

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
March 13, 2007

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

HIGHLIGHTS

Resolution – Congratulations to Interim President Marlene Strathe	1
New Student Orientation.....	2
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	3
Comments from the Interim President.....	4
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	4
Budget.....	5
Faculty.....	5
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology	5
Resolution: Posting of the Regents Board Books	6
Research.....	7
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	
Employee Tuition Benefit Recommendation.....	7
Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Recommendation	10
Rules and Procedures.....	14
Student Affairs and Learning Resources: Beulah Hirschlein	
Resolution: Library Proposal to Relocate Theses and Dissertations	15
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Student Government Association	16
Staff Advisory Council	16
Graduate Faculty Council	16
Regents Professors Committee	16
New Business	
Regents Professor Financial Support.....	18

Phillips asked for approval of the February 13, 2007, Minutes. Darcy moved acceptance of the Minutes. Jordan seconded. The Minutes were approved. Phillips asked for approval of the March 13, 2007, Agenda. Gasem moved the Agenda be amended so a resolution could be presented. Moomaw seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended.

The Chair recognized Bob Miller who presented the following resolution. *“I hereby move that: The Faculty Council offers its congratulations and best wishes to Interim President Marlene*

Strathe. We thank Dr. Strathe for assuming the leadership of our institution, and we look forward to working closely with her on many issues of vital importance to OSU.” Moomaw seconded. The Resolution passed unanimously and was followed by a round of applause.

SPECIAL REPORT: New Student Orientation – Missy Wikle

Wikle distributed a handout regarding new student orientation recommendations and said the Office of New Student Orientation is a new office on campus as of October 2006. She is the Director and Trinity Smith is the Coordinator. The office began as the need for year round orientation became apparent. The Office of New Student Orientation focuses solely on the transition of incoming students from admission through enrollment. The initial charge of New Student Orientation is to enhance orientation from recruitment through enrollment to “seal the deal” and lay a foundation for successful transition into the University community. They have worked with an advisory board which has included Dr. Tom Jordan, Faculty Council Secretary, student affairs, and student academic services across campus. The Advisory Board was called together by Drs. Strathe and Bird, and Mr. Colom to look at issues regarding orientation and to make sure everything the incoming students needed was provided to make them successful. Potential improvements to student success through enhanced orientation programming include: increased first year retention for freshman and transfer students; improved knowledge of University resources to aid in student success; enhanced student engagement with the University community; and greater focus on choosing a college/major/career to assist students in making connections between academic preparation and life after college.

The New Student Orientation Advisory Board identified summer orientation programs as the only time all incoming students are reached and suggested the following for summer 2007 orientation planning: An “academic orientation” should replace the previous “enrollment program”, stressing the academic choices and transitions ahead and including the participation of faculty and administrators; the program should first contact students during recruitment, maintain contact throughout the summer, and lay a foundation for a smooth transition to the fall; Academic Orientation/Enrollment, Camp Cowboy, and ALPHA should compliment each other without overlapping every topic. Planning should be collaborative to include just enough reiteration, emphasizing the most important academic and campus life transitional issues and resources; parent and family programming must be an integral part of the academic orientation. Parents should be given a specific time to connect with academic resources while students should be involved in discussions of financial aid, bursar, and other procedural areas previously reserved for just the parents; Camp Cowboy and ALPHA should focus on an introduction to student life while continuing to include those academic sessions that naturally overlap with student life offices; and sustainable subgroups of the advisory should be created to serve as year round advisory on specific program areas (advising, orientation leaders, campus life, overnight options, etc.). Academic Orientation begins with the resources students receive in recruitment and continues through the initial semester.

To prepare students for the academic transitions and decision making ahead, the New Student Orientation Office will develop a comprehensive website including the following: specialized materials for students and families; connections to program registration using O-Key to maintain integrity; on-line placement exams and placement information; links to Camp Cowboy and ALPHA with descriptions of how the three programs work together in the orientation process; orientation leaders maintain their own “advice and connection” section to include “a day in the life....,” “if I knew then....,” and contact information for maintaining contact until the first

semester begins; and academic preparation sections include pre-advisement worksheets specifically adjusted to the student's student academic services office.

Wikle said her main purpose for attending this meeting was to find out from the faculty what her office could do to get as many faculty involved as possible this summer in orientation. She asked for suggestions on how they could best connect with faculty members to meet with students and specifically to attend the **ACADEMIC PREVIEW**, from 4:00-5:30 p.m., on the first day of orientation so students and parents can meet with Academic Advising units and Colleges to discuss academic decisions related to choosing majors and to collect pre-enrollment information. Following a brief presentation there will be small group discussions with Academic Advisors and Orientation Leaders regarding preparation for the morning advisement. Students who desire to update their college choice will do so at this time.

Mitchell suggested involving departments that have faculty advisors. Leavell suggested those departments that do not have faculty advisors could contact faculty who would be willing to participate. Russell thought there are faculty who would be willing to talk to students and parents. He added in the College of Engineering they have an office of advising and if they are part of the team (Wikle indicated they were) then they could identify individual faculty if there is a specific need so there could be one-on-one meetings. Wikle said sessions this summer begin May 29 and run through July 13 and there are 19 sessions with about 160 students per session.

More information regarding new student orientation can be found on their website at: <http://newstudents.okstate.edu/> or by contact Wikle directly at missy.wikle@okstate.edu.

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

06-05-01-EXEC

Recommendations Concerning Confidentiality Agreement:

Completed. Data identification is an on-going process and will continue ad infinitum. The Exit Committee is working on a Termination-Separation Checklist that would ensure all university property is returned, appropriate notifications are made, and compliance with research requirements, if applicable. To be published by the end of the semester.

06-11-03-SALR

Study Abroad Initiative: Pending. Dr. J. Hromas and Ms. Gerry Auel have met several times with the Study Abroad Committee to discuss issues raised in the FC recommendation. [Strathe added that Ms. Auel had reported they have endorsed the 100% long-term goal with the caveat that this means 100% of the graduating class would have participated in some kind of international experience as opposed to 100% of all students. They also endorse the 25% participation in five years. The advisory committee is putting together an action plan for the fall. Glenn Brown added he hopes publicity can be generated after the report is finalized to advertise this program.]

06-12-03-COUNCIL

Smoke-Free Campus: Pending. Task Force, led by Vice President Lee Bird, continues to review strategies, legality, and timeliness.

