

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES
250 Student Union
April 10, 2007

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

HIGHLIGHTS

Intellectual Property Management at Oklahoma State University	1
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations	5
Comments from the Interim President.....	5
Renovation of Student Union - SGA	6
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies	
Recommended Policy on Academic Integrity	6
Budget.....	8
Campus Facilities, Safety, and Security	8
Faculty.....	8
Long-Range Planning and Information Technology	9
Research.....	9
Retirement and Fringe Benefits	9
Rules and Procedures.....	10
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Staff Advisory Council	10
Graduate Faculty Council	11
Emeriti Association.....	11
Women’s Faculty Council	11

Phillips asked for approval of the March 13, 2007, Minutes. Darcy moved acceptance of the Minutes. Jordan seconded. The Minutes were approved. Phillips asked the Agenda be amended so a partial report from Nick Materer, Chair of the LRPIT Committee, could be presented after the Special Report due to its relevance. Phillips then asked for approval of the April 10, 2007, Agenda as amended. Jordan move and Miller seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended.

SPECIAL REPORT: Intellectual Property Management at Oklahoma State University – Steve Price

Dr. Price is the Assistant Vice President for Research and Technology Development and Director of the Office of Intellectual Property Management at OSU. Their mission is to foster the creation of innovative technologies and to manage those technologies and other intellectual property for the benefit of the University and the public. This office interfaces between faculty and the commercial sector; works with patent counsel to assess patentability/licensability;

evaluates markets for commercialization of inventions; identifies potential licensees; negotiates terms of licenses; and assists with negotiating problematic sponsored research agreements. Intellectual property is an aggregate of rights resulting from the creative efforts of the mind. It is usually used for data, technical know how, which is protected by patents, plant variety certificates, trade secrets, copyrights, and trademarks. A patent is a legal right that permits the owner to exclude others from making, using, and selling an invention. Exclusionary Right lasts for 20 years from the date and patent application is filed. In return an inventor must disclose the invention to the public. Tests of patentability include: New, novel, innovative – demonstrably different from prior art, new use, and improvement; useful; non-obvious to the person with ordinary skill in the art – surprising/unexpected. Effective June 8, 1995, the patent law changed to that all patents filed on or after that date will be in effect for 20 years from date of filing. This replaces previous 17 years from issue. Steps for obtaining a patent include: prepare invention disclosure report; patent application is prepared by an attorney; patent application is sent to US Patent and Trademark Office for “filing”. Patent is now “pending”; and patent prosecuted, “allowed”, issue-grant made to the inventor, published. Steps in the process at OSU include: Inventor(s) review and fill out disclosure form; Inventor(s) route through the department/college; form is sent to the Office of Intellectual Property Management (OIPM); and OIPM reviews disclosure with the inventor. Then the IP Screening Committee determines ownership. If OSU owns the intellectual property, OIPM protects and markets, in appropriate. Patent Disclosure – The invention disclosure asks for: Good descriptive title; simple description; date it was made; recent literature including talks given and thesis prepared; names of inventors; funding sources, and signatures. In order to secure an earlier filing date, effective June 8, 1995, Provisional Applications can be filed. A provisional is a simpler form of a patent application, enabling rapid securing of a filing date. A complete patent application must be filed within one year of the provisional filing date. In the US a person has one year from the time of public disclosure of an invention to file a patent application. However, this “grace period” is not recognized outside the US, and in most foreign countries one cannot obtain a foreign patent if public enablement occurs before filing a US patent. Therefore, they recommend that the patent process begin before you publish your paper or give a talk. For persons in the laboratory, you cannot patent an invention in the US if it is known or used by the public more than one year prior to the date a patent application is filed. In foreign countries, you cannot obtain a foreign patent if there is any public disclosure before a patent application is filed. Public disclosure includes seminars, poster sessions, theses, and articles. For additional information contact OIPM at 744-6930. The Lab Notebook establishes priority of inventorship, documents “when”, “what”, and “why” of inventive research, documents fulfillment of contracts, and safeguards against loss of research data/observations. This lab notebook is a “diary”, not a “memoir”. It records your current and evolving thoughts and work performed. Have it reviewed, witnessed, and archived. Inventor rewards and incentives include: Royalties (after recovery of costs) – 50% to the inventor; 30% to OIPM; and 20% to the college or division.

