

FACULTY COUNCIL MINUTES  
250 Student Union  
June 12, 2007

Bob Miller called the meeting to order with the following members present: Bays, Bidwell, Brown, G., Calhoun, Carter, Casey, Dare, DeSilva, Gasem, Hirschlein, Hoffer, Jordan, Martin, Miller, R., Moberly, Moomaw, Perkins, Phillips, Ransom, Russell, Spicer, Van Delinder, Veenstra, and Yellin. Also present: Bell, G., Bird, L., Gates, G., Goodbary, A., Matoy, A., Mitchell, E., Weimer, C., Wieder, L., and Wright, C. Absent: Brown, T., Chang, Clinkenbeard, Giles, Goetze, and Westhaus

**HIGHLIGHTS**

---

Health Insurance Update.....	1
Reports of Status of Faculty Council Recommendations .....	2
Reports of Standing Committees	
Academic Standards and Policies .....	3
Athletics .....	3
Faculty.....	6
Recommendation: Revision of Section 2.06 of the Policy and Procedures for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty.....	6
Retirement and Fringe Benefits .....	7
Reports of Liaison Representatives	
Graduate and Professional Student Government Association .....	7
New Business.....	7

---

Miller asked for a verbal roll call due to the fact there were new Councilors in attendance. He then introduced Ron Moomaw, newly elected Vice Chair. Miller asked for approval of the May 8, 2007, Minutes. Jordan moved acceptance of the Minutes. Van Delinder seconded. The Minutes were approved. Miller asked the June 12, 2007 Agenda be amended to allow Greg Bell and Anne Matoy to give a health insurance update. Moomaw moved and Jordan seconded. The Agenda was approved as amended.

**HEALTH INSURANCE UPDATE:** Greg Bell and Anne Matoy

Greg Bell, Professor, Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, Past Chair of the Faculty Council Retirement and Fringe Benefits Committee and current member on the Health Care Task Force and University Flexible Compensation Benefits Committees, reported the Health Care Task Force had met today and determined they would like to try to reach an agreement with Blue Cross and Blue Shield (BCBS) to be the next health care provider for the OSU System. The administration will ask the Regent's permission to negotiate with BCBS at the next Board meeting on June 22. Bell said the BCBS plan is exceptionally cheaper than the current plan. The bad news is they do not have a provision for one child. If you are paying for one child it will be "dependent children" rather than "dependent child". BCBS has a large network of providers in the Stillwater area; however not all providers from OSEEGIB are going to be on the BCBS provider list. BCBS do not charge anything to a provider to be added to their list and Bell said it would take approximately 45 days for a new provider to be added to the list. Blue Cross

does not have HMO providers in Stillwater. If an agreement is reached, BCBS will try and build some kind of network for an HMO. If that does not work out the Health Care Task Force has asked them to provide a plan that is very similar to an HMO using the existing network so those presently on an HMO can continue on a similar plan. Rhonda Casey, Councilor and Pediatrician with the Center for Health Sciences in Tulsa, said as a Blue Cross provider, as of this time a year ago, they did not recognize Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) in children as a diagnosis and therefore did not cover any medications for this disorder in any percentage. She added this might have changed in the last year but it is something that should be looked into. Bell said the good news is the network outside the State of Oklahoma is just as strong as inside the State of Oklahoma and BCBS provides a seamless transition from one regional network to another. If you retire and move out of State you will not notice any difference. There is a wellness plan included. There will also be a five percent cap on premium increases in 2009 and 2010 unless certain things apply such as the number of people in the plan increases by ten percent or more. The savings to the University will be around 25 percent on a BCBS plan with the same coverage as our current Health Choice High plan. The final bid process has not been completed but we hope to negotiate an agreement soon. If the University is willing to give employees back that 25 percent savings then as far as your dependents are concerned you will probably see a 30 to 40 percent reduction in what you are paying now. We will have new premiums in place beginning January 1, 2008 if we can negotiate an agreement with Blue Cross or another provider. Bell and Matoy both stressed that their report is very preliminary and was only presented today because it is the last meeting of Faculty Council until September. Lori Wieder, Staff Advisory Council representative, asked if this would replace all of the options of the other HMO's and we would be serviced by one insurance plan. Matoy replied we could not be a member of OSEEGIB and any other plan. Ron Miller asked if someone had a spouse under Health Choice with the public school system and she were to retire what would be the options. Matoy said she could not answer that question at the present time as there are many details that have to be worked out. There were two viable vendor bids and they are looking at one of them more seriously but the other one is still under consideration. Matoy said in her last discussions with Health Choice they said they were expecting to increase premiums next year so changing plans will provide an even greater increase than a simple comparison with this year's rates. Brian Carter asked if this was an annual contract. Matoy replied it would be a three-year contract. Chuck Ransom asked if they knew approximately when details would be known so employees could make plans for the future. Matoy replied that they are looking at a plan change January 1. That is seven months away, and it will probably be the end of summer before it is known exactly how everything will be structured but all will be kept informed and that was the purpose of her and Bell attending today.