- 07-02-01-RFB ***Health Insurance Request for Proposals Recommendation:***
Completed. The Health Care Request for Proposals will be issued
March 23.
- 07-03-01-RFB ***Employee Tuition Benefit Recommendation:***
To Interim President Strathe
- 07-03-02-RFB ***Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Recommendation:***
To Interim President Strathe

Comments from Interim President Strathe

Dr. Strathe is looking forward to continuing to work with the Council on a variety of issues. Most of her time to date has been spent talking to people with regard to the Legislative agenda and reviewing issues in the Legislature. She has been meeting both with leadership in the House and Senate as well as our representatives. She has met with the Council of Presidents which is a group of all of the Presidents of all the universities in Oklahoma and she has met twice with the Chancellor. Several priorities have been identified by the State Regents and the Chancellor and, hopefully, by the leadership of the Legislature as well. One is to increase the construction bond monies associated with construction on campus including the Classroom Building, the Interdisciplinary Science Building, and renovation of South Murray. The cost of materials and construction has increased on all campuses, resulting in original allocations committed to those projects being unable to build the same building as originally planned. Therefore, the State Regents are asking for additional bond monies for all of the campuses to assist with those particular projects. Some of those have been value-engineered down and for others some of the space will be left vacant. Some of the bond monies might be used to complete those projects. They are also very interested in the Endowed Chairs and are gaining support for the State matching those chairs that are in the queue. The State Regents are requesting new appropriations, at least at the level of last year or more, and they will have to wait and see. Senator Morgan is very supportive of the continued support to higher education that was given last year and he has assured us he will be watching that very closely. There is also some supplemental funding that they are looking for, maybe one-time money, and one on the OSU campus would deal with the AG Extension money that we tried to obtain with last year. There is certainly concern about how to identify a more dependable revenue source for the OHLAP project program which is the scholarship program for low-income families in Oklahoma. OSRHE had been counting on tobacco and gambling monies but those have not been generating at the level they had hoped. There is also the question regarding tuition control. At this point the State Regents are monitoring the Legislation as there is no clear notion yet as to what direction guaranteed tuition might take. The revenue projections were a little different then originally identified and so there is some sense that it might be a tighter year.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Jean Van Delinder

The Incomplete Policy was discussed at their last meeting and they looked at the SGA recommendation. The Administration is going to enforce the existing policy rather than modifying it as discussed last fall. They did speak to representatives from SGA who had proposed a Middle East Studies Minor but the committee is not ready to bring a recommendation forward yet. They will also bring recommendations in a few months on student evaluation forms and on-line course evaluations. She also received an update regarding the availability of plagiarism software for faculty – which will be very soon. Also, the administration will now

keep track of minors on the academic ledger. The committee will meet with Gail Gates at their March meeting.

BUDGET — John Veenstra

Veenstra reported the committee is dealing with four issues. 1) The textbook issue, dealing with resale values. They will try and meet with the Ad Hoc Textbook committee in the near future. 2) Endowed Professorships and Chair issue – They have arranged a meeting with the OSU Foundation on March 28. 3) Information on organizational charts the committee has requested. Most information has been received from Joe Weaver's office and the committee is in the process of reviewing. 4) Faculty promotional pay increases.

The promotional pay increase idea was generated internally in the Budget Committee and we decided to approach Joe Weaver with the idea of having an increase in the promotional pay raise and from the committee's point of view this was a very positive, constructive and cooperative adventure with the Administration. We researched approximately 20 universities in the Southern University Group (SUG). Other universities were requested to provide data but they did not do so. The administration looked at the information provided and tried to assess what the budgetary implications would be. We negotiated back and forth and came up with targets we thought were acceptable and submitted the information in an email to Joe Weaver who then submitted it to Interim President Strathe for her review. After reviewing the information she was in agreement with it and a copy of her memo to the Faculty Council Budget Committee was distributed to all in attendance. The promotion to Associate Professor, which is currently \$3,500, will increase to \$5,000 and for promotion to full Professor, which is currently \$5,000, will increase to \$7,500.

Miller asked if this applied to all colleges and Strathe said, "That is correct." She added, "All faculty who are promoted in rank".

FACULTY — Bob Miller

The committee has been working on the Policies and Procedures Letter for the Cumulative Review Policy and they are currently reviewing the final draft. The committee hopes to present it to the General Faculty at the April 17 Spring General Faculty meeting at 3:00 p.m. in the SU Little Theatre. They hope to bring the final version to Council for their approval at the May monthly meeting.

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Nick Materer

In February, the Library catalog stopped functioning due to a hard ware failure on the server. Although IT was able to repair the problem, questions were raised on the reliability of the infrastructure and disaster planning. This issue was discussed with IT. Central IT functions (web, email) have redundancies that prevent the failure of a single server from "bringing down" the system. However, other critical functions do have a single point of failure. The Library server is one of them. A backup server is not possible due to both the cost and software license. Materer believes that the Library is looking into additional solutions for higher reliability. It is believed that this incident will result in better communication and planning in case of a future failure. Communication and planning for problems that span more than one administrative unit is difficult. He encouraged all faculty to let the LRP&IT committee know about technology based infrastructure they are concerned about or ongoing failures that cost time. They can then address these problems with IT or the appropriate department. Materer has also talked to IT about authentication methods to control access. For faculty created documents, it is possible to

utilize the SharePoint server. Access to documents can be limited using O-Key for authentication.

Mitchell asked what the dollar amount was for an additional Library server and Materer responded “tens of thousands of dollars”. Mitchell said if it was a question of a dollar amount shouldn’t there be an effort to find some way of obtaining the money. Phillips asked if they could consider a request to the Student Tech Fee Committee since this is a learning resource issue. Materer replied he thought they could consider that. Mitchell said this issue should not be dropped because he felt it was important for this institution to have a good server to provide that kind of information. Bosserman said it is not being dropped and they are just trying to figure out what the best solution is. He added they could not believe that the license agreement would not allow them to have two servers running, but only using one at a time, and require full licensing on the other; however, that is the product you buy.

Materer presented the following resolution to Council. He said this came out of their committee and it was almost unanimous with one dissenting vote.

Title: Posting of the Regents Board Books

Recommendation

Charge the Secretary of the Faculty Council that all Regents Board Books be available via the Faculty Council website as soon as possible but within one week after each Regents meeting and be protected by a suitable authentication mechanism to limit access to faculty and staff.