Price gave an overview of patent licensing at OSU as well as company start-ups. Relevant to new faculty start-up he thinks there are three “well developed” faculty spin-outs: Aestus, out of the Geology Department; SensorCorr; and the Catalyst Technology Group (CTG). These are companies that involve faculty developed technology. He feels CTG is one of the more interesting ones due to the fact it involves students in the business school. SensorCorr is a company involving Allen Apblett and Nick Materer and Price said this is his “poster child” company of how they prefer to see faculty start-ups arrive because the company involves faculty plus an external CEO. The TBAG (Technology Business Assessment Group) program has been

in existence for approximately one-and-one-half years. Price said he calls this program a “Gap Funding Program” because what it does is help move projects through this gap in development that occurs with all new company formations. That gap is the lack of money that results from where in technology development all federal and state funds are used up and requires more money to move forward. Therefore, the TBAG group was formed and includes OSU and business persons from outside the university. This year is about a \$200,000 program (\$100,000 in the Fall and \$100,000 in the Spring). The source of the money is excess royalties coming about as a result of patents and licensing. Price said he felt OSU has a well functioning patenting and licensing system, as well as the GAP fund; however, he feels what is lacking is a community pool of individuals with knowledge of business. They would like to assemble a group of individuals (CEO’s) that have expertise and are willing to donate their time to help faculty. The need is a system following TBAG, or “gap funding” funding—angel, pre-angel, pre-pre-angel, or “manna” from heaven funding or “angel of mercy” funding—high risk and forgivable and a source of CEO’s/management. Price said the word “angel” is a term used for “angel investors”. These are high-network individuals who are willing to invest at a very early stage of technology.

Price then showed three slides which showed ways of looking at the level of tech transfer activity which included the number of confidentiality and material transfer agreements. These agreements are entered into by faculty who are receiving or distributing materials that usually have terms of a commercial nature. The first slide dealt with disclosures. A disclosure is an official disclosing of a patentable idea to the University. This is a full-page form which gives a brief idea of what the invention is, list the funding that goes into the invention, a list of whether any talks have been given or not and it is signed and dated. There are approximately 30 to 40 disclosures at OSU per year and Price feels like there should be at least 50. Hopefully the TBAG Program will stimulate that. The next slide regarded license/option agreements. OSU does about 8 to 10 licenses per year. These are actually the contract that is negotiated between OSU and a commercial entity. In those agreements there are terms such as royalty rates. The next slide was in regard to royalty income. Price said they are projecting approximately \$1.2 million in royalty in the next year. This comes about as a result of a handful of inventions.

Al Rouch distributed a paper entitled “Entrepreneurial Faculty Fellows Program”. He felt this would be helpful with the TBAG Program mentioned earlier. The Entrepreneurial Faculty Fellows Program (EFFP) makes it possible for faculty members to take time from their regular university roles to establish a company for the purpose of further commercializing technology developed at, and belonging to, OSU. EFFP is intended for spin-off companies that require extensive instrumentation that is unavailable to the researcher outside his/her university laboratory. (For that reason, a web-based company, for example, would not be an appropriate company for this program.) Application for the EFFP should take place well in advance of the requested leave period. Incomplete applications, those without administrative support at each approval level, and those that do not meet the program’s stated mission will not be considered. EFFP applications will be reviewed in two tracks: business and academic. These reviews can occur simultaneously, but both must be completed prior to final review and decision by the Provost and Senior Vice President, and the Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer.

Rouch asked Price if any “angels” had been identified and Price replied, “No, however we have started looking for them. Steve Buzzard, in Steve McKeever’s office, is beginning to work that network”.

Gasem asked what would happen if OSU was not interested in pursuing a patent. Price said his position was it would be assigned to the inventor. He said there is a perception by some faculty that if OSU does assign it to the inventor, and any money is made off the invention, he would argue strongly that OSU should not ask for a return of any kind on the invention.