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

Vice President Lee Bird presented the status of the following recommendations:

06-11-03-SALR

***Study Abroad Initiative:*** Participation goals have been 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:*** Report received and under review. 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. The recommendation is being considered, along with other budget priorities, as the FY 2008 budget is finalized.
- 07-03-02-RFB ***Employee Dependent Tuition Benefit Recommendation:*** Pending. The recommendation is being considered, along with other budget priorities, as the FY 2008 budget is finalized.
- 07-05-01-LRPIT ***Course Management Systems and Extraordinary Use:*** Accepted. The VPR&TT agrees that the use of these software packages should not constitute “extraordinary use of university resources” and should not jeopardize such ownership.
- 07-05-02-FAC ***Policy and Procedures for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty:*** Pending. The Faculty Committee is currently reviewing several modifications to the original draft document that were suggested by the deans.
- 07-05-03-EXEC ***Merit Raise Salary Program for FY 2007-2008:*** Accepted. A proposed 3% merit raise program for faculty and staff was announced on May 29, and pending Board approval, will be effective July 1, 2007. [Bruce Russell asked Dr. Bird since this is merit only, did that infer there could be 0% for some faculty and greater than 3% for others. Dr. Bird replied, “that is what it infers”.]
- 07-06-01-FAC ***Revision of Section 2.06 of the Policy and Procedures for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty:*** To Interim President Strathe

## REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES:

### ACADEMIC STANDARDS AND POLICIES — Jean Van Delinder

Van Delinder reported the committee met in May to review four Policies and Procedures referred to them by Academic Affairs. These changes were made to be consistent with existing practices or to update phrases such as “physical and handicapped or physical disabilities”, etc. They do not require a faculty vote but she wanted Council to be aware of them. The four were: Standards for Semester-Credit Hour, P&P 2-0209; Academic Program Review, P&P 2-0215; Summer Sessions, P&P 2-0204; and Priority Enrollment for Continuing Students, P&P 2-0213. These were all approved by Instruction Council. They will be available in the near future at: <http://home.okstate.edu/Policy.nsf?OpenDatabase>. Or, copies can be obtained from the Faculty Council office by emailing [diane.lafollette@okstate.edu](mailto:diane.lafollette@okstate.edu).

### ATHLETICS — Bruce Russell

Russell is the Faculty Council representative to the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA). He reported on a conference he attended in May in Palo Alto, California and presented the following summary:

COIA is an alliance of 55 Division IA Faculty Senates and Councils whose mission is to provide a national faculty voice on intercollegiate athletics. The primary goal of COIA is to ensure that college sports are integrated within the University, and its academic goals, values and various missions. Most recent activity has been to develop a White Paper titled, “Framing the Future: Reforming Intercollegiate Athletics”. The paper includes position statements supporting the

COIA point of view. If you are interested in reading this paper the website address is: <http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>. Russell said he thought it was important for faculty to understand that this organization is going to grow. Currently it has 55 members and all are Division I football playing schools. Five of the Big 12 schools are currently members (Colorado, Missouri, Nebraska, Oklahoma State, and Texas) and he expects that number to grow. It is not a radical organization in that it wants to eliminate college athletics. They have a very realistic common-sense approach which recognizes that commercialization does exist in college sports and that it is not necessarily embraced. The white paper also includes a list of specific proposals for reform of college athletics. Proposals include four primary categories:

1. Academic Integrity and Quality Reforms
  - a. Admissions and Recruiting
  - b. The Primacy of Academics
2. Student-Athlete Welfare
  - a. Athletic Scholarships
  - b. Competition and Practice Schedules
  - c. Integration into Campus Life
  - d. Integration of Academic Advising for Student Athletes
3. Campus Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics (principally recommending proposals to give faculty a voice in Athletic oversight.)
4. Fiscal Responsibility

Russell said that Miles Brand, who is the President of the NCAA, along with two senior staff members, also attended the meeting in Palo Alto. They are asking Faculty Councils and Senates to help them maintain academic standards that are already in place. Russell said if you read the sports pages there are basketball coaches in this state who are saying that the current academic regulations for basketball teams are unreasonable. Miles Brand said he predicted this would begin to happen. The NCAA adopted a program called the Academic Progress Rate (APR) and every team receives a score. They must score at least a 925 and if they do not penalties would include revoking of scholarships. The NCAA can legislate academic policies on the member institutions and that is an example. The NCAA cannot legislate fiscal responsibilities on academic institutions. Regarding item 4 on the list above, the NCAA does have a certification process that occurs once every ten years for each of its member institutions. Part of this process includes a self assessment. OSU can, with the cooperation of administration, possibly influence the university into adopting some of these standards that NCAA calls "Best Practices. There are approximately 20 proposals on this list and Russell listed the top three he thought might cause the most concern for Athletic Directors and they include: 1) Athletic Scholarships will be awarded for four years and not rescinded except for violation of academic policies, or failure to meet university or team rules; 2) Integrating Athletic Advising into the campus advising; and 3) Fusing athletic fundraising with academic fundraising and eliminating separate 501(c)(3) organizations. He felt this was important for Oklahoma State because a separate 501(c)(3) was just created for athletic fundraising and this is opposed, in some ways, to the "best practices" of the NCAA. Russell added that in the White Paper mentioned above, 4.4 states: "The University President should take the appropriate steps to fuse athletic fundraising efforts into those of the rest of the university, including eliminating separate, athletic-only 501(c)(3) entities and establishing faculty representation on the board of the institutional fund-raising entity [*New; local and national (NCAA certification)*]" Russell feels whatever fundraising activities occur

for athletics should be in cooperation with academics and he added that for 15 years as a faculty member he has more or less promoted athletics to other faculty members in a sense that athletics attract alumni and donors back to the university. Hopefully those donors have a positive experience at that Saturday afternoon football game which in turn gives them a good feeling in donating to the rest of the university. When there are separate fundraising activities he feels that relationship is placed in jeopardy. Other concerns over fiscal responsibilities are that they would like to see some level of faculty governance in cooperation with policies adopted by the Athletic Department or athletics in general. Not in the sense they are told what to do but that there is some meaningful input into their processes of scholarship, financing, etc.

In regard to item 1 above, athletic scholarships are awarded on a year-by-year basis. Therefore, coaches can make it difficult on a student-athlete if they want to take their scholarship away. Russell said one of the policies they are promoting would be that once a scholarship is awarded that it is the scholarship of the student-athlete until they graduate unless they violate a team or university rule or they have academic problems.

Discussing item 2 Russell said he knew OSU had a very active athletic advising program that is not available to all students. NCAA would like to see that kind of academic advising report through an academic channel. Not just the VP for Athletics but also through the VP for Academic Affairs.

Russell ended by saying he feels COIA is a very dynamic organization and at the meeting in California it became apparent that there is no umbrella organization nationally for Faculty Councils or Senates. There is the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) but that is a different organization and he feels it is possible to see an organization with the emphasis on athletics but with a national voice on all kinds of issues that would be brought before Faculty Councils and Senates.

Hirschlein asked "How is the APR calculated and if we are expected to be at 925 what is the maximum"? Russell said he thought the max was 1,000 but he does not know if it is a linear scale. The 925 roughly correlates to a 60% graduation rate and he added he did not know how the number is calculated. It might be on the NCAA website.

Mitchell said the score is actually a way of penalizing universities who are doing well. He explained that four years ago there were four starters on the basketball team that graduated, one with a Master's Degree, and yet our score was so high because they penalize the institution for students who leave and never graduate and you do not get credit for those that transfer in and do graduate. He added there should be some way of changing that procedure.