Rationale

These books concern decisions of the Regents affecting the faculty and every aspect of the university

Minimal information is posted on the Regent’s home page
<http://home.okstate.edu/homepages.nsf/toc/welcome.html>

The library provides an archival function. Relevant information is provided by the OSU Library in Special Collections. However, these collections are not updated in a timely fashion. Unlike the Salary Books, located at the Circulation Desk, nothing can leave Special Collections, even for two hours.

The Board of Regents have an office in Room 220 of the Student Union. However, they are not obligated to have or to provide copies of the Regents Board Books.

Due to the volume of material, an electronic searchable format is desirable.

Phillips said this resolution came out of committee and did not require a second. He asked for discussion. Moberly commented she had spoken to the Head of Special Collections and University Archives at the Library and she said they process the copy when they receive it and they had received the December copy the week of March 5. Materer said the purpose of Special Collections is for archival purposes. Darcy added these were all public documents, by law, and the essence of them is handed out to the press at the Board of Regents Meetings. Phillips added the Council officers receive them a few days before the Board Meeting but the verbatim copy is

the paper copy that is picked up the day before the Board Meeting. Darcy said it is understood these copies are kept private until after the meeting. Phillips clarified this resolution was talking about just the Board Books and not the Minutes and he thought the Board Book could be scanned the day of the meeting for Faculty Council to purview. Mitchell asked if this was something that should be worked out with the Board. Darcy replied the Board Books originate in the President's Office and are presented to the Board. Russell asked if this was an attempt to bring salaries on-line which Council discussed last fall. Materer said, "I hope not and my personal view is that this contains a lot of information past that of salaries". He added it is easier to get salary information by going to the *Tulsa World* on-line or going to the Library then it is to get some of the information in the Board Books. Bosserman said the Council officers receive the information by email the Thursday before the Friday Board Meetings. Any changes made between that Thursday's electronic copy and what is given to the Board, if it is added it has to be "bolded" and if it is deleted it has to be "struck through". His advice was to wait for the Minutes because they talk about all the committees, what was discussed in the committees about items, who voted, etc. That has all of the information he felt was wanted versus just what the Agenda was. The Agenda does not have the discussions. Phillips said the Minutes were comprehensive. It was also pointed out to him the language in these books concerned decisions of the Regents and at the time the Board Book comes out there have been no decisions. Russell asked "What are we gaining if they are on-line". Materer replied "easy access by the faculty". He added if you looked at other Regent's pages in the state you would find OSU's has the least amount of information". Russell asked, "Beside salaries, what are you trying to see"? Materer replied, "Contractual issues, motions, new programs, anything that affects OSU. The faculty salary aspect is small". Cruz-Rodz, faculty representative from OSU-OKC, said they receive absolutely none of this information and something like this would allow them to look at these documents.

Phillips called for a vote. The Resolution passed with 18 "yes", 1 "no", and 8 "abstentions".

Miller said one of the items passed at the last Regent's meeting was the Master Plan and he had extra copies and anyone interested could pick one up after the meeting. Joe Weaver thanked the Ad Hoc committee that helped develop this plan and for the work that they had provided. He added that part of the recommendations made were taken directly from the report provided by Dr. Gasem's committee.

RESEARCH — Al Rouch

Rouch announced he had invited Steve Price, Director, Intellectual Property and Technology Transfer Office, to give a special report in April to Council. This has not been confirmed yet but Dr. Price has served in his position for a couple of years and Rouch feels he has done good things and thinks faculty should hear about them.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Greg Bell

Bell presented two recommendation on behalf of the R&FB committee.

Bell presented the first recommendation as follows:

Title: Employee Tuition Benefit Recommendation

The Faculty Council Recommends to Interim President Strathe that: the tuition benefit for OSU employees be increased from 50% of tuition to 100% of tuition with no change in the student fees currently required of employees. We recommend that, this become a system-wide OSU policy beginning with fall semester 2007.

Rationale:

Oklahoma State University is clearly behind its competitors in providing tuition benefits for its employees. This proposal provides for better educated employees who add value to the university and to the state of Oklahoma. The proposal helps to improve Oklahoma's educational standing compared with other states, helps to attract and retain more qualified staff, provides an education for students who could not otherwise afford it, and builds loyalty among employees. The program requires a one-time increase in tuition of 0.31% and provides a \$1.1 to \$5.0 million (current value) return on investment in 20 years that continues to grow in perpetuity.

A survey of Big 12 institutions conducted by the RFB committee revealed that 10 of our 11 peer institutions provided a tuition benefit for employees. Of the 11 Big 12 peer institutions, 8 provided a benefit equal to 100% of tuition. In addition, 24 land grant institutions were randomly selected and surveyed. Of those 24 institutions, 23 provided an employee tuition benefit program. Of those 23 institutions, 17 provided a 100% benefit and 19 provided a benefit of 90% or more.

An estimate prepared by the institutional research office for the 2007-08 fiscal year suggests that the cost of increasing the OSU employee tuition benefit from 50% to 100% would result in a loss of revenue for the university equal to \$312,668 based on the 424 employees currently enrolled (see attached sheet). Our tuition/fee income in Stillwater during the 2006-07 fiscal year is expected to be \$123,845,820 provided by 20,949 students (1). The 5% tuition/fee increase projected by institutional research in 2007-08 would increase that figure to \$130,038,111 (2). Increasing the employee tuition benefit to 100% for the 424 employee students currently enrolled would result in a 0.24% loss in tuition/fee income in 2007-08 (3). Since these students are already enrolled, the university cost for educating these students would remain the same. Assuming that an increase in benefit will attract 42 (10%) additional employee students to the system, an additional cost for educating these students would also be incurred unless these students can be absorbed into the current system. Based on fall 2006 enrollment, 20,949 students, we calculate that the potential cost for educating these employees is a 0.2% increase in teaching FTE amounting to approximately \$180 (4). Associated costs for facilities and other expenses are built into the mandatory fee structure that the students will pay. Since these students would not have enrolled prior to the increase in tuition benefit, they do not constitute a loss in revenue for the university. On the contrary, they increase our student population and the increase in student number is likely to help increase our state allotment and have several other positive effects. The total expense of the program is \$312,668 for lost revenue associated with existing employee students and an education expense of \$180 to provide education for the increase in students likely to follow implementation. The total expense is \$312,848 on the Stillwater campus and approximately \$495,130 system-wide (5). This expense could be offset, in 2007-08, by a one-time increase in tuition/fee equal to 0.31%, or 58 cents per credit hour. This one-time tuition/fee increase would continue to pay for the program permanently or until it was deemed no longer necessary. In the long term, the tuition benefit is an investment that returns increasingly higher dividends (6).