Greg Bell said he felt the division of royalties was pretty easy to understand as stated earlier – 50% to the inventor, 30% to OIPM, and 20% back to the inventor's department. Therefore, why was 70% going to the Agriculture Dean's Office? Price said if there was any exception to what was stated earlier he wanted to hear about it. Bell said the royalty money in AG stops in the Dean's Office. He wanted to know why the inventor didn't get a check from the University. Price said he would look into the matter.

Phillips introduced Nick Materer who presented a draft recommendation entitled, "Course Management Systems and Extraordinary Use". Copies of this draft recommendation along with two Policy and Procedures letters ("Copyrightable Intellectual Property", 1-0201 and "Intellectual Property", 1-0202) were distributed. The draft recommendation follows:

The Faculty Council Recommends to Interim President Strathe that the use of university-provided systems for course materials management and delivery (e.g., Desire2Learn, VBrick, etc.) does not, in itself, constitute "extraordinary use of university resources" that may jeopardize ownership and/or copyright of the intellectual property that a faculty member may post on those systems.

Rationale: Since classroom technology is becoming increasingly expansive, the utilization of these systems may be considered extraordinary of university facilities. The Copyrightable Educational Material and Other Intellectual Property policy (1-0201 section 1.02) states that the ownership of works created without direct assignment or supervision by the University for teaching purposes remain with the employee who created them except when the creation utilizes "extraordinary use of university facilities."

Faculty should be encouraged to utilize new technologies without the fear of losing copyright control over their materials.

Online materials created by Faculty for teaching purposes should not be treated differently than those created in traditional ways, for example handouts and overheads.

This recommendation does not address materials posted on non-university servers. Faculty members that post content on non-university servers should make proper arrangements regarding copyright ownership with their provider. This recommendation only addresses the possible claim of ownership by the university over coursework materials posted on systems maintained by the university.

This recommendation does not address possible external income generated through the selling of coursework material (textbook, laboratory manuals ...) by a faculty member. These issues are addressed in policy 4-0130 (Financial Conflict of Interest), State and Federal Law, and the Policy Statement to Govern Appointments, Tenure, etc. §1.1.3 that states "Members of the faculty must not exploit students for their private advantage."

Materer said there are procedures in the recommendation to make sure there is not “extraordinary use of university resources” and to clarify that aspect of it. Otherwise, the University can say you are an employee of the university. The LRP&IT committee will discuss this recommendation and if anyone has input for Materer please let him know.

REPORT OF STATUS OF FACULTY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATIONS:

Interim President Strathe, Provost, and Vice Presidents

- 06-11-03-SALR ***Study Abroad Initiative:*** Participation goals accepted; implementation plan due Fall 2007. Dr. J. Hromas and Ms. Gerry Auel have met several times with the Study Abroad Committee to discuss issues raised in the FC recommendation.
- 06-12-03-COUNCIL ***Smoke-Free Campus:*** Pending. The Task Force, led by Vice President Lee Bird, continues to review strategies, legality, and timeliness.
- 07-03-01-RFB ***Employee Tuition Benefit Recommendation:*** Pending. Recommendation will be considered, along with other budget priorities, as the FY 2008 budget is finalized.
- 07-03-02-RFB ***Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Recommendation:*** Pending. Recommendation will be considered, along with other budget priorities, as the FY 2008 budget is finalized.
- 07-04-01-ASP ***Recommended Policy on Academic Integrity:*** To Interim President Strathe

Comments from Interim President Strathe

Dr. Strathe reported the budget stalemate continues at the State Capital. Discussion of a new budget has begun; however, they do not know when it will be acted on. There has been no conversation that can be discerned between the various parties involved. Strathe indicated that the guaranteed tuition bill is still alive with the final format uncertain. It did pass out of the House and has been discussed in the Senate. In the original Governor’s budget there was recommendation for money to match the Endowed Chairs. There was no money for the matching of Endowed Chairs in the compromise budget and there is no sense as to whether there would be money for Endowed Chairs in a new budget that might be put together.