Gasem asked if there were any proposals to tie fundraising activities in athletics to that of academics; i.e., for every dollar spent in athletics you have to spend a dollar in academics. Russell replied that question came up at the university-wide Fall General Faculty Meeting and the answer was the donor gives money to what the donor wants to give money to. It was discussed in Palo Alto and Russell feels that is where the development officer has to suggest to the donor that perhaps part of the gift could go toward academics. That is what troubles Russell in regard to a separate 501(c)(3). You now have different development officers and one has the job of raising money for the Athletic Department (and they have something to sell) and the other has the job of raising money for the academic side. Russell feels the NCAA has taken the

position on financial matters that it is a violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act for them to tell the university how to manage their fiscal affairs whether it is athletics or anything else. Those kinds of proposals have to be done at the university or Regents level.

### **FACULTY — David Yellin**

Yellin presented the following recommendation to Council:

**Title:** Revision of Section 2.06 of the Policy and Procedures for Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty

**The Faculty Council Recommends to Interim President Strathe that:** Section 2.06 of the Policy and Procedures Letter entitled “Oklahoma State University Policy and Procedures— Cumulative Review of Tenured Faculty” be revised (changes in the original language are indicated by bold and underlined text) as follows:

#### **2.06 Development and Disposition of the Cumulative Review Report**

The committee shall prepare a written report that assesses the faculty member’s overall performance during the review period in terms of the academic unit’s performance standards and expectations.

The committee shall submit its report to the faculty member under review **and the unit administrator**. The faculty member **and the unit administrator** shall be given ten (10) working days to respond to the report in writing, and the committee may revise its report based on the faculty member’s response **and the unit administrator’s response**.

A final copy of the committee’s report, ~~and~~ the faculty member’s response, **and the unit administrator’s response**, if one is submitted, shall be provided to the faculty member and the unit administrator. These documents along with those listed in 2.05 shall be included in the faculty member’s personnel file.

Unit administrators shall report the summary results of cumulative reviews to their dean on an annual basis.

#### **Rationale:**

The original P&P letter allowed for the Department Head to sit on the committee, but it was not required, and in such cases there was no opportunity for the Department Head to have any input. The proposed revision allows for the Department Head to have input, the Committee to consider such input, use it in their final revision if they so desire, and simply have the Department Head comments on record.

Van Delinder asked for clarification in that once the committee has submitted the report to the faculty member and the unit administrator there does not have to be a response. Yellin replied it is an opportunity to.

Miller called for a vote. The recommendation passed unanimously.

**RETIREMENT AND FRINGE BENEFITS — Bruce Russell**

Russell thanked Greg Bell and Anne Matoy in regard to their work regarding health insurance as the change will make a big difference to families. He asked Matoy to please keep him “in the loop” with the work on the Task Force and asked to be added to the committee.

**REPORTS OF LIAISON REPRESENTATIVES:****Graduate and Professional Student Government Association — Chris Wright**

Wright introduced himself as the new GPSGA President. One of the first initiatives he wants to undertake is a way to create an award to acknowledge some of the professors on campus and also find out what a professor would appreciate in the way of a non-monetary award.

**NEW BUSINESS:**

Bob Miller read a letter he had received from Tom Phillips, Past Chair of the OSU General Faculty as follows:

Dear Bob:

As you know, I will be leaving OSU at the end of this month for a new position at Kansas State University and I will be unable to fulfill my duties to Faculty Council. Therefore, effective at close of business today, I am resigning from Council and from my officer position as Past Chair of the Oklahoma State University Faculty Council.

I wish you and the Council all the best for a productive and progressive year in “shared faculty governance” at OSU.

Yours truly,  
Tom Phillips

Miller said Council will be sorry to lose Phillips. He then suggested Carol Moder, Faculty Council Chair, 2003-2004, be appointed to replace Phillips as Past Chair. She had not served in that position after her term ended due to the fact that 2005 was the first year Council had the position of Past Chair. Miller said he had discussed this issue with Moder and she had agreed to serve. Moomaw moved and Ransom seconded this recommendation. Moder to serve as Past Chair of Faculty Council for the 2007-2008 meeting year passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m. The next regular meeting of the Faculty Council is September 11, 2007. Faculty Council does not meet in July and August.

Respectfully submitted,  
Thomas Jordan, Secretary