Many of the employees educated in this program will eventually leave university employment. Those who remain add value to the system. Many of these employees, regardless of whether they leave system employment or remain, will encourage their offspring to attend OSU. With the education

provided by OSU, the employees will be more likely to be able to afford a college education for their offspring. As these employees return offspring to the university twenty years from now, the tuition benefit begins to pay for itself and its growth becomes geometric with subsequent generations. In a worst-case scenario, an employee undergraduate student would take advantage of the program for 120 credit hours. At today's rates, the loss in tuition income for that student would be the difference between today's 50% tuition benefit program and the 100% benefit program suggested by this proposal, a total loss in revenue of \$6,525 at today's tuition rates (7). Assuming that as few as 20% of the employee students return two offspring (generation 2) to the university, the two offspring's tuition and fees at today's rates would be \$44,864 for 120 credit hours each. In this case, the program returns a dividend of \$38,339 from those employee students who return two offspring (8). However, the parents of these offspring only constituted 20% of the employee students educated by the tuition benefit program so the return on investment was not that high. The parent who returned offspring and four other student employees who did not return offspring to the university represent the total cost of the program which is \$32,625 and the dividend for the first generation is \$12,239 or \$2,448 per employee student. These two offspring for every five employee students return the original investment plus a small dividend in generation 2. The dividends grow exponentially as offspring return students in generation 3 and higher (9).

The current increases in tuition also increase the investment. Last year inflation increased at approximately 3.2% and inflation increases have averaged 3.1% over the last 20 years. Over the past five years, tuition has increased at over 7.8% per year. Assuming that inflation increases to an average of 4% and tuition increases decline to 7% per year, the difference between inflation and tuition would be 3%. If this proposal were implemented in fall 2007 and the tuition increase that year exceeded inflation by 3%, the return on investment would increase more rapidly. If the tuition increase exceeded inflation by 3% that year and tuition increases fell to match the inflation rate in subsequent years, the offspring in generation 2 would be paying 3% more than their parents were forgiven in terms of current value. If tuition increases continued to exceed inflation by 3% over the next 20 years, generation 2 would be paying about twice what their parents were forgiven in terms of current value and the program would produce substantial dividends in generation 2 (10).

Last year the OSU Foundation acquired 104.7 million dollars in contributions. Most of those contributions came from OSU alumni. An estimate of the gifts likely to result from this program could be calculated. We have demonstrated that the proposed program will not only pay for itself but produce dividends within one generation. However, if alumni of this program who would not otherwise have been able to afford an education donate to the foundation, the proceeds of the program increase substantially. The 466 employee students likely to take advantage of this program constitute 2.2% of the student population. If these students donate their fare share, 2.2% of \$104.7 million is \$2.3 million dollars per year or \$4,936 per employee student educated in generation 1 with exponential increases for offspring in future generations (11).

The 100% tuition benefit program is a good business investment for the university that benefits all employees by increasing the financial health of the system. A small tuition increase now returns increasingly higher dividends that lower tuition costs in the future. In the long term, the proposal benefits both the students and the university. An investment of \$495,130 returns a minimum dividend of \$1.1 million (present value) in 20 years, with potential dividends of \$5 million (present value) or more (12). The program can be secured in the short-term with a 0.31% tuition increase that amounts to 58 cents per credit hour.

NOTE: Two documents were attached to this recommendation: “Tuition Waivers for Spouses & Children of OSU Employees Project Costs Based on Projected 5% Tuition Increase in FY 2008” and “Projections Determined by RFB Committee, Committee Chair: Dr. Greg Bell”. If you are interested in obtaining copies of these two documents email diane.lafollette@okstate.edu.

Russell said the justification points toward a tuition increase of 0.31% but the recommendation itself did not recommend increasing tuition. Bell said because they were not the ones making that decision. Their advice is to increase tuition by 0.31% but how the administration chooses to pay for this is up to them. Russell said a different way to account for the benefit would be to say, “If you had a little over one million dollars in annual cost and the total payroll was somewhere between three to four hundred million dollars, the total costs to benefits as a surcharge of salaries is probably less than 0.31% and more like 0.25% and maybe that is a better way to discuss this instead of a tuition increase”. He added he is in favor of the recommendation as it reads but he is not in favor of asking the students to pay more money so employees can have free tuition. Bell said it is tied into tuition so that money will always be available. If tuition increases the cost of the program increases but at the same time it offsets itself. He said he did not know if faculty in the room or the faculty that he represents wanted to give up a portion of their paycheck to fund a program like this. He asked last year and everyone in the room seemed all right with that. The Interim President said Bell indicated it was a system-wide policy and she assumed he was saying this would apply to all five campuses. He said, “Yes, that is what they would like to see”. Phillips asked if they received the 50% now for employees. Cruz-Rodz said OSU-OKC did. Ransom said he assumed the 0.31% was in there as a measure of what it would take as opposed to a recommendation that it actually be funded that way. Bell said it is not in the recommendation and only in the rationale. They were asked to provide a business plan, so they provided one. Moomaw said he would like to speak in favor of both recommendations. One of the advantages OSU has in attempting to recruit faculty is that this is a family-friendly community. One of the disadvantages is that the benefit package is very family unfriendly and this recommendation is a very slight move to make it more family friendly. In terms of the real cost and the only relevant monetary cost is the cost of tuition being paid at this time by the affected groups. The additional person that may take advantage of this is effectively at zero cost because one more student in a classroom does not raise anyone’s cost except for a graduate teaching assistant. Russell said he felt if the benefit structure for faculty and staff was improved there might be a net savings by improving benefits because the direct salary remuneration does not have to be quite as large in that recruitment process. We cannot always count on new hires that do not check into the health-care package and then they are unhappy once they are surprised at their first net pay. He explained what he was saying was that perhaps the costs would not be as great as they might seem because the package becomes more attractive to the prospective faculty member.

Phillips called for a vote. The recommendation passed unanimously.

Bell then presented the second recommendation as follows:

Title: Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Recommendation

The Faculty Council Recommends to Interim President Strathe that: the spouses and children of OSU employees be offered OSU classes at 50% of tuition. We recommend that, this become a system-wide OSU policy beginning with fall semester 2007.