It has been a very productive last 10 days in regard to student awards. Two Udall scholars; one Truman scholar; one National Science Foundation Graduate Fellowship; and one Fulbright award were announced. Two recent academic gifts were announced which OSU is very pleased about. One is a \$1.5 million gift from Sherman Smith that will provide some tuition-free scholarships for students in the College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology. Strathe said he had been a generous benefactor before and this gift will certainly help in terms of scholarships. Last week there was a \$2.5 million gift from Stephen Birch that will provide monies for two Endowed Chairs in the College of Education.

Phillips asked at this time the Agenda be amended so the Student Government Association could present their liaison report. Darcy moved and Jordan seconded.

Student Government Association — Leah Roper and Trevor Sharon

Roper reported, “The Student Union renovation plans vary by amount we want to spend on it. The SGA was going to hear a bill (and actually passed it) recommending that the most extensive plan for renovation be accepted, but cap the student fee at \$4.25 with a graduated implementation beginning in fall of 2008”. They have been assured the Union will remain functional and operational during the renovation. Sharon said the size would be increased by an additional 35,000 sq. ft. They really feel the Union needs to be renovated even though current students will not benefit, at the present time, they are looking at it as a benefit for future students. Also, the architect feels the renovation will increase the use of the Union and alumni and visitors as well as students will benefit. VP Bird said they have stressed the point of intergenerational transfers (the people who have made sacrifices all along, such as the students who built the Colvin Center and never got to use it but were also paying that fee). The students understand this more than anyone. Bird said the students have been involved in this process all along and they have been an extraordinary committee. They have looked at other Unions across the country and fully vested and understand better than anyone else the burden that they bear for future students and she is very proud of them for that. There will be an aggressive fund-raising campaign to raise the remainder of the money.

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:**ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Jean Van Delinder**

Van Delinder reported the committee is working on reviewing the policies and procedures on a course action request; guidelines for initiating, modifying and discontinuing academic options in degree programs; and a class attendance policy for pandemics. The committee has also been discussing the absence of a student survey of instruction for on-line courses and a policy has been drafted and is being pilot-tested for this Spring. She understands this feature is being built into Desire2Learn. This is for courses taught on-line and does not include video or distance learning. The evaluations for on-line courses will also be sent to the outreach directors so they can evaluate the technological aspects of on-line course. The committee has also discussed the feasibility of all student surveys of instruction being done on-line but was told administration has tested this in the past and did not have a very high rate of participation.

Van Delinder presented a recommendation from the ASP committee entitled “Recommended Policy on Academic Integrity”. This recommendation amends the OSU Policy and Procedures on Academic Integrity, 2-0822 in regard to revising the existing policy to include revocation of a degree. Van Delinder said this is a procedure to revoke a degree in the case of fraud or plagiarism and therefore this is an amendment to the existing policy. Policy 2-0822 can be found at: <http://home.okstate.edu/Policy.nsf>. The committee recommended revising three sections as follows:

Current

These behaviors may subject the student to disciplinary action including receiving a failing grade on assignment, examination or course, receiving a notation of a violation of academic integrity on the transcript, and suspension from the University. These behaviors are described in detail in the Academic Integrity Guidelines.

Proposed

These behaviors may subject the student to disciplinary action including receiving a failing grade

on assignment, examination or course, receiving a notation of a violation of academic integrity on the transcript, and suspension from the University. Serious violations discovered after a student graduates may lead to revocation of a degree. These behaviors are described in detail in the Academic Integrity Guidelines.

Adding Section 2.11 (as amended by Faculty Council)

2.11 If clear and convincing evidence of a serious violation of academic integrity is discovered (including but not limited to the violations listed under level three sanctions in 2.05.c.) after a student graduates, revocation of the degree may be recommended.

2.11 originally read: If an instructor discovers clear and convincing evidence of a serious violation of academic integrity is discovered (including but not limited to the violations listed under level three sanctions in 2.05.c.) after a student graduates, the instructor may recommend revocation of the degree may be recommended.

Current

3.11 The decision of the Appeals Panel is final.

Proposed

3.11 The decision of the Appeals Panel is final except when revocation of a degree is recommended by the Academic Integrity Panel. Revocation of a degree requires approval of the Provost and Senior Vice President, President and CEO, and A&M Board of Regents.

