study.

### **Graduate Faculty Council — Bob Hunger**

Hunger presented the following report:

- Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs conducted by the National Research Council is ongoing. The deadline for program responses is Feb 15<sup>th</sup> and the deadline for faculty responses is Feb 22<sup>nd</sup>. Participation is important. Currently OSU is some above the average response level, so participation is encouraged.
- In January, Graduate Council recommended approval (with revisions, etc.) of:
  1. A name change in an option in Psychology from “Experimental Psychology” to “Lifespan Developmental Psychology.”
  2. A graduate certificate in Business Data Mining.
  3. A PhD in Geology.
- Support and participation in the Research Symposium, which is scheduled for February 19-23, is highly encouraged. 60+ McNair Scholars are presenting, which is up from 3 in 2003, 5 in 2004, ~20 in 2005, and ~35 in 2006.
- Graduate student recruitment is being helped with increased funding, including:
  1. The GAP program.
  2. The Graduate College has budgeted approximately \$50,000 for FY 2007 to support campus visits by prospective graduate students this spring. This will be a cost-shared program between the Graduate College and other Colleges/Departments.
  3. The Graduate College has approximately \$500,000 committed for FY 2008 for supplementary doctoral fellowships.
- Graduate applications are up approximately 30% from last year, and the online application system is fully operational.
- Through this spring, a process by which candidacy is established will be examined at Group meetings and meetings of the Graduate Council. This is needed to facilitate appeals and to help students obtain their Doctoral degrees in a timely manner.

Glenn Brown asked why we care about standardizing candidacy protocols across campus. He is a Graduate Coordinator and the Graduate College has been swamping him not only with information, but also the online application process is anything but fully implemented. Gagem said he is a Graduate Coordinator and the online application process is “a mess”. Hunger indicated that admission to candidacy and the online application process are two separate issues, and that although there had been some problems with the online application process, Dean Emslie indicated that these were resolved. Hunger said the standardization of candidacy has to do with a number of issues but in particular with the appeals process because a Ph.D. student is not really under the auspices of the Graduate College until they are admitted to candidacy. Appeals of grades in academic courses falls to the Grade Appeals Board. Appeals of other academic matters related to graduate education (for example, appeals of graduate committee exams, defenses, etc.) are made to the Graduate College after a Ph.D. student has been admitted to candidacy, or for a masters student when the issue is under direction of the graduate

committee (which is approved by the Graduate College). Some graduate exams are administered by departments rather than graduate committees, and that creates problems when a graduate student wants an appeal of that because they want to come to the Graduate College even though departmental exams are not the responsibility of the Graduate College. For example, in Biochemistry, the Department (not the graduate committee or the Graduate College) administers accumulative exams. Appeals of these do not come to the Graduate College because these are department exams. That is one of the main reasons the Graduate College and the Graduate Council are looking to clarify and standardize the process of admission to candidacy. Brown said the problem now is the graduate admission process. Moomaw commented on the standardization. He had attended a meeting on the NRC assessment with several professors and Dean Emslie, and it was very clear that different disciplines across the nation have different ways of doing this and to try and standardize that is like trying to standardize what the entire academic community would be doing and he does not see the point. Hunger said he agreed that it would be very difficult. Phillips said the issue is “candidacy” and that is defined at the college level and only related to Ph.D. students. He thinks if each department could determine when a Ph.D. student becomes a candidate for a degree that would solve the problem. Rouch said he understood that a Ph.D. student becomes a candidate for the degree once he or she passes the preliminary examination administered by the advisory committee as stated in the Graduate Catalog and that is standard university-wide. Phillips said different departments follow different guidelines. Hunger indicated he would convey comments and concerns on both issues (candidacy and the online admission process) to Dean Emslie and the Graduate College.

### **Women’s Faculty Council — Jean Van Delinder**

Women’s Faculty Council announces its annual competition: AWARDS FOR RESEARCH AND SCHOLARSHIP BY WOMEN. The Women’s Faculty Council invites women graduate and undergraduate students currently enrolled at Oklahoma State University to apply for awards for research/scholarship projects. These awards are sponsored by Women’s Faculty Council and the Graduate College. This year the council will present four awards of \$250.00 each this spring. The awards will be given out as follows:

- 1 (one) award for an undergraduate student in humanities or social sciences
- 1 (one) award for an undergraduate student in the sciences, mathematics, or engineering
- 1 (one) award for a graduate student in the humanities or social sciences
- 1 (one) award for a graduate student in the sciences, mathematics or engineering

The awards are open to students at both OSU-Stillwater and OSU-Tulsa. The student must be the sole or primary author of scholarship completed within the last year, or of a project to be completed within the following year. All topics are relevant, but the primary work must have been done by a woman student. Appropriate projects include theses, dissertations, projects completed for coursework, and creative works.

Works in progress will be considered; however, completed projects will be preferred over those that are not yet complete. Students should submit all materials preferably via e-mail by the deadline, 5:00 p.m. on Friday, March 2nd, 2007. Detailed information can be found on the Women’s Faculty Council website at: <http://womensfacultycouncil.okstate.edu/> or by contacting Michele Seikel at [michele.seikel@okstate.edu](mailto:michele.seikel@okstate.edu).

### New Business

Darcy presented a recommendation from the Faculty Council Executive Committee entitled **“Funding Priority for Endowed Chairs and Professorships”**. This recommendation requested Oklahoma State University (OSU) raise more funds for endowed faculty chairs and endowed professorships to match state-appropriated funds that are made available for this purpose. After a lengthy discussion and two amendments Council determined the recommendation, as written, did not have a specific goal or plan to increase money raised, which raised questions by some Councilors regarding its value. Moomaw moved to send the recommendation to the Budget Committee for action at the next Council meeting. Mitchell seconded. The motion passed with 19 “yes” and 6 “no”.

Tom Phillips asked for Council’s approval for the establishment of a special committee on **Tenure Track Adjustment Related to Family Leave**. The committee will investigate the current policies at Oklahoma State University regarding extension of the probationary period (a so-called “tenure clock adjustment”) and health related leave or so-called “family leave”; determine if the current policies are in compliance with Federal law, both in words and in practice; and study what is done at other universities with regard to adjustments to the tenure clock related to family or health leaves of all kinds. The committee is thus charged to prepare a summary report on findings, and if warranted, suggest a Recommendation that Faculty Council could make to improve and ensure equitable, consistent and streamlined implementation of requests for tenure track adjustments based on family leave and related needs for all OSU faculty. The work of the special committee should be completed by the May 8, 2007 meeting of Faculty Council. The special committee shall be composed of the following members, with College or Unit affiliations given: Barbara Miller, Chair (Library); Kathleen Kelsey (CASNR); Kay Bull (Education); Gregory Wilbur (CEAT); Frederique Knottnerus (Arts & Sciences); Matthew Brosi (HES); and Carolyn Hernandez, *ex officio*, Advisory (Affirmative Action Program Director)

Darcy moved approval and Moomaw seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

Phillips reported Ed Lawry, Faculty Council’s representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), had retired and moved out-of-state. He recommended Sandra Goetze as the replacement. Darcy moved and Jordan seconded. This recommendation passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is March 13, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,  
Thomas Jordan, Secretary