Rationale:

This proposal attracts more and better students to the university, helps to improve Oklahoma’s

educational standing compared with other states, helps to attract and retain more qualified faculty and staff, provides an education for students who could not otherwise afford it, and builds loyalty among employees. The program requires a one-time increase in tuition of 0.7% and provides a \$2.5 to \$7.3 million (current value) return on investment in 20 years that continues to grow in perpetuity.

The RFB committee randomly selected and surveyed 24 land grant institutions. Of those 24 institutions, 19 provided a tuition benefit program for employee dependents. Of those 19 institutions, five provided 100% of tuition and 18 provided a benefit of 50% tuition or more. In addition, five of the institutions waived all or a portion of student fees for employee dependents. A survey of Big 12 institutions revealed that only four had an employee tuition benefit program and only three of eight state universities in Oklahoma provided an employee dependent plan. Clearly our region is less progressive than most of the country in this area and Oklahoma State University has the opportunity to take a leadership role. As the second largest employer in Oklahoma and one of the two premier higher education institutions in the state, we need to keep pace with the three smaller institutions providing an employee tuition benefit plan. Only 27.2% of Oklahoma residents are college graduates and Oklahoma ranked 41 out of 50 states in 2005 (1). We can help increase that number by providing affordable tuition rates for the dependents of our employees and influencing other institutions to provide similar plans.

Most of our employees live in Stillwater and their children attend Stillwater High School. An Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Program provides a greater opportunity to attract students from Stillwater High School, one of the leading public systems in the state and provides a potential mechanism for increasing our student success rate.

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education predict that the number of students graduating from Oklahoma high schools will decline from a high of 38,512 students in 2000 to a low of 34,742 students in 2014, a decrease of nearly 10% (2). In order to maintain student numbers, OSU will have to attract more students. The OSU Office of Institutional Research estimates that the Dependent Tuition Benefit proposal will result in an increase of 630 students in Stillwater in 2007-08 (see attached sheet). If our student numbers drop as fewer high school students move on to college, we are in a position to handle the increase in students expected from this proposal with no additional cost to the university. If we can maintain student numbers without these additional students, a cost for education will be incurred but that cost will be covered by future income from the program. If just 20% of the original 630 students return two offspring to the university, the program will account for $630 + 252 = 882$ students in generation 2 and $882 + 353 = 1,235$ students in generation 3, etc. The 252 offspring in generation 2 will be paying full tuition and fees and will not only pay for the program but provide the reimbursement for their parents program plus a return on investment. In generation 3, the 605 offspring attending the university as a result of the program generate a substantial return on investment. In addition, spouses are estimated to enroll in six credit hours per semester. Their offspring will enroll in 15 credit hours per semester at full tuition and fees.

The estimate prepared by OSU Institutional Research suggests that the cost of initiating the Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit in 2007-08 would result in a revenue loss of \$230,215 for dependent spouses and \$503,095 for dependent children resulting in a total revenue loss for the year of \$733,310 in Stillwater. If we assume that the same factors occur system-wide, the total revenue loss system-wide would be \$1,160,575 (3). Our system-wide tuition income during the 2006-07 fiscal year is expected to be \$158,982,135 provided by 33,155 students (4). Initiating the Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit would result in a system wide 3% increase of 997 students (5). These 997 students would

result in a revenue increase equal to 50% of tuition and 100% of fees, \$2,831,057 (6). If all of these students are currently enrolled in the university, no additional educational costs are incurred, the loss of revenue for the program is \$1,106,002, and the loss can be permanently funded by a one-time 0.7% tuition increase, a value equal to \$1.30 per credit hour (7). However, if these are all new students, they provide \$2,831,057 in new income but require educational expenses for personnel and facilities.

For purposes of these projections we will assume that half of these students are already attending the university and half will be new students. We will assume that 499 students are already enrolled and 498 students will be new freshmen or transfers. The 499 students already attending will result in a direct loss of revenue that amounts to half the projected cost, $\$1,106,002 / 2 = \$553,001$. A tuition increase of 0.35% amounting to 65 cents per credit hour will permanently cover the lost revenue. Since both the income and expenses of the program are directly affected by tuition, any increase or decrease in tuition will have no affect on this program. A one-time increase of 0.35% of tuition in 2007-08 that is permanently allocated to this program in future years provides all of the funds necessary to permanently fund the loss of revenue. The only change that could affect the program is if the student body increased or decreased in relation to the number of students in the program. Either occurrence is likely to have minimal affect.

The potential cost for educating the 498 new students is not associated with the revenue losses projected by institutional research because these students provide new revenue equal to \$1,413,006 (8). The cost for educating the new students are the expenses associated with providing their education, primarily an expansion in personnel and facilities. Currently we provide education for 33,155 students system-wide. An increase of 997 students represents an increase in the student population of 3% and requires an increase of 3% teaching FTE and other related services. Assuming that a teaching FTE costs \$90,000, the benefit program would have to pay for \$2,700 in teaching FTE. Some of the associated educational expenses are built into student fees. However, the fees probably do not cover all expenses. Assuming that related costs are three times the FTE expense, the total expense for educating the new students is \$10,800. Assuming that the related expense is 10 times the teaching FTE, the cost for educating the new students is \$27,000. The new students provide \$1,413,006 in new income, 523 times the FTE required to educate them.

Many of these employee dependents will encourage their offspring to attend OSU. With the education provided by OSU, the employee dependents will be more likely to be able to afford a college education for their offspring. As these employee dependents return offspring to the university twenty years from now, the tuition benefit begins to pay for itself and its growth becomes geometric with subsequent generations. In a worst-case scenario, an employee dependent would take advantage of the program for 120 credit hours. At today's rates, the loss in tuition income would be 50% of tuition, \$6525 (9). Assuming that as few as 20% of the employee dependents return two offspring (generation 2) to the university, the two offspring's tuition and fees at today's rates would be \$44,864 for 120 credit hours each. In this case, the program returns a dividend of \$38,339 from those employee dependents who return two offspring (10). However, the parents of these offspring only constituted 20% of the employee dependents educated by the tuition benefit program so the return on investment was not that high. The parent who returned offspring and four other student employees who did not return offspring to the university represent the total cost of the program which is \$32,625 and the dividend for the first generation is \$12,239 or \$2,448 per employee dependent. These two offspring for every five employee dependents return the original investment plus a small dividend in generation 2. The dividends grow exponentially as offspring return students in generation 3 and higher (11).