Darcy spoke against these amendments because he is opposed to revoking or taking away degrees. On the other hand, he completely understands the committee's rationale which is that it is in the power of the Regents to do this and therefore there ought to be due process and fair procedures. He feels taking a degree away is a political process and is not a scientific or academic process. He cited the case of Dr. Martin Luther King who received a degree from Boston University. It was alleged that he plagiarized his dissertation and Boston University put together a committee to look into the matter and they concluded the dissertation was, in fact, plagiarized. They had the ability to take away the degree but chose not to. Instead, they inserted a statement in the dissertation indicating the plagiarized portions and the matter ended at that point. Darcy said the solution to this matter, in the academic environment, is dialogue, study, investigation, and publicity. He suggested that if it is the will of the faculty to take away degrees then this recommendation ought to be written in such a way to express that will. It is unclear if undergraduate degrees should also be revoked and he feels it should be clearly stated.

Strathe spoke very strongly in support of this recommendation. She said she did not think it was a question of what the Board decided about whether or not a particular degree is revoked or not. She thinks it is about the authority of the Board to revoke the degree. She does not think there is anything that limits this to graduate work at all. There are certainly creative components, professional education portfolios, reports, research, and laboratory data that occurs both at the graduate and undergraduate levels although it is more likely this would occur at the graduate level. Strathe said she was more concerned with some of the court documents and quoted from a 1986 case the Ohio Supreme Court considered in *Waliga v. Board of Trustees of Kent State University* in which they write: "We consider it self-evident that a college or university acting through its board of trustees does have the inherent authority to revoke an improperly awarded degree where (1) good cause such as fraud, deceit, or error is shown, and (2) the degree holder is

afforded a fair hearing at which he can present evidence and protect his interest. Academic degrees are a university's certification to the world at large of the recipient's educational achievement and fulfillment of the institution's standards," the court continued. "To hold that a university may never withdraw a degree effectively requires the university to continue making a false certification to the public at large of the accomplishment of persons who in fact lack the very qualifications that are certified." Strathe said they asked again for good cause to be shown and that a fair hearing procedure be made available. This was reaffirmed in 1997 by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges in the publishing of their report about the responsibilities that we have relative to the appropriate standards and NASULGC urges a minimalist approach to degree revocation.

After a lengthy discussion, Hirschlein introduced a friendly amendment to reword section 2.11, as stated above. Miller seconded. The amendment passed with 18 for and 5 against. The original motion was voted on and passed with 22 for and 3 against.

BUDGET — John Veenstra

Veenstra reported a meeting was held with the OSU Foundation officers to discuss the Endowed Chair and Professorships and the **Committee** was informed that the **State's** compromise **budget** has no additional funding for the Endowed Chairs positions. They are also working with the textbook issue and are waiting for a response from the Textbook Ad Hoc Committee so the Budget Committee can begin discussing the issue **with them**. They are also looking at the proposed Regents Professors pay increase that was discussed at the March Council meeting.

CAMPUS FACILITIES, SAFETY, AND SECURITY — Khaled Gasem

Gasem reported the committee is discussing the issue of a Tobacco-free Campus. He said they were aware VP Bird is working with this issue and hope to be in contact with that committee. During their deliberations the committee came up with five guidelines to guide them in their deliberations on this issue as follows: 1) protection of the community; 2) involve the Wellness Center and other organizations to educate and assist the smokers in their struggle with this addiction; 3) be compassionate with the people who are addicted to the smoking habit; 4) have a definite time horizon on how to transition from a campus who has some allowances to a campus that is tobacco free; and 5) not infringe on personal liberties.

FACULTY — Tony Brown

Brown presented a DRAFT policy regarding "Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty" as an information item. The "Policy" is the first section of the document was adopted and approved and the committee was charged with the development of the procedures to implement the policy. This will also be presented at the April 20 Spring General Faculty Meeting. The DRAFT, in its entirety, can be viewed on the Faculty Council website at: <http://facultycouncil.okstate.edu/> (left column on home page under the Main Menu entitled "Policies and Procedures" – "Cumulative Review Draft". Brown has asked Interim President Strathe to provide review and comments on the document. Brown asked Faculty Council to provide review and comment. The committee hopes to bring a final recommendation to the Faculty Council at the May 8 meeting.