The current increases in tuition also increase the investment. Last year inflation increased at approximately 3.2% and inflation increases have averaged 3.1% over the last 20 years. Over the past five years, tuition has increased at over 7.8% per year. Assuming that inflation increases to an average of 4% and tuition increases decline to 7% per year, the difference between inflation and tuition would be 3%. If this proposal were implemented in fall 2007 and the tuition increase that year exceeded inflation by 3%, the return on investment would increase more rapidly. If the tuition increase exceeded inflation by 3% that year and tuition increases fell to match the inflation rate in subsequent years, the offspring in generation 2 would be paying 3% more than their parents were forgiven in terms of current value. If tuition increases continued to exceed inflation by 3% over the next 20 years, generation 2 would be paying about twice what their parents were forgiven in terms of current value and the program would produce substantial dividends in generation 2. If, in fact, the projected losses are \$1,106,002 suggesting that all students who will take advantage of the program are currently enrolled, the income from the program minus the expense is \$3,335,398 in generation 2 at present value (12). The program pays for itself and returns a yield of 300% in 20 years.

Last year the OSU Foundation acquired 104.7 million dollars in contributions. Most of those contributions came from OSU alumni. An estimate of the gifts likely to result from this program could be calculated. We have demonstrated that this program will not only pay for itself but produce dividends in the long term. However, if alumni of this program, who would not otherwise have been able to afford an education, assuming the 498 students who are not currently enrolled, donate an average amount to the foundation, the proceeds are substantial. The 498 employee dependents who take advantage of this program constitute 1.5% of the student population. If these students donate their fare share, 1.5% of \$104.7 million is \$1.6 million dollars per year or \$3,154 per employee dependent educated in generation 1 with exponential increases for offspring in future generations (13).

An increase in students results in an increase in athletic ticket sales, team support, and future alumni donations to the athletic program.

The employee dependent tuition benefit program is a good business investment for the university that benefits all employees by increasing the financial health of the system. A small tuition increase now returns increasingly higher dividends that lower tuition costs in the future. In the long term, the proposal benefits both the students and the university. An investment no greater than \$1,106,002 returns dividends of at least \$2.5 million (present value) in 20 years. Potential returns exceed \$7.3 million (14). Short-term funding can be provided by a one-time tuition increase no greater than 0.7%, \$1.30/credit hr. This is the worst-case scenario.

NOTE: Two documents were attached to this recommendation: “Tuition Waivers for Spouses & Children of OSU Employees Project Costs Based on Projected 5% Tuition Increase in FY 2008” and “Projections Determined by RFB Committee, Committee Chair: Dr. Greg Bell, Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Plan”. If you are interested in obtaining copies of these two documents email diane.lafollette@okstate.edu.

Ransom commented that over the years Stillwater Medical Center has provided an OSU tuition benefit for one dependent as a recruiting tool in hiring nurses and they felt this was a fantastic advantage.

Glenn Brown said OSU probably had some employees that would qualify for the OLAP program and if tuition were waived for dependents would they lose OLAP money. Bosserman said that

might be true because you had to have an expense to have it covered. Phillips clarified that if someone qualifies for OLAP it brings money into OSU. Bob Miller said that a 50 percent tuition reduction is probably 50 percent more than OSU would have received if the program did not exist because these students might not have gone to OSU otherwise. He is not sure that the money that might be lost in OLAP would necessarily be greater than what might be lost from the students never attending OSU. Gasem said the language could always be written that if a student qualifies for OLAP they have the privilege of receiving that money and should they fail to receive that money OSU would cover 50 percent of their tuition. Bosserman said he would modify that by having gap funding by saying that if you qualify for OLAP then you can receive up to the amount of the tuition for the courses you take by insuring mandatory fees which are not covered by OLAP. Russell said he thought what the Rationale was saying was that we could build good will with employees. Many schools have reciprocal agreements with other universities. He received his PhD from the University of Texas and faculty there can send their dependents to Notre Dame and receive tuition benefits because Notre Dame has a reciprocating agreement with the University of Texas. If there is not a policy in the first place there is no hope of having reciprocating agreements in the future. He feels this is a very important step for a relative small cost and that the administration could help out in recruiting and maintaining a high-quality faculty.

Cruz-Rodz said he graduated from the University of Puerto Rico and his son, who was a Valedictorian, is now attending that university instead of OSU because of a similar dependent tuition waiver program. This is the strategy the University of Puerto Rico has used to attract faculty because of their lower faculty salaries.

Phillips called for a vote. The recommendation passed unanimously. Phillips thanked Bell and his committee for their outstanding work. Round of applause followed.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Ron Moomaw

Council elections are currently in progress. All ballots will be in the mail by March 16 with a return date of Wednesday, April 4. The OSU Center for Health Sciences in Tulsa had only one candidate and the Nominating Committee added the name of Stan Grogg, with his permission, to provide two candidates on the ballot. There was only one nomination for the vacant position from the College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology. The Nominating Committee was unable to obtain a second name. Phillips asked for nominations from the floor. There being none, the one faculty member nominated will be placed on the ballot with “approve” or “disapprove”.

Russell said two months ago he had ask the Rules Committee to look at the rules of Council to see whether or not the recommendations and resolutions of the Council should require a majority of voting members (Councilors) to pass as opposed to a majority of members (Councilors) present. Phillips said the by-laws state, “A quorum shall consist of a majority of the voting members of the Council” and to make this change would require a vote of the General Faculty and would require a quorum, which, according to the by-laws state, “A quorum shall consist of one hundred (100) voting members of the General Faculty”. Russell said he hoped a greater consensus would develop when recommendations are brought to Council. Moomaw said the Rules Committee would look into the issue.

STUDENT AFFAIRS AND LEARNING RESOURCES — Beulah Hirschlein

Hirschlein said they acknowledged the progress made on the Study Abroad Initiative and gratefully acknowledge the offer for visibility in the media which would cast us in a leadership position on our peers and at the same time inspire our faculty and students to take advantage of the opportunity.

The committee met on February 14 and Dr. Gail Gates informed the committee of many factors associated with student assessment of academic fees. They realized that everything affects everything else and it was a very interesting session. She recommended it as a report for Council in the future.