Brown said the objective of the Faculty Committee was to develop a procedure that provides for effective implementation of the new policy; minimizes the administrative burden of implementation; emphasizes a non-punitive and professional development approach to post-

tenure review; is faculty driven in process; is department centered in scope; and reinforces existing faculty performance policies.

Glenn Brown asked how much faculty and administration time will be created by this new policy which will be taken out of research, teaching and extension. Tony Brown replied that was a major concern with the policy. Bruce Russell (committee member) said the policy calls for a faculty committee to evaluate their colleagues and in creating that structure that faculty committee will have to have a post-tenure review committee in every department every year. The alternative is a model other universities have adopted and that is to have it part of the annual A&D process which the department or unit head essentially has control over. That system may reduce the amount of time that is burdened on the faculty but the committee saw that as problematic in that an individual may be targeted by a unit head for some other reason. It could either be a collegial type of process or a “top-down” type of process and the committee decided the collegial process was better. Moomaw thought if you looked at five years worth of annual reviews and you see that someone has received very positive reviews and you look at the persons resume and you see what the person has published then it should not take more then 15 minutes.

Gasem asked if the committee had looked at other systems that have gone through this process, how they went about it and what kind of results were received. T. Brown replied there have been a series of reports looking at the histories of schools that have adopted this policy. The schools that have taken a much more faculty development approach, using it in a positive constructive way of addressing faculty performance issues, were the most successful. Mitchell asked if there were other peer institutions that conduct a review such as this. Phillips replied nine out of twelve.

Brown urged faculty to read the document carefully and submit any comments, questions or concerns to Tony Brown (anthony.brown@okstate.edu) or Tom Phillips (tom.phillips@okstate.edu).

LONG-RANGE PLANNING AND INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY — Nick Materer

Materer reported the mainframe software, utilized for SIS and administrative functions, will no longer be supported in 2011. Upgrade cost are estimated in the range of 32 million. IT is considering options ranging from maintaining the software in house to a complete upgrade. Bosserman noted the cost was around \$40 million now.

RESEARCH — Al Rouch

Rouch reported a policy that was written in 1984 entitled, “Guidelines to Govern Overload Assignments, Outside Professional Activities, and Other Outside Activities of Faculty Members”, will be discussed. The Faculty Council Executive Committee suggested updating and/or revising the current policy. Rouch suggested forming a special committee consisting of faculty from each of the colleges to deal with this issue. The current policy (Policy & Procedure Letter 2-0111) can be reviewed at: <http://home.okstate.edu/Policy.nsf>. Contact Rouch at: al.rouch@okstate.edu with any comments or suggestions.

RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Greg Bell

Bell reported the request for proposals for health insurance was submitted on April 6 to potential providers. It includes a component plan like the current plan, an option for a high deductible health insurance plan with a health-savings account if you choose, and also a health maintenance organization.

There are various wellness components within those proposals. This does not mean this is the type of insurance OSU will end up with but what the providers will bid on. These will be returned by early May and a committee will be chosen to review the proposals and they will be read by Human Resources. That committee will choose a plan, that plan will be sent to the Board of Regents, and should be approved in either June or July.

RULES AND PROCEDURES — Ron Moomaw

The R&P committee counted ballots on April 6. Approximately 425 votes were submitted for Vice Chair. A run-off election will be held between Bus Jaco and Ron Moomaw as well as a run-off election in the College of Education between Timm Bliss and David Yellin. Moomaw presented the remaining election results as follows: College of Agricultural Sciences & Natural Resources (three-year term) – Udaya DeSilva; College of Arts & Sciences (two three-year terms) – Brad Bays and Stephen Perkins; College of Arts & Sciences (one one-year term) – Heidi Hoffer; College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology (three-year term) – Bruce Russell; Wm. S. Spears School of Business (three-year term) – Ron Miller; OSU Center for Health Sciences/Tulsa (three-year term) – Rhonda Casey; OSU Oklahoma City (three-year term) – Russ Calhoun; Multicultural Group (three-year term) – Young Chang. New Councilors will take office June 1, 2007. Ballots for the run-off elections were mailed April 9 and due back by April 20.

REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:

Staff Advisory Council — Liz Condit

Staff Advisory Council: Staff Picnic.

For a number of years, Oklahoma State University Administration and Staff Advisory Council set aside one day a year to honor and recognize the contributions made by staff employees. This day is entitled Staff Appreciation Day and includes a picnic lunch, entertainment, and door prizes for staff at OSU. We host the event outdoors on Willard Lawn and invite vendors to set-up booths on Willard Lawn & Terrace. The Awards and Recognition Committee partner with the Public Relations Committee in planning this big event. Many organizations at OSU and businesses in Stillwater participate in this event yearly. Many local businesses give door prizes and set-up booths for information about their business. The 2007 Staff Picnic is scheduled to take place Thursday, April 12, 2007 on Willard Lawn near Theta Pond. (If weather is bad, the Picnic will be moved to the Student Union Ballroom). Condit thanked Faculty Council for any assistance that they are able to give in asking fellow faculty members to help serve at the luncheon.

Staff Advisory Council: SAC Nominations

Staff Advisory Council nominations concluded, Friday, April 6, 2007. The number of positions to be filled and terms of office are listed below; next to the Division name. Terms begin June 1, 2007. Academic Affairs: Two A/P positions (one 1 year term and one 3 year term) and three Classified positions (one 1 year term and two 3 year terms) Administration and Finance: Two 3 year Classified positions. Enrollment Management/Marketing/EREDF/General University & Research: One 3 year A/P position Student Affairs: One 3 year term Classified position. SAC elections will take in the next few days.

The next Staff Advisory Council meeting takes place Wednesday, April 11, 2007 in SU Case Study room 408. All are welcome to attend.

Graduate Faculty Council — Al Rouch

Lowell Caneday, Professor of Applied Health & Educational Psychology, was elected Vice-chair of the Graduate Faculty. His four year term will begin June 01, 2007.

- A PhD program in Fire and Emergency Management Administration was approved by the Graduate Council at its March meeting.
- Officers from the appropriate Group are conducting reviews and will provide input to the Graduate College for those graduate programs that are up for their five-year, Academic Program Review.
- “Group” meetings were in March; at the next Graduate Council meeting (April 23) there will be a discussion of input from the Groups related to the topic of candidacy as well as any other items of concern at the Group level.
- Graduate Commencement is scheduled for Friday, May 4th at Gallagher-Iba Arena. Students and advisors should arrive by 6:15 PM for assembly. The student processional starts at 6:40 PM with the commencement starting at 7:00 PM. A reception will be held immediately following Friday’s commencement on the second floor of Gallagher-Iba, which is open to all graduates, their friends, and family.

Emeriti Association — Robert Swaim

The OSU Emeriti Association will have a celebration of their 20th anniversary of founding on January 7, 2008 at a dinner at the Conoco-Phillips Alumni Center.

Women’s Faculty Council — Jean Van DelinderReception for Research Awards

Tuesday, April 17, 3:30 pm in the Peggy V. Helmerich Browsing Room, 2nd floor, Edmon Low Library. A record number of applications were received this year! The winners are as follows: **Undergraduate Science or Engineering** – Renee Hale, “Optimizing a Three-Dimensional Tissue Model for the Production of Dendritic Cells”; **Undergraduate Humanities or Social Sciences** – Amanda Williams, “Web Journal Content Posted by Adolescents Attending Public and Catholic Schools: Implications for Future Research and Intervention”; **Graduate Science or Engineering** – Anna Childers, “Decision Support Model for Rural Water Systems- A Planning Model for Rural Water Systems: How to Optimally Meet Future Drinking Water Demands in Northeastern Oklahoma”; **Graduate Humanities or Social Sciences** – Emma Deputy, “Rationalizing the Impact of Maghrebi Women”.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is May 8, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,
Thomas Jordan, Secretary