Hirschlein presented the following resolution to Council:

Title: LIBRARY PROPOSAL TO RELOCATE THESES AND DISSERTATIONS

***WHEREAS* the library has two print copies of OSU theses and dissertations, and**

***WHEREAS* first copies of theses and dissertations are held in the Special Collections and University Archives department where they can be consulted from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday, and**

***WHEREAS* theses from 2004 have been digitized and are freely available online, and**

***WHEREAS* many of the older theses are in fragile condition that would be impossible to replace, and**

***WHEREAS* all dissertations from 1961 forward are already available online, and**

***WHEREAS* plans are in place to digitize theses written from 1995 through 2003 and dissertations written between 1942 and 1960, and**

***WHEREAS* the Library is urgently in need of space to store items deemed more useful to students and faculty,**

***THEREFORE*, be it resolved that we support the Library staff proposal to move second copies of theses written from 1919 through 1994 and dissertations written between 1942 and 1960 to the Library Annex.**

This resolution was submitted on behalf of the Faculty Council Executive Committee. Rich Paustenbaugh from the Library was available to answer questions.

Miller asked why the portion regarding dissertations did not go back to 1919 as well. Paustenbaugh replied because the first dissertation was not written until 1942. Moomaw asked why something that seemed so reasonable and obvious had to be brought to Faculty Council for discussion. Hirschlein replied it was a courtesy on the part of the Library by saying what happens in the Library does concern the faculty. Hunger said this was also circulated through Graduate Council and they reported no problem with this issue.

Phillips called for a vote. The Resolution passed unanimously.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Student Government Association — Leah Roper

Roper reported a recommendation (House Bill 17671) supporting a cap on tuition at OSU had gone to the Board of Regents and the Oklahoma State Legislature. This Bill passed once by a narrow margin of 14-12-2; however, the SGA President vetoed it because she felt it needed a majority vote. It came up a second time and passed by a majority of votes.

Staff Advisory Council — Bonnie Gladden

- **Staff Appreciation Picnic** is April 12 on Willard south lawn (rain location Student Union Ballroom). Cherokee Strip will cater. As always, SAC appreciates the Faculty Council's volunteers who help serve.
- Staff Advisory Council passed unanimously at their 2/14/2007 meeting a "Recommendation that Administration create an equity pool (or pools) in addition to the anticipated annual raise program to be used to increase staff salaries in positions and job groups that are below the appropriate external market. Additionally, Staff Advisory Council recommends that funding above that required by an increase in the minimum wage include funds to maintain an appropriate pay difference among jobs (with special consideration for longevity and performance) affected the increase pay for entry level jobs."
- Carey Warner, Staff Advisory Council Chair, continues to take an active part in the **Health Care Task Force** which has recommended that a consulting firm be hired to review OSU's health care programs and present recommendations to be taken to the Board of Regents in May (hopefully) with the possibility of implementation in 2008.
- Staff Advisory Council has been apprised of Faculty Council's recent recommendations surrounding **Employee/Dependent Tuition Benefits** and will be discussing supporting these recommendations at their meeting on March 14.

Graduate Faculty Council — Bob Hunger

- Currently in process of electing a new Vice-chair of the Graduate Council, with the two candidates being Lowell Caneday (Leisure Studies) and Dennis Seager (Foreign Languages and Literature). Ballots due on March 13th.
- In March, Graduate Faculty Group meetings are held. Items being discussed at these for which the Graduate Council is strongly looking for input on include:
 1. Possible revisions to assigning of R-grades.
 2. Possible revisions to the guidelines by which PhD candidacy is achieved.

Regents Professor Committee — Ranga Komanduri

Dr. Komanduri is Chair of the Regents Professors Executive Committee and he thanked the Faculty Council for the opportunity to share his thoughts. He said the Regents Professors are part of the faculty, just like the Assistant Professors, Associate Professors and Full Professors and not a separate entity. Just as Assistant Professors are promoted to Associate Professors, and Associate Professors to Full Professors, Full Professors are promoted to Regents Professors. So, they are part of the chain. Each promotion has its own criterion. So, whatever salary increases

are given to Assistant and Associate Professors upon their promotion, similar increase in salary should be considered for the Regents Professors. In the document containing the nomination and appointment process for Regents Professors, it states “the position of Regents Professor is the most prestigious rank that may be attained in recognition of scholarly accomplishments by faculty in the Oklahoma State University system. This permanent position recognizes faculty who have made important contributions to their discipline. It also states that the position of Regents Professors is awarded to faculty who have advanced their discipline through exceptional accomplishments in research, creativity, or scholarship.” Unfortunately, such an elite position currently carries no financial reward.

For a long time, the position of Regents Professors was like an untenured Assistant Professors. Every four years, they have to prove that they are worthy of the title. The title was honorary and was prohibited from any financial reward. There are Regents Professors who have been in that position for over 35 years (Dr. D. Berlin for example). Komanduri added, “we would like to see that Regents Professors be rewarded when they are promoted from Full Professors, just as Assistant and Associate Professors are promoted to their next higher rank.

Over the past three years the Regents Professors worked closely with the leadership of the administration and accomplished several important things. He wanted to acknowledge and thank them for their support. Under the leadership of President David Schmidly, Provost and Senior Vice-President (now Interim President) Dr. Marlene Strathe, and Vice-president Stephen McKeever, many of the antique rules were changed. For example, the position of Regents Professor is now permanent and does not need renewals. There is a \$30K/year financial support for the Regents Professors lecture series on a permanent basis. A Fall dinner and Spring reception for the Regents Professors was introduced. Dr. McKeever offered the services of Ms. Darla Duncan for the Regents Professors activities. At the request of Dr. Strathe, the library has agreed to exhibit photographs of the Regents Professors. In return, the Regents Professors have agreed to nominate a person to address graduate students at the graduation. They have also agreed to nominate a Regents Professor to give Kick-Off presentation at the Research Week every year. At the request of Dr. McKeever, the Regents Professors have agreed to appoint a committee to advise Dr. McKeever on key research issues, etc. The Regents Professors have agreed to mentor junior faculty as well as honor students. They have requested some financial support by way of student stipend for the honor students. The Regents Professor lecture series will now be open to public. Komanduri added they plan to have at least two lectures per year which will include one by a distinguished external speaker and the other by a Regents Professor. Dr. Donna Branson, Regents Professor, gave a presentation on March 7, 2007 on Protective Clothing Research: Body Armor, which was extremely well attended. They plan to have a Nobel Prize winner in Chemistry (1981), Dr. Roald Hoffman on April 12, 2007. Next Fall they plan to have Regents Professor, Dr. Agrawal, give a lecture on his specialty. In conclusion, Dr. Komanduri said, “I would like to state that together we have addressed many issues and would like to address some of the remaining issues working with the Faculty Council and the Administration”.

Moomaw asked who the Nobel Laureate would visit with. Komanduri replied, “The entire University”. He said several years ago it was just the Regents Professor in the Library; however, it has been decided to open the lectures to the public. Miller added the April visit will include a technical talk to the Chemistry Department and then a general talk to the public which they hope will not only include the University community but the entire community of Stillwater for the

evening lecture. There will also be an opportunity for faculty and graduate students to meet one-on-one or in small groups.

New Business

Bob Darcy said he had circulated a motion to Faculty Council earlier in the week regarding financial support of Regents Professors. He said this was prompted by a meeting he attended with the Budget Committee where they were going to propose an increase in salaries of \$5,000 for promotion to Associate Professor and \$7,500 for full Professors. The Regents Professors felt this activity should include their title. They have been concerned for some time that, for their title, for the first 30 plus years, it was explicitly stated there would be no financial component to this title. Darcy talked to the committee and was told that for various reasons they were not interested in including the Regents Professors at that time. He prepared the Motion as an amendment to a proposed Motion he thought the Budget Committee would make and was told the committee was not going to bring this to the Faculty Council rather they were negotiating with the President directly and therefore Darcy had decided to bring his Motion as New Business. Darcy said, "We have a very different University then we had several weeks ago. We have a 'hands on' President. We have a President that one can make an appointment with, one can talk to, one can negotiate with, etc. We might define our new President as a 'real-time President' whereas the previous President, for good or for ill, was sort of a 'batch process' President. We saw him at regular intervals and it worked that way. Hence, I feel this Council ought to proceed in a different way on this issue and so I am not going to present the motion and I felt I needed to acknowledge the fact that I heard from a lot of you. I listened to a lot of voices. I was persuaded that a lot more work needs to be done and that's going to happen. I appreciate all of your comments and I am not going to introduce the measure at this point".

Moomaw asked if the Budget Committee refused to deal with this issue and Budget Committee Chair, John Veenstra, replied they had another initiative under way and did not want to add something else. Moomaw moved and Mitchell seconded that the issue for remuneration for Regents Professors be reviewed by the Budget Committee for consideration. Darcy said he respected Moomaw and Mitchell wanting to "push this issue forward" but he thought that on behalf of the Regents Professors he would like to "sit on it awhile and do our homework and come back with a much better prepared proposal". He asked for this motion to be voted down. Mitchell said, "The Regents Professors are our most esteemed faculty on this campus and since I am not a Regents Professor I think this is not self-righteous on my part. These are the faculty that we have accepted as being the top, the best in the professorial. There is no reason why they should not receive remuneration for it. I'm sad to say the Regents Professors had to be the ones to bring this up. It should be the faculty because they represent us. They are the best we have. I have Regents Professors in my department and it has been unfair and not only unfair, it's very different depending on disciplines. Some have been paid well in terms of appraisals but I think that position itself deserves something special. And so, Faculty Council should take the initiative, discuss it, come up with an idea, make a presentation, and that's why I support the motion". Moomaw said he supported the motion as well. He said, "I think these kinds of issues should be dealt with through committee and I think that if the Regents Professors would like to postpone their report to the Budget Committee to sometime in the future I see no problem with that but I think that the first step in the Faculty Council dealing with this issue should come from the Budget Committee".

Interim President Strathe spoke to the resolution Professor Darcy originally identified because based on that information she needed to look at what the cost would be if that level of a salary increase was provided. She shared some general information that the Budget Committee should consider if the motion passed. Strathe said, "I do recognize and appreciate the contributions of the Regents Professors and I do believe there should be some monetary acknowledgement as well as public recognition of the Regents Professors". Paper copies of a Memo from Strathe (copied below) to the Faculty Council Chair and Faculty Council members were distributed to all present and Phillips said that if the motion passed the Budget Committee would consider it in addition to any other information from others if provided. Phillips added the Budget Committee would be happy to accept information from the Regents Professors as an autonomous yet highly integrated group of the faculty. Russell said he did not think that would preclude the Regents Professors from addressing this body independently. Phillips replied, "Absolutely" and that is why we were happy to have Dr. Komanduri here today".

Miller called the question. The Motion to send to Budget Committee passed with 26 "yes", 1 "no", and 1 abstention.

Memo below from Provost Strathe regarding Regents Professor Financial Support.

March 13, 2007

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Tom Phillips, Chair of Faculty Council
Faculty Council Members

FROM: Marlene I. Strathe
Provost and Senior Vice President

SUBJECT: *Regents Professor Financial Support*

In response to the resolution passed by the Regents Professors I provide the following information:

- Average Regents Professor Salary: \$125,351
- Regents Professor Salary Range: \$73,500 - \$227,645
- Average Full Professor Salary at OSU: \$85,200
- Average Full Professor Salary of Big XII: \$102,519
- Current Number of Regents Professors: 41
- Proposed Incremental Increase: \$10,000
- Total Salary Dollars Needed: \$410,000
- Fringe Benefit Dollars Needed: \$127,100
- Total Salary and Fringe Benefit Dollars Needed: \$537,100

- Cost of 1% Salary and Fringe Benefits for Faculty: \$800,000
- Proposed Increment Cost as % of Cost of 1%: 67.14%

Additionally, from any finite salary pool approximately \$200,000 is needed annually for faculty promotional increases across the university. The approved promotional increases will raise this to an estimated \$250,000. Consequently, the combination of the promotional increases, plus the requested Regents Professor increase, would reduce the available salary pool monies by 1%.

I am committed to providing salary increases to the faculty and staff of Oklahoma State University consistent with the OSU Board of Regents' approved "Restore, Reward and Grow Initiative" and available resources. Additionally, I recognize and appreciate the accomplishments and contributions of the Regents Professors, and believe they deserve a financial award as well as public recognition. We do not, however, anticipate a significant increase in new funding dollars during the coming year. As such, I believe it important that the above information be considered as the members of the Faculty Council discuss this resolution.

The meeting adjourned at 4:53 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is April 10, 2007 and the Spring General Faculty Meeting is Tuesday, April 17, 2007, 3:00 p.m., Student Union Little Theatre.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas Jordan, Secretary